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DEFINITION OF A STUDENT

A student is one who studies. He is an attentive and systematic observer. A student is one who reads in detail in order to learn and then apply.

As a student studies he knows that his purpose is to understand the material: he is studying by reading, observing, and demonstrating so as to apply them to a specific result.

He connects what he is studying to what he will be doing.

Jon Horwich
Flag Class VIII Course Supervisor for
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:JH:kjm.ka.rd
THE INTENTION OF THE STUDENT

The state of mind with which a student approaches study will determine the results that student gets from the study.

The student must determine what he is going to do with the materials he is studying. He must determine what he is going to do with the information he is absorbing.

If a student's intent is to study the materials so he can pass the exam he will be very incapable of doing anything with the subject once the exam is over. He might be a great theoretician, but he will not be able to use the subject.

Some students don't have any intention other than getting through the course. They are just there studying away. They balk at doing demos or clay or looking up words for their exact meaning. Even when forced to demonstrate something they maintain the attitude that it has nothing to do with them. "It's all very interesting to read but..."

Non-involvement is the primary barrier in the ability to apply the materials of a course.

There can be many reasons for study. Points, exams, status, speed, glory, whatever.

There is only one valid reason. Studying for understanding, application and practice.

Jon Horwich
Flag Class VIII Course Supervisor
for
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:JH:kjm.ka.rd
Word Clearing Series 3R

BARRIERS TO STUDY

There are three different sets of physiological and mental reactions that come from 3 different aspects of study. They are three different sets of symptoms.

(1) Education in the absence of the mass in which the technology will be involved is very hard on the student.

It actually makes him feel squashed. Makes him feel bent, sort of spinny, sort of dead, bored, exasperated.

If he is studying the doingness of something in which the mass is absent this will be the result.

Photographs help and motion pictures would do pretty good as they are a sort of promise or hope of the mass but the printed page and the spoken word are not a substitute for a tractor if he's studying about tractors.

You have to understand this data in its purity—and that is that educating a person in a mass that they don't have and which isn't available produces physiological reactions. That is what I am trying to teach you.

It's just a fact.

You're trying to teach this fellow all about tractors and you're not giving him any tractors—well he's going to wind up with a face that feels squashed, with headaches and with his stomach feeling funny. He's going to feel dizzy from time to time and very often his eyes are going to hurt.

It's a physiological datum that has to do with processing and the field of the mind.

You could therefore expect the greatest incidence of suicide or illness in that field of education most devoted to studying absent masses.
This one of studying the something without its mass ever being around produces the most distinctly recognizable reactions.

If a child felt sick in the field of study and it were traced back to this one, the positive remedy would be to supply the mass—the object or a reasonable substitute—and it would clear it up.

(2) There is another series of physiological phenomena that exist which is based on the fact of too steep a study gradient.

That's another source of physiological study reaction because of too steep a gradient. It is a sort of a confusion or a reelingness that goes with this one.

You've hit too steep a gradient.

There was too much of a jump because he didn't understand what he was doing and he jumped to the next thing and that was too steep and he went too fast and he will assign all of his difficulties to this new thing.

Now differentiate here—because gradients sounds terribly like the 3rd one of these study hang-ups, definitions—but remember that they are quite distinctly different.

Gradients are more pronounced in the field of doingness but they still hang over into the field of understanding. In gradients however it is the actions we are interested in. We have a plotted course of forward motion of actions. We find he was terribly confused on the second action he was supposed to do. We must assume then that he never really got out of the first one.

The remedy for this one of too steep a gradient is cutting back. Find out when he was not confused on the gradient, then what new action he undertook to do. Find what action he understood well. Just before he was all confused what did he understand well—and then we find out that he didn't understand it well.

It's really at the tail end of what he understood and then he went over the gradient you see.

It is most recognizable and most applicable in the field of doingness.

That's the gradient barrier and one full set of phenomena accompanies that.

(3) There is this third one. An entirely different set of physiological reactions brought about through—a bypassed definition. A bypassed definition gives one a distinctly blank feeling or a washed-out feeling. A not-there feeling and a sort of nervous hysteria will follow in the back of that.
The manifestation of "blow" stems from this 3rd aspect of study which is the misunderstood definition or the not comprehended definition, the undefined word.

That's the one that produces the blow.

The person doesn't necessarily blow on these other two—they are not pronouncedly blow phenomena. They are simply physiological phenomena.

This one of the misunderstood definition is so much more important. It's the make-up of human relations, the mind and subjects. It establishes aptitude and lack of aptitude and it's what psychologists have been trying to test for years without recognizing what it was.

It's the definitions of words.

The misunderstood word.

That's all it goes back to and that produces such a vast panorama of mental effects that it itself is the prime factor involved with stupidity and the prime factor involved with many other things.

If a person didn't have misunderstood his talent might or might not be present but his doingness would be present.

We can't say that Joe would paint as well as Bill if both were unaberrated in the field of art, but we can say that the inability of Joe to paint compared with the ability of Joe to do the motions of painting is dependent exclusively and only upon definitions—exclusively and only upon definitions.

There is some word in the field of art that the person who is inept didn't define or understand and that is followed by an inability to act in the field of the arts.

That's very important because it tells you what happens to doingness and that the restoration of doingness depends only upon the restoration of understanding on the misunderstood word—misunderstood definition.

This is very fast processing. There is a very swift wide big result obtainable in this.

It has a technology which is a very simple technology.

It enters in at the lower levels because it has to. This doesn't mean it is unimportant, it means it has to be at the entrance gates of Scientology.

It IS a sweepingly fantastic discovery in the field of education and don't neglect it.

You can trace back the subject a person is dumb in or any allied subject that got mixed up with it. The psychologist doesn't understand Scientology. He never understood a word in psychology so he doesn't understand Scientology.

Well that opens the gate to Education. Although I've given this one of the misunderstood definition last it is the most important one.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
In research concerning Word Clearing, study and training done with various groups over the recent past months, it has become all too obvious that a misunderstood word remains misunderstood and will later hang a person up unless he clears the meaning of the word in the context of the materials being read or studied and also clears it in all of its various uses in general communication.

When a word has several different definitions, one cannot limit his understanding of the word to one definition only and call the word "understood." One must be able to understand the word when, at a later date, it is used in a different way.

HOW TO CLEAR A WORD

To clear a word one looks it up in a good dictionary. Dictionaries recommended are The Oxford English Dictionary or the Shorter Oxford Dictionary and Funk and Wagnalls Standard English Dictionary.

The first step is to look rapidly over the definitions to find the one which applies to the context in which the word was misunderstood. One reads the definition and uses it in sentences until one has a clear concept of that meaning of the word. This could require ten or more sentences.

Then one clears each of the other definitions of that word, using each in sentences until one has a conceptual understanding of each definition.

The next thing to do is to clear the derivation – which is the explanation of where the word came from originally. This will help gain a basic understanding of the word.

Don't clear the technical or specialized definitions (math, biology, etc.) or obsolete (no longer used) or archaic (ancient and no longer in general use) definitions unless the word is being used that way in the context where it was misunderstood.
Most dictionaries give the idioms of a word. An idiom is a phrase or expression whose meaning cannot be understood from the ordinary meanings of the words. For example, "give in" is an English idiom meaning "yield." Quite a few words in English have idiomatic uses and these are usually given in a dictionary after the definitions of the word itself. These idioms have to be cleared.

One must also clear any other information given about the word, such as notes on its usage, synonyms, etc. so as to have a full understanding of the word.

If one encounters a misunderstood word or symbol in the definition of a word being cleared, one must clear it right away using this same procedure and then return to the definition one was clearing. (Dictionary symbols and abbreviations are usually given in the front of the dictionary.)

**EXAMPLE**

You are reading the sentence "He used to clean chimneys for a living" and you're not sure what "chimneys" means.

You find it in the dictionary and look through the definitions for the one that applies. It says "A flue for the smoke or gases from a fire."

You're not sure what "flue" means so you look that up: it says "A channel or passage for smoke, air or gasses of combustion." That fits and makes sense so you use it in some sentences until you have a clear concept of it.

"Flue" in this dictionary has other definitions, each of which you would clear and use in sentences.

Look up the derivation of the word "flue."

Now go back to "chimney." The definition "A flue for the smoke or gases from a fire," now makes sense so you use it in sentences until you have a concept of it.

You then clear the other definitions. One dictionary has an obsolete definition and a geological definition. You would skip both of these as they aren't in common usage.

Now clear up the derivation of the word. One finds in the derivation that it originally came from the Greek word "kaminos," which means "furnace."

If the word had any synonym studies, usage notes or idioms, they would all be cleared too.

That would be the end of clearing "chimney."

**CONTEXT UNKNOWN**

If you don't know the context of the word, as in Word Clearing Methods 1, 5 (when done from a list), 6 or 8, you should start with the first definition and clear all definitions, derivation, idioms, etc. as covered above.
"WORD CHAINS"

If you find yourself spending a lot of time clearing words within definitions of words, you should get a simpler dictionary. A good dictionary will enable you to clear a word without having to look up a lot of other ones in the process.

CLEARED WORDS

A cleared word is one which has been cleared to the point of full conceptual understanding by clearing each of the common meanings of that word plus any technical or specialized meanings of that word that pertain to the subject being handled.

That's what a cleared word is. It is a word that is understood. In metered Word Clearing this would be accompanied by a floating needle and very good indicators. There can be more than one F/N per word. Clearing a word must end in an F/N and VGIs. Off the meter this would be accompanied by very good indicators.

The above is the way a word should be cleared.

When words are understood, communication can take place and with communication any given subject can be understood.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
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"Mis-Understood" or "Not-Understood" are terms used to define any error or omission in comprehension of a word, concept, symbol or status.

Most people go around thinking that a misunderstood is just something they obviously don't know – a "not-understood."

A "not-understood" is a misunderstood but there are additional ways a person can misunderstand a word.

A misunderstood word or symbol is defined as a word or symbol for which the student has:

1. **A FALSE (TOTALLY WRONG) DEFINITION:** A definition that has no relationship to the actual meaning of the word or symbol whatsoever.
   
   **Example:** The person reads or hears the word "cat" and thinks that "cat" means "box." You can't get more wrong.
   
   **Example:** A person sees an equals sign (=) and thinks it means to subtract something twice.

2. **AN INVENTED DEFINITION:** An invented definition is a version of a false definition. The person has made it up himself or has been given an invented definition. Not knowing the actual definition he invents one for it. This is sometimes difficult to detect be-
cause he is certain he knows it, after all he invented it himself. There is enough protest pre-
ceding his invention of it to make it read on a meter. In such a case he will be certain he
knows the definition of the word or symbol.

Example: The person when very young was always called "a girl" by his pals when he
refused to do anything daring. He invents the definition of "girl" to be "a cowardly person."

Example: A person never knew the meaning of the symbol for an exclamation point (!)
but seeing it in comic strips as representing swear words invents the definition for it "a foul
curse" and regards it accordingly in everything he reads.

3. **AN INCORRECT DEFINITION:** A definition that is not right but may have
   some relationship to the word or symbol or be in a similar category.

   Example: The person reads or hears the word "computer" and thinks it is "type-
   writer." This is an incorrect meaning for "computer" even though a typewriter and a computer
   are both types of machines.

   Example: A person thinks a period (.) after an abbreviation means that you halt in
   reading at that point.

4. **AN INCOMPLETE DEFINITION:** A definition that is inadequate.

   Example: The person reads the word "office" and thinks it means "room." The defini-
   tion of the word "office" is: "a room or building in which a person transacts his business or
   carries on his stated occupation." (Ref: Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English
   Language) The person's definition is incomplete for the word "office."

   Example: The person sees an apostrophe (') and knows that it means that something is
   owned ('s) but does not know that it also is used to show that a letter has been left out of a
   word. He sees the word "can't" and immediately tries to figure out who can is.

5. **AN UNSUITABLE DEFINITION:** A definition that does not fit the word as it
   is used in the context of the sentence one has heard or read.

   Example: The person hears the sentence: "I am dressing a turkey." The person's under-
   standing of "dressing" is "putting clothes on." That is one definition of "dressing" but it is an
   unsuitable definition for the word as it is used in the sentence he has heard. Because he has an
   unsuitable definition he thinks someone is putting clothes on a turkey. As a result the sentence
   he has heard doesn't really make sense to him. The definition of "dressing" that correctly ap-
   plies in the sentence he has heard is: "to prepared for use as food, by making ready to cook, or
   by cooking." (Ref: The Oxford English Dictionary)

   The person will only truly understand what he is hearing when he has fully cleared the
   word "dressing" in all its meanings, as he will then also have the definition that correctly ap-
   plies in the context.
Example: The person sees a dash (-) in the sentence: "I finished numbers 3 - 7 today." He thinks a dash is a minus sign, realizes you cannot subtract 7 from 3 and so cannot understand it.

6. **A HOMONYMIC** *(one word which has two or more distinctly separate meanings)* **DEFINITION:** A homonym is a word that is used to designate several different things which have totally different meanings; or a homonym can be one of two or more words that have the same sound, sometimes the same spelling, but differ in meaning.

*Example:* The person reads the sentence: "I like to box." The person understands this sentence to mean that someone likes to put things in "containers."

The person has the right meaning for the word "box," but he has the wrong word! There is another word "box" which is being used in the sentence he has just read and means: "to fight another in a boxing match." (Ref: Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language)

The person has a misunderstood because he has a homonymic definition for the word "box" and will have to clear the second word "box" before he understands the sentence.

*Example:* The person sees a plus sign (+) and as it resembles a cross he thinks it is something religious.

*Example:* The person hears the word "period" in the sentence: "It was a disorderly period in history" and knowing that "period" comes at the end of a sentence and means stop, supposes that the world ended at that point.

*Example:* Homonymic misunderstands can also occur when a person does not know the informal or slang usage of a word. The person hears someone on the radio singing: "When my Honey walks down the street." The person thinks a "thick, sweet, yellow or golden liquid, good to eat, that bees make out of the nectar they collect from flowers" is walking down the street! He doesn't know the informal definition of "honey" which is: "sweet one: a pet name" which is how it is being used in the song. (Ref: Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language)

7. **A SUBSTITUTE** *(SYNONYM – a word which has a similar but not the same meaning)* **DEFINITION:** A substitute definition occurs when a person uses a synonym for the definition of a word. A synonym is not a definition. A synonym is a word having a meaning similar to that of another word.

*Example:* The person reads the word "portly" and thinks the definition of the word is "fat." "Fat" is a synonym for the word "portly." The person has a misunderstood because the word "portly" means: "of a stately appearance and carriage; impressive, especially on account of size." (Ref: Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language) The person does not have the full meaning of "portly" if he thinks it just means "fat."

Knowing synonyms for words increases your vocabulary but it does not mean you understand the meaning of a word. Learn the full definition for a word as well as its synonyms.
8. **AN OMITTED (MISSING) DEFINITION:** An omitted definition is a definition of a word that the person is missing or is omitted from the dictionary he is using.

Example: The person hears the line "The food here is too rich." This person knows two definitions for the word "rich." He knows that "rich" means "having much money, land, goods, etc." and "wealthy people." Neither of these definitions make much sense to him in the sentence he has just heard. He cannot understand what food could have to do with having a lot of money.

Omitted definitions can come about from using dinky dictionaries. If the person had looked up "rich" in a small paperback dictionary, he would probably still be stuck with his misunderstood. A dinky dictionary probably will not give him the definition he needs. In order to understand the word he would have to get a good sized dictionary to ensure it gives him the omitted definition which is: "having in a high degree qualities pleasing to the senses; luscious to the taste: often implying an unwholesome excess of butter, fats, flavoring, etc." (Ref: Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language)

Example: The person reads "He estimated the light at f 5.6." He can't figure what this "f" is, so he looks up "f" in the American Heritage Dictionary and wonders if it is temperature or money or sports for "foul" or maybe the money "franc." The text doesn't refer to France so he can't figure it out. Omitted in the American Heritage is the photography definition of "f" which simply means "the number which shows the width of the hole the light goes through in the lens." The moral of this is to have enough dictionaries around.

**NOTE:** It can occur that an accurate definition for a word is not given in any dictionary which is an error in the language itself.

9. **A NO-DEFINITION:** A no-definition is a "not-understood" word or symbol.

Example: The person reads the sentence "The business produced no lucre." No understanding occurs, as he has no definition for "lucre." The word means: "money, especially as the object of greed; gain." (Ref: Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language) It isn't that he has the word in-correctly, unsuitable or any other way defined, he has no definition for it at all. He has never looked it up and gotten it defined. Thus he does not understand it. The definition does not exist for him until he looks it up and gets it clearly understood.

Example: The person sees a dot at the end of a word on a printed page and having no definition for "a period (.)" tends to run all of his sentences together.

10. **A REJECTED DEFINITION:** A rejected definition is a definition of a word which the person will not accept. The reasons why he will not accept it are usually based on emotional reactions connected with it. The person finds the definition degrading to himself or his friends or group in some imagined way or restimulative to him in some fashion. Although he may have a total misunderstood on the word he may refuse to have it explained or look it up.
Example: The person refuses to look up the word "mathematics." He doesn't know what it means, he doesn't want to know what it means, and he won't have anything to do with it. A discussion of why he refuses to look it up discloses that he was expelled from school because he flunked with violence his first month of his first course in mathematics. If he were to realize that he flunked because he didn't know what he was supposed to study he would then be willing to look the word up.

Example: The person refuses to look up the definition of asterisk (*). On discussion it turns out that every time he sees an asterisk on the page he knows the material will be "very hard to read" and is "literary," "difficult" and "highbrow."

Discussion of why he won't look it up usually reveals and releases the emotional charge connected with it which he may never have looked at before. Properly handled he will now want to look it up, having gained an insight into why he wouldn't.

Any word you come across which fits one or more of the above definitions of a misunderstood word or symbol must be cleared up, using a good size dictionary or more than one dictionary or text book or encyclopedia.

It is catastrophic to go on past or ignore a misunderstood word or symbol as one simply will not understand what he is studying.

A student must discipline himself not to go past misunderstood words. He should learn to recognize from his reaction to what he is reading, especially the mental blankness which usually ensues right after one, that he has gone by a misunderstood. He should look them up and get them fully defined before going on with his reading. Students must be persuaded to do this. It is a self-discipline that has to be learned.

The definitions of "misunderstood" and "not-understood" and their different types, must be clearly understood by a person seeking to clear them in himself and others. The commonest error in Word Clearing is for the person being word cleared to believe that a misunderstood is something he simply does not know. With this limited definition he cannot adequately be word cleared nor can he adequately word clear others. So these definitions of "misunderstood" and "not-understood" should be very well known as it will often be necessary to clarify them to the person being word cleared.

Good reading.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:gal
A DICTIONARY is a book containing the words of a language (or a specific subject) usually arranged in alphabetical order, which gives information about the meanings of the words, their pronunciations, origins, etc.

Dictionaries are vital and important tools in studying or learning any subject. However, current dictionaries vary in accuracy and usefulness and many of these modern dictionaries are virtually useless and can actually confuse a person due to their false and omitted definitions and grammatical and other errors. So the dictionary that a student chooses to use is important and can actually make a difference in his success as a student.

As dictionaries are such an important factor in the learning and application of Scientology (or any subject for that matter) I thought I had better recommend some dictionaries that have been found to be the best of those currently available.

I have also included some additional data on the use of dictionaries in clearing words.

SOME USEFUL DICTIONARIES

The following dictionaries are recommended because they have been found to be better, more accurate and more useful than others. No one dictionary was found that would be ideal for all students. The dictionary a student uses is a matter of personal preference and depends to some degree on his vocabulary and level of literacy.

Using the wrong dictionary can make study much harder for a student and greatly extend his time on course. If a student finds he is looking up a lot of words in the definitions he’s clearing and that he is getting into long word chains, he should change to a more simple dictionary. An out gradient dictionary can make word clearing and study unnecessarily difficult. For example, "college" dictionaries are often quite complicated and some students will find themselves spending too much time chasing around the dictionary trying to clear up MUs within the definitions of the words being cleared. This can be time consuming and frustrating.
If you look up "bird" in a simple beginner's dictionary it says something like "an animal covered with feathers that has two legs and lays eggs". Now if you look up this same word in a college dictionary it becomes "any warm-blooded vertebrate (animal with a backbone) of the class Aves (latin for 'birds'), having a body covered with feathers and forelimbs (front legs) modified (changed in some way) into wings." (The explanations in the brackets of course are not included in the dictionary definition. They have been added here so that one can easily understand that presentation of the definition of "bird"). This would likely lead a student into the definitions of "vertebrate", "Aves", "forelimbs" and "modified". After a bit of this the student is slumped on the table with 45 words to look up that he has never heard of before. The answer is to take away his "college" dictionary and give him a more simple dictionary and he'll begin to make some progress.

On the other hand, some students would do just fine with the more advanced dictionaries and would find the additional data helpful.

From the dictionaries recommended here a student should be able to find one that suits him and his vocabulary. (Note: If the dictionary a student chooses does not contain derivations then after clearing the word in that dictionary he should consult a larger dictionary to clear the derivation. Some of the better simple dictionaries unfortunately do not contain the derivations of the words.)

Webster's New World Dictionary for Young Readers:
This is a very simple American dictionary. It is published by William Collins. It is a hardbound volume and does not contain derivations. When using this dictionary a student must be sure to clear the derivations in a larger dictionary. The definitions in this dictionary are quite good.

Oxford American Dictionary:
This is a very good American dictionary, simpler than the college dictionaries yet more advanced than the beginning dictionary listed above. It does not list derivations of the words. It is quite an excellent dictionary and very popular with students who want to use an intermediate dictionary.


The Random House College Dictionary Revised Edition:
This is a college dictionary and somewhat of a higher gradient than the dictionaries listed above. This is a one volume American dictionary published in the US by Random House Inc., New York and in Canada by Random House of Canada Limited, Toronto.

This Random House dictionary contains a large number of slang definitions and idioms and also gives good derivations.
The Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language College Edition:

This is an American college dictionary published by Simon and Schuster of New York. It is a one volume dictionary and gives most of the slang definitions and idioms. It also has good derivations.

Funk and Wagnalls New Comprehensive Dictionary of the English Language International Edition:

This dictionary has been previously published as the Britannica World Language Edition of Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary (published by Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., Chicago) and then as the Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language International Edition (published by J. G. Ferguson Publishing Co. Chicago). It is currently available from the Publishers International Press under the name Funk and Wagnalls New Comprehensive Dictionary of the English Language Edition. Publishers International Press is located in New York City at 9 Madison Ave. and in Los Angeles at 1543 West Olympic Blvd., 90015. (This most recent edition is sold by the Publishers International Press, not in bookstores, and can be obtained by writing or calling the above locations.)

This is one of the most grammatically correct dictionaries there is and it is probably the best American dictionary available. It is a two volume set and is a fairly advanced dictionary.

Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary:

This is an English dictionary printed in Edinburgh, Scotland. It is quite thorough, containing most of the English idioms and slang. It is a fairly high gradient dictionary however and is recommended for the more literate students. The definitions are quite thorough but few examples are given.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary:

This is a very concise English dictionary, but is not a simple or beginner's dictionary. It is a small one volume dictionary. It uses a lot of abbreviations which may take some getting used to, but once the abbreviations are mastered students find this dictionary as easy to use as any other similarly advanced dictionary. It is less complicated in its definitions than the usual college dictionary and has the added benefit that the definitions given are well stated—in other words it does not give the same definition reworded into several different definitions, the way some dictionaries do.

This dictionary is printed in Great Britain and the United States by the Oxford University Press.

The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary:

This is a two volume English dictionary and is a shorter version of The Oxford English Dictionary. It is quite up-to-date and is an ideal dictionary for fairly literate students. Even if not used regularly it makes a very good reference dictionary. The definitions given in the Oxford dictionaries are usually more accurate and give a better idea of the meaning of the word than any other dictionary.
This Oxford dictionary is also printed by the Oxford University Press.

**The Oxford English Dictionary:**

This is by far the largest English dictionary and is the principal dictionary of the English language. It consists of 12 volumes and several supplementary volumes. (There is a *Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary* which the exact text of *The Oxford English Dictionary* is duplicated in very small print which is read through a magnifying glass. Reduced in this manner the whole thing fits into two volumes.)

For many students this dictionary may be too comprehensive to use on a regular basis. (For some students huge dictionaries can be confusing as the words they use in their definitions are often too big or too rare and make one chase through 20 new words to get the meaning of the original.)

Although many students will not use this as their only dictionary, it is a must for every course room and will be found useful in clearing certain words, verifying data from other dictionaries, etc. It is a valuable reference dictionary and is sometimes the only dictionary that correctly defines a particular word.

These Oxfords are also printed by the Oxford University Press. If your local bookstore does not stock them they will be able to order them for you.

As a student's vocabulary increases and he becomes more literate, he will often "graduate" to a more advanced dictionary. This phenomenon of "out-growing" dictionaries was observed on a pilot course designed to increase a person's level of literacy. As students progressed through the course they switched from a beginner's dictionary to a more advanced dictionary and sooner or later started delving into *The Oxford English Dictionary*. The point is, use as complete and advanced a dictionary as you can without getting in over your head. And don't hesitate to use a simpler one if it's better for you. (Some students have found their study speed greatly increased just by switching to a simpler dictionary.)

(Note: When a student using a simple dictionary has to go to a larger dictionary in order to find a definition he's looking for (but isn't in his dictionary) he would clear that particular definition in the larger dictionary and then go to his simpler dictionary to clear the rest of the definitions of that word. Otherwise he could get in over his head.)

From the dictionaries recommended here a student should be able to find one that suits him. Whatever dictionary one chooses, it should be the correct gradient for him. For instance, you wouldn't give a foreign language student, who barely knows English, the big Oxford to use in his studies!

**DINKY DICTIONARIES**

A dinky dictionary is a dictionary that gives you definitions inadequate for a real understanding of the word. Entire definitions are sometimes found to be missing from such dic-
tionaries. "Dinky dictionaries" are the kind you can fit in your pocket. They are usually paperback and sold at magazine counters in drug stores and grocery stores. Don't use a dinky dictionary.

**DICTIONARIES AND A PERSON'S OWN LANGUAGE**

English dictionaries and American dictionaries differ in some of their definitions, as the Americans and English define some words differently. (For example, in an American dictionary we find "pavement" defined as a hard paved surface, generally referring to a road or a street. In an English dictionary it is defined as a paved footway at the side of the road, which is known in America as a "sidewalk". So you could get a situation where an American is barreling down the road on a steam roller yelling "Clear the pavement!" and an Englishman walking at the side of the road on the sidewalk hears this and thinks he means to get off the "paved footway at the side of the road" and so he jumps into the road and gets run down! And you'll find that the word "sidewalk" does not even appear in the English dictionary, yet it is a very common American word.)

An English dictionary will have different applications of words that are specifically British. These usages won't necessarily be found in American dictionaries, as they are not part of the American version of the English language. Different dictionaries have things in them which are unique to that language.

In addition to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, the *Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary* mentioned above is a good example of an English dictionary for the English.

For the most part a student's dictionary should correspond to his own language. This does Dot mean that an American shouldn't use an English dictionary (or vice versa), but if he does he should be aware of the above and check words in a dictionary of his own language as needed.

**SYNONYMS**

In using dictionaries and clearing words you should be aware that one can make the error of "defining" a word using synonyms.

A *synonym* is a word that means the same or nearly the same as another word in the same language. It is not the definition of the word. Example: defining "fat" as "portly", is "defining" a word using a synonym. Whereas a *definition* of "fat" would be: "Having much or too much flabby tissue."

A definition is a precise statement of the real nature of a thing; an exact explanation of the meaning of a word or phrase. A synonym is not a definition.

A student who defines a word as its synonym does not necessarily understand the nuances of that word. The correct handling for this would be for him to *define* the word and use it in sentences until it is understood conceptually.
If a student defines a word in terms of its synonyms only, he will be missing a true understanding of the word.

FALSE AND OMITTED DEFINITIONS

It has been found that some dictionaries leave out definitions and may even contain false definitions. If, when using a dictionary, a student comes across what he suspects to be a false definition there is a handling that can be done. The first thing would be to ensure there are no misunderstandings in the definition in question and then he should consult another dictionary and check its definition for the word being cleared. This may require more than one dictionary. In this way any false definitions can be resolved.

Other dictionaries, encyclopedias and text books should be on hand for reference.

If a student runs into an omitted definition, or a suspected omitted definition, then other dictionaries or reference books should be consulted and the omitted definition found and cleared.

DERIVATIONS

A derivation is a statement of the origin of a word.

Words originated somewhere and meant something originally. Through ages they have sometimes become altered in meaning.

Derivations are important in getting a full understanding of words. By understanding the origin of a word, one will have a far greater grasp of the concept of that word. Students find that they are greatly assisted in understanding a word fully and conceptually if they know the word's derivation.

A student must always clear the derivation of any word he looks up.

It will commonly be found that a student does not know how to read the derivations of the words in most dictionaries. The most common error they make is not understanding that when there is a word in the derivation which is fully capitalized it means that that word appears elsewhere in the dictionary and probably contains more information about the derivation. (For example, the derivation of "thermometer" is given in one dictionary as "THERMO + METER". Looking at the derivation of "thermo" it says it is a combined form of the Greek thermos, meaning hot and therme, meaning heat. And the derivation of "meter" is given as coming from the French metre, which is from the Greek metron, meaning measure.) By understanding and using these fully capitalized words a student can get a full picture of a word's derivation.

If a student has trouble with derivations it is most likely because of the above plus a misunderstood word or symbol in the derivation. These points can be cleared up quite easily where they are giving difficulty.

An excellent dictionary of derivations is The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology, also printed by the Oxford University Press.
We have long known the importance of clearing words and it stands to reason that the dictionary one uses to do this would also be quite important.

I trust this data will be of use.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER
As Assisted by
Research & Compilations Unit
Accepted by the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY of CALIFORNIA
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WHAT IS A CHECKSHEET

References:

HCO PL 30 Sep 70      Checksheet Format
HCO PL 25 Sep 79I     Urgent - Important, Successful Training Lineup
HCO PL 29 Jun 66      Keep Academy Checksheets Up-To-Date
HCO PL 17 Jun 70RA    KSW Ser. Series 5, Technical Degrades Re-rev. 27.4.81

The "Checksheets" is a Scientology development in the field of study.

a checksheet is a form which sets out the exact sequence of items to be studied or done by a student, in order, item by item, on a course. It lists ALL the materials of the course in order to be studied with a place for the student (or the person checking the student out in the case of a Starrate Checkout) to put his initial and the date as each item on the Checksheets is studied, performed or checked out.

The Checksheets is the program that the student follows to complete that course.

The data of the course is studied and its drills performed in the order they are given on the checksheet. The student does not "jump around" or study the material in some other order. The materials are set out in the Checksheets in the best order for study by the student so that he covers all the material in logical sequence.

Further, following the exact order of the Checksheets has a disciplinary function which assists the student to study.

The student's initial beside an item is an attestation that he knows in detail AND can apply the material contained in that Bulletin, Policy Letter or Tape, or that he has done and can do that drill. The initial of the supervisor or another student against a Starrated item is an attestation by him that he has given the student a Starrate checkout on the item and that the student has passed.
The Course Supervisor must inspect students' checksheets daily to ensure that all students are following the Checksheet in its correct set out order, and that the student is making good progress through it.

"Through a Checksheet" means through the entire checksheet – theory, practical, all drills – and done in sequence.

**RETRAINING**

"Retraining" or "back to Course for retraining" means that the student is sent to Cramming to get straight exactly what is missed and then back to Course and does THE ENTIRE COURSE AGAIN. No short cuts or skimping is allowed on retraining, as a student who fails to apply one aspect of the course had a misunderstood which would have prevented him from fully grasping and understanding the other material on previous times through the Checksheet. Also - number of times over the material equals certainty and results (a major study datum which has been proven beyond any question in Dianetics and Scientology).

**ADDING MATERIALS TO CHECKSHEETS**

Every student is given a complete Checksheet at the start of a course. It is not added to after he has started working on it. It is in its final form when it is handed to him.

It may be added to for those who enroll later but is not added to during the course.

The materials which may be added to a course are those which specifically state this in the distribution. (Example: "NED Course" or "Class VIII Course.") They must be specifically designated for the course. If the distribution of an issue simply states, for example, "NED Auditors" or "Class IVs" the issue is not to be added to those courses. The issue would be for distribution to the graduates of those courses.

**Only those issues whose distribution specifically states "course" may be added to course checksheets. No others may be added.**

Indiscriminately adding materials to course checksheets has been largely responsible for extending training time. This practice caused the Class VIII Course, a 3 week course in 1968, to take up to 8 months to do in 1970.

Note: Hat Checksheets are the exception to the above. They are to be completely updated with all new materials that apply to the hat whether stated in the distribution of the issues or not. This means that all new materials that belong on the checksheet are added before the student starts his hat. (Ref. HCO PL 30 Sep 70 Checksheets Format)

**MASTER CHECKSHEETS**

The Course Admin is to keep up a Master Checksheet for each course he is responsible for. These Master Checksheets must be kept up-to-date, noting all cancellations, revisions, additions and corrections to each checksheet.
Thus when a student starts a course he can be handed a checksheet that has been completely updated per the Master Checksheet.

Checksheets are a tremendous aid to study and are an essential part of any training.

It is illegal to run any Course on any subject without a checksheet in Dianetics and Scientology.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

As assisted by Research and Technical Compilations Unit

Accepted by the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:RTC:bk
HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
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TWINNING

(CANCELS: BTB 16 Mar 71 STUDENT AND COURSE MORALE, TOUGH CHECKOUTS & COACHING)

Cancellation of Issues Canceling Twinning

The following BPLs and HCO PLs which canceled issues on twinning, or canceled or suspended twinning itself, are now canceled:

1. HCO PL 29 Jul 72 II Fast Flow In Training written by Training and Services Aide. Though the issues it canceled remain canceled, this HCO PL itself was canceled by BPL 10 Oct 75 X Cancellation Of Policy Letters 1972 and remains so.

2. HCO PL 31 Aug 74 Fast Flow Training Reinstated which suspended twin training or checkouts, was previously canceled and remains so.

3. BPL 18 Oct 76RD, Rev. 10.9.78 Urgent, Important, Successful Training Lineup, which canceled requirements of twin training or checkouts for Academy, has been canceled and replaced by HCO PL 25 Sep 79 I Urgent, Important, Successful Training Lineup.

There are no valid BPLs or HCO PLs now existing which cancel twinning.

"Twinning" is the pairing up of two students training on the same subject to work together on their materials.

It is a Scientology innovation in training. For years it was used highly successfully when done correctly and as a standard action on Scientology courses.

Recently I discovered a big WHY behind course failures. That is that twinning as a subject and practice has become confused and fallen into misuse or fallen out completely and one of the reasons behind that is that a number of HCOBs on twinning were canceled and no one issue exists that covers the subject in its entirety.

This HCOB reinstates twinning firmly and with emphasis.

It is not subject to cancellation.
It fully lays out the purpose of twinning, the basics and rules and correct use of twinning, when and how it is done, the responsibility of twins and the responsibility of the Supervisor and the handling of twinning bugs.

It re-establishes mandatory twinning on all practical courses, such as the TRs Course, or on the practical sections of a course, such as E-Meter Drills. It also covers twinning in some areas of theory study where it is obviously called for, such as Method 9 Word Clearing when done between students.

**BACKGROUND**

In 1954 we found that when you teamed up students of comparable case level and ability they then made progress. When we find something that is that workable we put it to use. Twinning was installed as a fundamental part of the Scientology system of training and it immediately and effectively brought up the participation and action levels of entire course rooms of students. Students grasped the application of the materials faster. It gave us results.

Originally twinning was used almost exclusively on practical drills. Later, in the early '60s, it was carried over into twin checkouts on theory. Still later, with the advent of Word Clearing, applied study tech and fast flow, twinning as a broad mandatory action for all students on theory was canceled.

Even so, some orgs continued twinning students unnecessarily on admin courses and some theory courses and were not enforcing twinning on courses where it is mandatory, such as a TRs Course.

Twinning on practical courses and practical actions has never been canceled by me and was never intended to be canceled. However, a line in a BPL (BPL 18 Oct 76RD Rev. 10.9.78 Urgent, Important, Successful Training Lineup) which stated: "Requirements of twin training or checkouts for Academy are canceled" caused twinning to be dropped out even on practical drills in some areas and threw a confusion into the scene in other areas. The above BPL has now been canceled with a vengeance and is replaced by HCO PL 25 Sept 79 I Urgent, Important, Successful Training Lineup.

And this bulletin restores twinning to its rightful place in training as the vital tool that it is.

**WHY TWINNING?**

One reason twinning is so vital is that it brings those people who have sunk back into their First Dynamic up out of their First Dynamic and onto the Third. It gives the student a terminal to work with. It puts students into communication, into doingness and participation. One doesn't learn by being a spectator. Twinning not only gets students extroverted but also gets them to take some responsibility for their fellow man. These are factors that are sadly lacking in modern permissive education.
TWINNING VERSUS MODERN PERMISSIVENESS

With twinning we are cutting right across modern "permissive" teaching.

The modern tendency is to just let everybody do as they please and put their attention on whatever they please. This is the "think" of the day, and it is in in most basic school systems and has spread as well into many different fields.

Probably someone somewhere thought it would be much quicker and easier and require much less confront to just let a student sit there permissively, with his attention wandering around in the total significance of it all and then claim he had passed the subject when he had never gone near it.

It is a symptom of people who can't confront not to make anyone else confront.

We don't buy this. It is totally batty. The creeping disease of permissiveness, non-confront and spectatorism is simply a part of "the beautiful world of irresponsible slop." It has no place in Scientology training.

Real twinning, enforced, effectively pulls the student right up out of the vague permissiveness of modern think and lands him with some responsibility right from the start. With that he can be honestly trained.

CAUSE AND EFFECT

A person being trained is mainly working on an inflow basis. Day after day it is inflow, inflow, inflow. This tends to put him at effect.

In twinning, the person can balance his inflow with outflow. This keeps him from going totally into effect. It puts some cause into the scene.

A person, when he is expected to apply knowledge or skills, must, of course, be at cause. When he is trained totally at effect, he can get into what is called a "stuck flow" phenomenon whereby he can't outflow the subject. Yet, if he is ever going to apply it, he is going to have to outflow it.

Twinning has the virtue of balancing inflow and outflow. It will be found that when the person comes to apply the tech, he is already able to outflow if he was trained using twinning.

WHEN TO TWIN

It is not necessary to twin students on admin courses, nor, as a general rule, on tech theory courses. You ensure the student is applying study tech and is not going past misunderstood words and you let him get on with it.

Practical and practical courses are another matter.
Mandatory Twinning

Twinning is mandatory on those courses where the essence of the course is to train the student in the practical application of the data. This would include the TRs Course, any Upper Indoc and Objectives Course, a specialized E-Meter Drills Course and courses of a similar nature.

Even though such courses also include theory, the final objective of such a course is a person trained and drilled in the doingness involved and twinning is absolutely essential for this purpose.

Thus, on such a course, twins are assigned at the beginning of the course and they remain assigned through to the completion of that course. We call it "assigning twins in concrete." One does not musical chair twins, once assigned, nor allow them to drift from one twin to another.

The whole essence of twinning is to get two students to work together, to assist each other and take responsibility for getting each other successfully through the course.

Twinning On Practical Sections Of Courses

On certain courses containing both theory and practical, such as Academy Levels, you would not necessarily twin students on the theory section of the course. You would, however, definitely and mandatorily twin them on the practical sections.

For example, twinning is a must on E-Meter Drills, or such actions as assessment drilling, drilling of special rundown procedures where this is called for, Learning Drills, Obnosis Drills and other practical applications.

Twinning On Word Clearing

One always twins students where Method 9 Word Clearing is to be done between the students themselves and not by a Word Clearer.

Similarly, Method 8 Word Clearing is twinned, on exactly the same turn-about basis as described in Method 9. (Ref: HCOB 30.1.73RB, Method 9 Word Clearing The Right Way)

An example of turn-about on Method 8 would be: First twin clears word "a." Second twin then clears word "a" AND word "b." First twin then clears word "b" AND word "c," etc. You do two actions consecutively every time.

Twins may also be assigned to get each other through other methods of Word Clearing in this way.

Henceforth, on courses such as the Primary Rundown, where Word Clearing is the essence of the course, twinning is mandatory.

Wherever twins are assigned, whether for an entire course or for practical sections of a course, the rules of twinning apply.
ASSIGNING TWINS

The Supervisor is responsible for assigning twins.

He should take care to team up students of comparable case level and training and abilities inasmuch as possible. In this way both twins make the best progress. Twinning a very fast student with a slow student should be avoided, if possible, as it can be frustrating and upsetting to both students. This must never be used as an excuse NOT to twin students. However, ideally, one matches them up according to their capabilities and twinning goes smoothly and produces best results when this is done.

In some rare instances it may be necessary to reassign twins who have been incorrectly paired. But it should not be necessary if care was taken in teaming them up correctly to begin with.

Otherwise, once assigned, twins work together through to successful completion of the course or activity.

TURN-ABOUT

The rule of twinning is that it is done on a "turn-about" basis.

"Turn-about" is done as follows:

One student coaches his twin through a drill or a section of a drill. They then turn-about and the second twin does the same drill or section of that drill PLUS the next drill or next section of the drill. They then turn-about again, with the first student doing the drill his twin has just done PLUS the one following.

The same system applies in Method 9 or Method 8 Word Clearing. One twin clears a word or M9s a paragraph or section of the text. They turn-about and the second twin clears the word or M9s the paragraph or section plus the following one. They turn-about again, with the first twin now clearing or M9ing the word or section his twin just cleared plus the one following.

Turn-about is applied as well to starrate checkouts where these are called for. It may be done by checking out an entire bulletin on one's twin before the turn-about is done. Or, where a very long text is to be starrated, the turn-about can be done after each section.

With the turn-about system one person is not constantly leading and misunderstands are kept picked up between twins. The twins keep apace with each other, we don't get unbalanced flows and both are kept progressing.

THE TWIN'S RESPONSIBILITY

A twin is responsible for seeing that the student with whom he is twinned knows and can apply the material he has studied.

Twins must be made aware of this responsibility at the onset of the course.
The twin word clears his fellow student. He listens to his sentences and sees that they are correct and fit the definition of the word being cleared. He makes sure his twin understands the materials. If the student doesn't know them cold, the twin helps the student find his misunderstood words and gets him through any difficulties.

Twins do practical drills together. They coach each other to wins and certainty in applying the materials hundred percent correctly.

If a student flunks a Supervisor checkout on materials he's been passed on by his twin, both students get a flunk. The twin must have a misunderstood himself if he missed the other student's goof.

**Morale and Production**

**Morale** depends on production.

**Production**, in training, is the evidence of the demonstration of competence.

**Morale is up when competence is demonstrated.**

**Morale is up when production is up.**

Morale isn't necessarily built by being "nice." Twinning actions are carried out with good ARC, but being "nice" is not enough.

A student getting a good stiff coaching session from his twin and passing—or getting a good, stiff checkout and passing, feels great. He has really accomplished something. He knows that he knows the data or drill.

A student who gets poor or nonstandard coaching or checkouts feels and knows that he has been cheated. If his twin is just being "nice" he doesn't win and doesn't appreciate the checkout. His morale will be down.

One keeps his twin's morale and production high. One gives him tough standard coaching sessions so he becomes competent. One gives him tough standard checkouts so he knows he has demonstrated his competence in the materials. It is always done with good ARC.

It must be real to student and Supervisor alike that twinning is not a namby-pamby, brush-off activity.

One is responsible for getting his twin through the course. If one twin goes to Review, the other goes to Review. If one twin goes to Ethics, the other goes to Ethics. If one twin should blow, the other twin must go and get him. One is responsible for getting his twin through the course.

There have been cases in the past where one twin worked like mad to get the other twin through an extensive section right at the end of the course. The other twin then simply went off and would not do the same so the first student could also finish the course.
It is now firm policy that where such an instance occurs, the student who abandoned his twin just because he himself was finished may not be certified and may not be given a course completion until he has completed his twin.

Twins are responsible for getting each other through the course.

THE SUPERVISOR'S RESPONSIBILITY

It is the Supervisor's responsibility to enforce twinning per the points in this bulletin.

He assigns twins, pairing them according to their capabilities.

He ensures twinning is being done by the book, on a turn-about basis, with both twins making progress.

He makes sure twins are wearing their hats as twins and taking responsibility for getting each other through, exactly as laid out in course materials.

A "double flunk" is given when a student flunks a Supervisor checkout on materials his twin has passed him on. "Double flunk" means the student and his twin are both flunked in such a case, as, if the twin has missed the student's goof, he must have misunderstoods of his own.

The Supervisor maintains high tech standards by adhering firmly to this system and when he must double flunk he makes sure both twins get handled on the goof.

A situation can occur where a student and his twin get into a "games condition," one with the other. This gives a no-progress, problem situation. The students who are twinned are not both working toward the same goal but one is in opposition to the other in some way. This gives no progress, no wins, no production, no demonstration of competence being permitted and low morale.

It is the responsibility of the Supervisor as well as the twinned students to not permit such a situation to occur. With any failure of a twin to be a twin and assume that responsibility, the Supervisor gets the student checked out on this bulletin and any other applicable course material and ensures the student is fully handled.

To keep the course morale high, Supervisors must insist on production and on the demonstration of competence on all materials by the student and his twin.

In a case where a student gets sent to Review or Ethics, the Supervisor must uphold the rule that his twin always gets sent as well. He ensures that any blown student is recovered by his twin. In all such cases the Supervisor keeps track of his students and ensures they're handled and gotten back on course rapidly.

A Supervisor who understands the why of twinning and sees it is carried out standardly is going to produce causative, responsible graduates who can apply what they have learned.
EMPHASIS ON NO VERBAL DATA

All students should be made aware, from the beginning of training, that the answers to their questions are in their course materials or other source references.

The issues on verbal tech, HCOB 9 Feb 79 How To Defeat verbal Tech and HCOB 15 Feb 79 Verbal Tech Penalties, should be well-known in the course room.

Even so, students, particularly when they are new, sometimes get into an exchange of verbal data or opinion while they are twinning. A Supervisor must be on the alert for this and step in to handle at once when he observes it happening. He uses study tech to straighten the scene out and always refers the students to the above mentioned HCOBs on verbal tech.

Twinned students, of course, bear a responsibility for not spreading verbal tech, neither between themselves nor to anyone else, for that matter. A twin always refers his fellow student to source materials.

HANDLING BUGS ON TWINNING

The main twinning bugs which could arise are those which were encountered earlier on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. One twin would get sent to Ethics or Cramming or Review and the other one then had no twin. Thus, twinning could get to be a little bit unpopular and could block somebody from finishing the course unless these factors are handled.

The remedy for this sort of thing is to send both twins to Ethics, both twins to Cramming, both twins to Review and if anybody blows, send his twin after him. In other words, we don't buy the idea that everybody is totally irresponsible for everybody else in this wonderful First Dynamic world. This is not a mere expediency. It takes only a good, straight look at the purpose and WHY of twinning to recognize the value of this system. Those who do recognize its value will enforce and maintain it.

There is another situation which could act as a bug in twinning. What happens when one twin actually does disappear from the scene totally, in spite of checkouts and cramnings and ethics? What do you do with the remaining twin? Unhandled, it can stop a course for a student, so handled it must be and with no time wasted. You don't let the odd twin rattle around on his own for very long.

If he's not too far advanced into the course he can be twinned with an oncoming student. (A well-run course room will always have new students enrolling.) Every effort is then made to get the newcomer caught up with his twin as rapidly as possible.

But what of the more advanced student who loses a twin? If there's absolutely no other single terminal to team him up with, there is still a solution far preferable to having him continue on his own. You match him up with a set of twins of comparable ability and advancement to his and you turn that twinship into a trio. Once formed, you run that trio as tightly as you would any twinship. The turn-about system would then need to be adjusted to a "round robin." (Example: A coaches B. B coaches C, C coaches A.) And it would then reverse. This is more easily seen if it is diagrammed:
A coaches B on the 1st action (drill, definition, etc.) \( \longrightarrow \) B

B coaches C on the 1st action \( \longrightarrow \) C

C coaches A on the 1st action \( \longrightarrow \) A

And then it reverses.

B \( \longrightarrow \) C coaches B on the 2nd action

A \( \longrightarrow \) B coaches A on the 2nd action

C \( \longrightarrow \) A coaches C on the 2nd action

And now it reverses back.

A coaches B on the 3rd action \( \longrightarrow \) B

B coaches C on the 3rd action \( \longrightarrow \) C

C coaches A on the 3rd action \( \longrightarrow \) A

And now it would reverse back again (C coaches B, etc.) and so on through the drill, definition or M9 section.

All the rules of twinning then apply to these three. You "assign the trio in concrete" and you ensure they keep advancing. Again, the point here is that we operate on the Third Dynamic where one does take some responsibility for his fellow man.

**HANDLING BOGGED STUDENTS AND THEIR TWINS**

When a bogged student cannot be handled in the course room with standard Word Clearing and Study Tech and he is sent to Cramming, Review or, where indicated, to Ethics, his twin is also always sent.

The idea is not only to keep the twins together and taking responsibility for each other but to also correct and repair both of them as needed.

In other words, one twin doesn't simply sit there and observe the other twin being handled. The twin of a bogged student will also require handling in Review, Ethics, or Cramming himself. If a student has ended up on Review lines, it must be assumed that the twin has
goofed as a twin and has misunderstands on the course materials. This must be sorted out and resolved by the Dir Review when the twins route through Review.

The Dir Review determines, by interview, what the trouble is and how it should be resolved. This is done on an individual basis for each twin.

For example, the boggled student may need Word Clearing or a Word Clearing Correction List and his twin may need to restudy this twinning bulletin or other course materials.

In Ethics, for example, a student may be involved in some sort of out-ethics situation, such as continually being late for course. In any ethics situation one would look for the possibility of mutual rudiments between twins. Whether or not mutual ruds exist, the twin would always be given some handling in regard to his responsibility in the situation.

In the above example, the Ethics Officer might handle the student with an amends project. He would then go over with the twin the matter of his responsibility and what steps he could take to ensure the student gets to course on time. The twin would then get the student through his amends, get through his own handling, whatever its nature and the two of them would then go back to course.

The twin sees the student through his review, cramming or ethics cycle and, whenever possible, is used to help the student get through it. He also receives appropriate handling himself.

The rule is: When one student becomes boggled, his twin is always sent with him to cramming, review or ethics.

In the rare case where a student is going to require extensive handling in Review or Ethics, such as case handling or suspension from course where such would be truly warranted, the Dir Review or Ethics Officer may send the other twin back to course to be ret-winned with another student.

The Supervisor always checks up on any students who have been routed off course temporarily. He must keep himself informed as to their whereabouts and progress on correction lines and see that they are returned to course corrected, as rapidly as possible. He does not allow any student or twin to simply drop off his lines with an incomplete course, unhandled or unaccounted for. Any twin has the responsibility of getting himself and his fellow student back onto the course as well.

Once students get the idea that their own progress on a course depends utterly on the quality of their twinning you will start to see some quite magical results. They're now out of the irresponsibility of it all and operating on the Third Dynamic.

It simply takes standard supervision plus real twinning.

That is the winning combination.

So enforce twinning.
It will show up in F/Ning students and high and genuine course completions, which any Supervisor, any org. any graduate can be proud of.

And I will be proud of you, too.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
DEMONSTRATIONS

Demonstration – Showing something by examples.

Demo – Abbreviation for "demonstration".

Part of Scientology study technology is the use of "demonstration" when a student is studying concepts and ideas.

The student is often asked to show such things as definitions of terms, basic principles, etc.

Two ways of demonstration that are commonly used are:

1. Demo Kit Demonstration – meaning the use of various small objects such as corks, caps, paper clips, batteries, etc. These objects are kept in a box or container called a "demo kit". Each student should have one. The pieces are used while studying, to represent the things in the material being read. Demonstrating helps make concepts and ideas more real. A demo kit adds mass (physical matter), reality and doingness to the significance and so helps the student to study.

   When a student is required to do a demonstration using his demo kit, he simply takes whatever demo kit items he wishes and has them represent the ideas he is studying.

   An example of this is:

   The student is reading about how a student and his twin should sit across from each other, each with a dictionary and a demo kit.

   To demonstrate this, he picks a blue battery and decides that that represents the student. He picks out a red battery and decides that represents his twin. He places the batteries across from each other. He then picks out two pennies which he decides will represent the demo kits and he places a penny (demo kit) beside each of the batteries (students). He then picks out two paper clips which he decides will represent dictionaries and places them next to each of the batteries (students).

   The student now has sitting in front of him some actual objects that represent what he has read and he feels much better because the information isn't just in his head.

   The demo kit pieces can be moved around by the student if he is studying about an activity or an action.
If a demo is being done for a twin or the supervisor, the student explains what the objects represent and what he is doing with them (but the idea is to actually have the objects showing any action, not the student's explanations).

2. Clay Demonstration – meaning the use of clay in demonstrating or representing facts, ideas, procedures, add mass, reality and doingness to the significance and so help the student to study.

Clay demos give a proper balance of mass and significance. They are used to teach a student to apply.

The student is given a word or auditing action or situation to demonstrate. He then does this in clay, labeling each part. The clay shows the thing. It is not just a blob of clay with a label on it. Use small strips of paper for labels. The whole demonstration then has a label of what it is.

On the checkout, the student removes the overall label. The student must be silent. The examiner must not ask any questions.

The examiner just looks and figures out what it is. He then tells the student who then shows the examiner the label. If the examiner did not see what it was, it is a flunk.

Clay table must not be reduced to significance by the student explaining or answering questions. Nor is it reduced to significance by long-winded labels of individual parts. The clay shows it, not the label.

The clay demonstrates it. The student must learn the difference between mass and significance.

For example, the student has to demonstrate a pencil. He makes a thin roll of clay which is surrounded by another layer of clay – the thin roll sticking slightly out of one end. On the other end goes a small cylinder of clay. The roll is labeled "lead". The outer layer is labeled "wood". The small cylinder is labeled "rubber". Then a label is made for the whole thing: "pencil". On checkout, the student removes "pencil" before the examiner can see it. If the examiner can look at it and say, "It's a pencil," the student passes.

If clay table training is not brightening that student up, then the above is NOT being done. Someone is in such a rush that real learning is being put aside for the sake of speed.

"Demo" on a checksheet usually refers to using a demo kit.

"Clay Demo" on a checksheet refers to using clay to demonstrate per the procedure given above.

A well done demonstration, which actually does demonstrate, will produce a marvelous change in a student. And he will retain the data.
DEMONSTRATION

(Cancels HCO PL 28 March 1971 "Successful Actions on the FEBC" and HCO PL 2 April 1971 Issue III "How to Push Up Student Points").

The correct use of demonstration is contained in the LRH HCO PL of 4 October 1964 "Theory Checkout Data".

The purpose of demonstration by that policy was to detect glibness on checkouts. If the person can't demonstrate a datum by the use of a few rubber bands or paper clips it is obvious the person is glib, able to quote the words but not able to apply the data. The solution would be to find WHY that person is not applying study tech, get him oriented toward application, locate and handle any misunderstood words in the materials and get them re-studied and checked out.

The use of demo kits became extended and altered to mean the student fiddles with bits and pieces continually while studying. This serves no useful purpose and is not demonstration.

The twin or supervisor has the student demonstrate key principles of the materials while doing starrate checkouts. This doesn't mean the student fiddles constantly while being checked out. It means specific demonstration of data contained in the materials as asked for by the person doing the checkout.

If a student, while studying, is not clear on something and has looked up the words, he may use a demo kit to work it out. This is not demanded. It is at the discretion of the student himself.

The more usual action in such a case is for the student to go over to the clay table and work it out properly in clay in accordance with the clay demonstration HCOBs (which are fully valid and in no way changed by this HCO PL).

The principle of demonstration is invaluable for working out something one is developing. A staff member working at his desk isn't going to do a clay demo. He can however easily use a pen and paper. Part of demonstration is drawing something out in two dimensions.

An arbitrary rule which works out in practice is if you cannot demonstrate something in two dimensions you have it wrong.
This rule is used in engineering and architecture. If it can't be worked out simply and clearly in 2 dimensions, there is something wrong and it couldn't be built. In those professions one wouldn't consider writing the specifications (written instructions) without first having it worked out fully in diagram form on paper. This applies not only to construction details but also to the full sequence of co-ordinated actions resulting in a building in the physical universe. It is a full program worked out on paper as an "arrow diagram" showing co-ordination of sequences, terminals, materials, sub-products, etc. against time. From this diagram specific written instructions for the job are easily and accurately drawn up.

Such a graphic demonstration immediately shows up any outpoints and confusions and is a key use of demonstration.

When a graphic representation gets too complicated or can't be graphed at all, you have something wrong. Usually the diagram will show what is wrong and itself leads to the solution.

An obvious example is a navigator who, instead of trying to work it all out in his head with some foggy concept of where he is, simply graphs the sailing plan and progress on a chart.

Org Boards and statistical graphs are also examples in their own way.

There is another form of demonstration, by far the best when applicable, and that is to show the actual thing to the person. It is limited to those things which currently exist and are available. You can show a housewife a washing machine but you can't show a person a human mind in the same way. The human mind can however be well demonstrated in clay. Demonstrating data in clay is too slow a method of detecting glibness on checkouts so one uses rubber bands and paper clips, etc. Demo kit is not always an easy way to work out something new being developed so one uses pen and graphs it out diagrammatically in such cases. The graphic form is also much easier for disseminating to others, clay demos being difficult to pin on walls, mail, or put into hats.

**SUMMARY**

There are four primary methods of demonstration used in Scientology.

1. Demonstration by showing the actual object (e.g. "What is an E-Meter?" – "This is an E-Meter." "What does an auditing session really sound like?" – "Listen to this tape recorded session of LRH auditing.")

2. Clay demonstration. Used to demonstrate existing data, etc. Adds mass to the significance and is invaluable where the actual thing is not present or cannot be shown visibly.

3. Demo Kit using rubber bands, paper clips, etc. Used in starrate checkouts to detect glibness.

4. Graphic demonstration. Used in developing or clarifying sequences, lines, flows, how things work or go together, etc and locating bugs in such. A useful fast form of developing something new and communicating concepts, sequences and arrangements to others.
All four methods are for use and are part of Scientology study tech.

On the instructions of LRH by Training and Services Aide for L. RON HUBBARD Founder

LRH:BL:mes.rd
DEMO KITS

All students are required to have their own demonstration kit.

A demo kit is a bunch of rubber bands, batteries, fuses, corks, caps, paper clips, coins or whatever will do. These are kept in a box or container (tobacco tins and dairy cartons are good).

A demo kit is to be used for all study. It is to be used frequently while coaching, doing checkouts, solo studying, or listening to tapes.

A demo kit adds mass, reality and doingness to the significance.

The pieces of the kit represent the things one is demonstrating. It helps hold concepts and ideas in place.

Thus the idea of an auditor, a pc, and a meter become real with two coins and a paper clip. They can be seen and felt.

Demo kits are for use. They will get you much better results.

Flag Class VIII Course Supervisor
for
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
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CLAY TABLE TRAINING

Purpose: 1. To make the materials being studied real to the student by making him demonstrate them in clay.

2. To give a proper balance of mass and significance.

3. To teach the student to apply.

The student is given a word or auditing action or situation to demonstrate. He then does this in clay, labeling each part. The clay shows the thing. It is not just a blob of clay with a label on it. Use small strips of paper for labels. The whole demonstration then has a label of what it is.

On the checkout, the student removes the overall label. The student must be silent. The examiner must not ask any questions.

The examiner just looks and figures out what it is. He then tells the student who then shows the examiner the label. If the examiner did not see what it was, it is a flunk.

Clay table must not be reduced to significance by the student explaining or answering questions. Nor is it reduced to significance by long-winded labels of individual parts. The clay shows it, not the label.

The clay demonstrates it. The student must learn the difference between mass and significance.

For example, the student has to demonstrate a pencil. He makes a thin roll of clay which is surrounded by another layer of clay – the thin roll sticking slightly out of one end. On the other end goes a small cylinder of clay. The roll is labeled "lead". The outer layer is labeled "wood". The small cylinder is labeled "rubber". Then a label is made for the whole thing: "pencil". On checkout, the student removes "pencil" before the examiner can see it. If the examiner can look at it and say, "It's a pencil," the student passes.

It might also be noted that checkouts on bulletins must also ask for demonstrations. Use paper-clips, rubber bands, etc. The examiner should ask questions that require an ability to apply. Give the student a situation and have him tell you how he would handle it.

Questions about what is rule "a" do not detect the glib student. Long-winded explanations on clay table put it back into significance, prevent the student from learning to apply, and prevent the student from getting the proper balance of mass, and do not blow confusion.
All checkouts must keep in mind that the purpose is application, not just getting a checksheet complete.

If clay table training is not brightening that student up, then the above is not being done. Someone is in such a rush that real learning is being put aside for the sake of speed.

This student has to audit with his materials. Don't let him fall flat by lousy checkouts and lousy demonstrations. A well done clay demo, which actually does demonstrate, will produce a marvellous change in that student. And he will retain the data.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH.jp.rd
CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING

The only reason any student is slow or blows lies in failure to understand the words used in his or her training.

You will find that students at any level in any course will benefit greatly from Clay Table work on definitions.

The importance of this will become apparent as you study our ... educational technology, now mainly to be found on the Study Tapes.

THE CLAY TABLE

A Clay Table is any platform at which a student, standing or sitting, can work comfortably. In an Academy it may be 3 feet by 3 feet or 5 feet by 3 feet or any larger size. Smaller sizes are not useful. ...

The surface must be smooth. A table built of rough timber will serve but the top surface where the work is done should be oilcloth or linoleum. Otherwise the clay sticks to it and it cannot be cleaned and will soon lead to an inability to see clearly what is being done because it is stained with clay leavings.
In the Academy castors (wheels) can be put on the legs of both the clay table and the clay container where they will be moved a lot.

Large classes should have several clay tables.

**CLAY**

Several different colours of clay should be procured. The best source is a school supply house where educational supplies are sold. Artists' clay is not as good as the school type. (Ask for kindergarten clay.)

A receptacle, also of wood or metal and having a separate stand of its own of any type, is also valuable. It should have subdivisions in it for the different coloured clays.

The amount of each colour is not important so long as there is at least a pound or two of each colour in a small class. ...

In the Academy colours are only used to make a student see the difference between one object and another and have no other significance as the objects in the mind are not uniformly coloured. While "ridges" are black, they can become white. Engrams may be a number of colours all in one engram, just as Technicolor is a coloured motion picture. However, some persons see engrams only in black and white. So the colour in the Academy is for instruction only, assisting to tell the difference between one object or another. ... ...

**USE ON COURSES**

*Any part of the mind or any term in Scientology can be demonstrated on a Clay Table.*

This is an important point to grasp. The use of the table is not just for a few terms. It can be used for all definitions.

The ingenuity of ... the student and his understanding of the terms being demonstrated are the only limits on a Clay Table.

Simplicity is the keynote. Nothing is too insignificant or unimportant to demonstrate on a clay table. ...

*Anything* can be so demonstrated if you work at it. And just by working on *how* to demonstrate it or make it into clay and labels brings about renewed understanding.

In the phrase "how do I represent it in clay" is contained the secret of the teaching. If one can represent it in clay one understands it. If one can't, one really doesn't understand what it is. So clay and labels work only if the term or things are truly understood. And working them out in clay brings about an understanding of them.

Therefore one can predict that the clay table will be most used in a practice or organization which understands the most and will be least used in an organization that understands the least (and is least successful).
Let us look over the level of simplicity of the terms to be used in a course of instruction.

Let us take **body**. All right, make a few lumps and call it a body and put a sign on it "Body".

Now that doesn't seem to be much to do. But it is a lot to do to forward understanding.

Let us make a yellow ring of clay beside the body or on it or in it and label it "A Thetan".

We can thereupon see the relationship between the two most used terms in Scientology, "Body" and "Thetan". And cognitions will result. The student's attention is brought right to the room and the subject.

Getting the student to do this by himself ... produces a new result. Getting the student to do it 25 times with his own hands almost exteriorizes him. Getting the student to contrive how it can be done **better** in clay or how many ways it can be done in clay drives home the whole idea of the location of the thetan in the body.

**Art** is no object in clay table work. The forms are crude.

Take a large lump of clay of any colour, and cover up both "thetan" and "body" with it and you have **Mind**.

Take every part of the mind and make it in clay by making a thetan, making a body and making one or more parts of the mind (Machine, facsimile, ridge, engram, lock, what have you —all Scientology terms) and get the student to demonstrate in clay what it is and we begin to clarify what we're about.

Get a student to make a Present Time Problem. Make him put in all its parts represented in clay (boss, mother, self) and have each one done with a body, a thetan and a mind and some rather remarkable insights begin to occur.

The quantity of things that can be made has no limit.

**LABELING CLAY DEMONSTRATIONS**

*Any* part of the mind can be represented by a piece of clay and a label. The mass parts are done by clay, the significance or thought parts by label.

A piece of clay and a label are usually **both** used for any part of the mind. A thin-edged ring of clay with a large hole in it is usually used to signify a pure significance.

... 

*Everything* is labeled that is made on the clay table, no matter how crude the label is. Students usually do labels with scraps of paper written on with a ball-point. ... 

The procedure should go - student makes one object, labels it, makes another object, labels it, makes a third object and puts a label on it and so on in sequence.
If a student makes all the masses of his demonstration at once, without labeling them, he is sitting there with all those significances stacking up in his mind instead of putting down each one (in the form of a label) as he goes.

*The correct procedure is label each mass as you go along.*

**SIZE OF CLAY DEMOS**

The size of the demo can be important.

A clay demo should be rather large. (One or two inches high is usually inadequate.) Large demos help to increase the student's reality on what he is demonstrating. More reality means more affinity and communication and therefore more understanding.

**CHECKOUTS**

The clay demonstration must show that the student's understanding of the materials being demonstrated is present. The clay shows the thing, not the labels or the imagination. If a student's clay demonstration isn't correctly done or doesn't show what is to be demonstrated it must be flunked with reference to the material. In such case, the student must be referred to the correct Bulletin, Policy, Book or Tape reference from the materials of the course. Another student's demo is never referred to or used as an example.

**HANDLING CLAY**

Clay is messy. Until we find or unless we find a totally non-oily clay, precautions must be taken to keep students clean, and if not clean, cleaned up afterwards. Therefore the course administrator can provide liberal quantities of cheap cleaning tissues and odourless solvent.

The clinging quality of clay and the odour of bad solvents could put an end to the great value of clay table work. So safeguard against this.

The principal thing is to **get every Scientology term made in clay and labels** by the individual student.

You will see a new era dawn in training. You will see Academy blows vanish and time on course cut to one fifth in many instances. These are desirable attainments in any course so Clay Table work is serious Academy business.

Ingenuity and understanding are the only limits on the use of the clay table and the attainment of excellent results with it.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder
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SCIENTOLOGY TRAINING

TWIN CHECKOUTS

(Excerpts from HCO Policy Letters of 4 October 1964
and 24 September 1964 rewritten)

In Scientology training we use a system called Twin Checkouts. Each student is assigned a "twin" to work with. The student studies his assigned material and is sometimes coached over the rough spots by his twin. When the student knows the material, he is then given a checkout by his twin. If he flunks, he returns to study and when ready gets a new checkout. When he passes, the twin signs the assignment sheet certifying that he has grasped it. The assignment sheet is turned in to the Course Supervisor at the end of the period.

BAD STUDY HABITS

Earlier forms of education suffer because of a habit. The habit is all one's years of formal schooling where this mistake is the whole way of life.

If the student knows the words, the teacher assumes he knows the tune.

It will never do a student any good at all to know some facts. The student is expected only to use facts.

It is so easy to confront thought and so hard to confront action that the teacher often complacently lets the student mouth words and ideas that mean nothing to the student.

All theory checkouts must consult the student's understanding.

If they don't, they're useless and will upset the student eventually.

Course difficulties stem entirely from the students' non-comprehension of words and data.

While this can be cured by auditing, why audit it all the time when you can prevent it in the first place by adequate theory checkout?

There are two phenomena here.
FIRST PHENOMENON

When a student misses understanding a word, the section right after that word is a blank in his memory. You can always trace back to the word just before the blank, get it understood and find miraculously that the former blank area is not now blank in the text. The above is pure magic.

SECOND PHENOMENON

The second phenomenon occurs after the student has gone by many misunderstood words. He begins to dislike the subject being studied, more and more. This is followed by various mental and physical conditions and by various complaints, fault-finding and look-what-you-did-to-me. This justifies a departure, a blow, from the subject being studied.

But the system of education, frowning on blows as it does, causes the student to really withdraw self from the study subject (whatever he was studying) and set up in its place a circuit which can receive and give back sentences and phrases.

We now have "the quick student who somehow never applies what he learns".

The specific phenomena then is that a student can study some words and give them back and yet be no participant to the action. The student gets A+ on exams but can't apply the data.

*Demonstration* is the key here. The moment you ask this type of student to demonstrate a rule or theory with his hands or the paper clips on your desk this glibness will shatter.

The reason for this is that in memorizing words or ideas, the student can still hold the position that it has nothing to do with him or her. It is a total circuit action. Therefore, very glib. The moment you say "Demonstrate" that word or idea or principle, the student has to have something to do with it. And shatters.

The thoroughly dull student is just stuck in the non-comprehend blankness following some misunderstood word.

The "very bright" student who yet can't use the data isn't there at all. He has long since ceased to confront the subject matter or the subject.

The cure for either of these conditions of "bright non-comprehension" or "dull" is to find the missing word.

But these conditions can be prevented by not letting the student go beyond the missed word without grasping its meaning. And that is the duty of the twin.

COACHING IN THEORY

Coaching Theory means getting a student to define all the words, give all the rules, demonstrate things in the text with his hands or bits of things, and also may include doing Definitions of Scientology terms.
The usual Course Supervisor action would be to have any student who is having any trouble or is slow or glib team up with a twin of comparable difficulties and have them turn about with each other with Theory Coaching.

Then when they have a text assignment coached, they give their twin a checkout. The checkout is a spot checkout, a few definitions or rules and some demonstration of them.

**DEMONSTRATION**

Giving a text assignment check by seeing if it can be quoted or paraphrased proves exactly nothing. This will not guarantee that the student knows the data or can use or apply it nor even guarantees that the student is there. Neither the "bright" student nor the "dull" student (both suffering from the same malady) will benefit from such an examination.

So examining by seeing if somebody "knows" the text and can quote or paraphrase it is completely false and must not be done.

Correct examination is done only by making the person being tested answer

(a) The meanings of the words (redefining the words used in his own words and demonstrating their use in his own made up sentences), and

(b) Demonstrating how the data is used.

The twin can ask what the words mean. And the twin can ask for examples of action or application.

"What is the first paragraph?" is about as dull as one can get. "What are the rules given about . . . . . ?" a question I would never bother to ask. Neither of these tell the twin whether he has the bright non-applier or the dull student before him. Such questions just beg for natter and course blows.

I would go over the first paragraph of any material I was examining a student on and pick out some uncommon words. I'd ask the student to define each and demonstrate its use in a made up sentence and flunk the first "Well . . . .er . . . let me see. . . ." and that would be the end of that checkout. I wouldn't pick out only Scientologese. I'd pick out words that weren't too ordinary such as "benefit" "permissive" "calculated" as well as "engram".

Students I was personally examining would begin to get a hunted look and carry dictionaries – but they wouldn't begin to natter or get sick or blow. And they'd use what they learned.

Above all, myself would be sure I knew what the words meant before I started to examine.

Dealing with new technology and the necessity to have things named, we especially need to be alert.

Before you curse our terms, remember that a lack of terms to describe phenomena can be twice as incomprehensible as having involved terms that at least can be understood eventually.
We do awfully well, really, better than any other science or subject. We lack a dictionary but we can remedy that.

But to continue with how one should examine, when the student had the words, I'd demand the music. What tune do these words play?

I'd say "All right, what use is this text assignment to you?" Questions like, "Now this rule here about not letting pcs eat candy while being audited, how come there'd be such a rule?" And if the student couldn't imagine why, I'd go back to the words just ahead of that rule and find the one he hadn't grasped.

I'd ask "What are the 3 parts of the ARC triangle?" And when the student gave them, I'd still have the task of satisfying myself that the student understood why those were the 3 parts. I'd ask "How come?" after he'd given them to me. Or "What are you going to do with these?"

But if the student wasn't up to the point of study where knowing why he used the ARC triangle was not part of his materials, I wouldn't ask. For all the data about not examining above level applies very severely to Theory Checkout as well as to Practical and general Instruction.

I might also have a stack of paper clips and rubber bands and use them to have students show me they knew the words and ideas.

Theory often says "Well, they take care of all that in Practical." Oh no they don't. When you have a Theory Section that believes that, Practical can't function at all.

Practical goes through the simple motions. Theory covers why one goes through the motions.

I don't think I have to beat this to death for you.

You've got it.

**DICTIONARIES**

Dictionaries should be available to students in Theory and should be used in Twin Checkouts as well, preferably the same publication. Dictionaries don't always agree with each other.

No Twin should try to define English language words out of his own head when correcting a student as it leads to too many arguments. On English words, open a dictionary.

A Scientology dictionary will be available in a few months from the date of this bulletin as one is being rushed into publication.

L. RON HUBBARD
Remimeo
All Students
Student Examiners
Supervisors

HOW TO DO THEORY CHECKOUTS
AND EXAMINATIONS

(Revises and replaces HCO PL 14 Feb 63 by adding Demos and Twin Checking Out and by deleting Verbatim Checkout requirements.)

The important points of a Bulletin, Tape or Policy Letter are:

1. The specific rules, axioms, maxims or stable data;
2. The doingness details, exactly how is it done; and
3. The theory of why it is done.

All else is unnecessary. All you have to demand is the above. (1) The rules, axioms, maxims or stable data must be known and the student must be able to show their meaning is also known to him or her.

(2) The doingness must be exactly known as to sequence and actions but not verbatim (in the same words as the text).

(3) The theory must be known as a line of reasoning, reasons why or related data and with accuracy, but not verbatim.

The date of the lecture or bulletin or letter is relatively unimportant and other details of like nature should never be asked for.

If a student or Staff Member is ever going to apply the data, then above (1) must be down cold, (2) must be able to be experienced and (3) must be appreciated.

Asking for anything else is to rebuff interest and give a feeling of failure to the person being examined.

An examiner or twin should examine with exactness on (1), alertness on (2) and seeing if the student understands (3). An examiner or twin should not go beyond these points, asking for what person was mentioned, who did the test, what is the copyright date, what are the first words, etc.
Graduation from courses must be speeded up. And at the same time, the data, the important data must be known and understood. Good, sound examination is the answer here. Irrelevant examination questions only slow the student and extend the course.

It might also be noted that checkouts on bulletins must also ask for demonstrations. Use paper clips, rubber bands, etc. The examiner or twin should ask questions that require an ability to apply. Give the student a situation and have him tell you how he would handle it.

Be as tough as you please, but only on (1), (2) and (3) above.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo
Sthil Instructors
HCO Hat Check on
all Acad Instructors

INSTRUCTION & EXAMINATION:
RAISING THE STANDARD OF

The basic reason students remain long on courses stems from inept criticism by instructors regarding what is required.

There is a technology of criticism of art, expressed beautifully in the Encyclopaedia published by Focal Press.

In this article it stresses that a critic who is also an expert artist tends to introduce unfairly his own perfectionism (and bias and frustrations) into his criticism.

We suffer amazingly from this in all our courses. I had not previously spotted it because I don't demand a student at lower levels produce results found only in higher levels.

You can carelessly sum this up by "letting the student have wins" but if you do you'll miss the whole point.

Example: A student up for a pass on his Itsa is flunked because he or she couldn't acknowledge.

But a student at the Itsa level hasn't been taught to acknowledge.

This student hasn't even read the data on acknowledgement.

So the student can't pass Itsa level and so never does get to the level where acknowledgement is taught – and if he does, really never passed, in his own mind, Itsa and so hasn't advanced.

And we catch all our students this way and they don't therefore learn.

How is this done? How could this be?

The instructor is an expert auditor. That's as it should be. But as an expert auditor, bad execution of a level above where the student is studying, pains the instructor. So he flunks the student because the auditing looks bad.

But look here. The student wasn't being checked out as an auditor. The student was only being checked out on Itsa.
Further, the action of auditing as a whole is so easy to an instructor who is an expert auditor that he fails to take it apart for instruction.

If I say the following, it will look ridiculous and you'll get the point better: The student is up to pass TR 0. The Instructor on check out looks the student over and says "You flunked the test." The student says "Why?" The Instructor says "You didn't take the Class VI actions to clear the pc of all his GPMs." All right, we can all see that that would be silly. But Instructors do just that daily, though on a narrower band.

The Instructor puts in additives. As an expert auditor it seems natural to him to say "You flunked your test on Itsa because you never acknowledged the pc." You get the point. This really is as crazy wide as the ridiculous example above. What does Ack have to do with Itsa? Nothing!

Because the Instructor is an expert auditor, auditing has ceased to have parts and is all one chunk. Okay. A good auditor regards it that way. But the poor student can't grasp any of the pieces because the whole chunk is being demanded.

What's Itsa? It's Listen. Can the student listen? Okay, he can listen but the expert says, "He didn't get 15 divisions of TA per hour." On the what? "On the meter of course." What meter? That's Level II and Itsa is Level 0. "Yes," the expert protests, "but the pc didn't get any better!" Okay, so what pc is supposed to get better at Level 0. If they do it's an accident, usually. Now does this student pass? "No! He can't even look at the pc!" Well, that's TR 0 of Level I. "But he's got to look like an auditor!" How can he? An auditor has to get through a comm course before you can really call him that. "Okay, I'll drop my standards...." the expert begins. Hell no, expert. You better pick up your standards for each Level and for each small part of auditing.

What's it say at Level 0? "It says 'Listen!'" Okay, then, damn it, when the student is able to sit and listen and not shut a pc down with yak, the student passes. "And the meter?" You better not let me catch you teaching meters at Level 0.

And so it goes right on up through the Levels and the bits within the Levels.

By making Itsa mysterious and tough, by adding big new standards to it like TA and Ack you only succeed in never teaching the student Itsa! So he goes on up and at Level IV audits like a bum. Can't control a pc. Can't meter, nothing.

So the expert tries to make a student do Class VI auditing the first day and the student is never trained to do any auditing at Level 0.

This nonsense repeated at Level I (by adding a meter, by purist flunking "because the pc couldn't handle an ARC Break") and repeated again at Level II ("because the pc couldn't assess") and at Level III etc. etc.

Well, if you add things all the time out of sequence and demand things the student has not yet reached the student winds up in a ball of confusion like the cat getting into the yarn.
So we're not instructing. We're preventing a clear view of the parts of auditing by adding higher level standards and actions to lower level activities.

This consumes time. It makes a mess.

The new HCA always tries to teach his group a whole HCA course his first evening home. Well, that's no reason seasoned veterans have to do it in our courses.

If you never let a student learn Level 0 because he's flunked unless he does Level VI first, people will stay on courses forever and we'll have no auditors.

Instructors must teach not out of their own expertise but out of the text book expected actions in the Level the student is being trained in. To go above that level like assessment in Level II or Ack and meters at Level 0 is to deny the student any clean view of what he's expected to do. And if he never learns the parts, he'll never do the whole.

And that's all that's wrong with our instruction or our instructors. As expert auditors they cease to view the part the student must know as itself and do not train and pass the student upon it.

Instead they confuse the student by demanding more than the part being learned.

Instruction is done on a gradient scale. Learn each part well by itself. And only then can assembly of parts occur into what we want – a well trained student.

This is not lowering any standards. It's raising them on all training.

**BULLETIN CHECK OUTS**

The other side of the picture, theory, suffers because of a habit. The habit is all one's years of formal schooling where this mistake is the whole way of life.

If the student knows the words, the theory instructor assumes he knows the tune.

It will never do a student any good at all to know some facts. The student is expected only to use facts.

It is so easy to confront thought and so hard to confront action that the Instructor often complacently lets the student mouth words, ideas that mean nothing to the student.

**All theory check outs must consult the student's understanding.**

If they don't, they're useless and will ARC Break the student eventually.

Course natter stems entirely from the students' non-comprehension of words and data.

While this can be cured by auditing, why audit it all the time when you can prevent it in the first place by adequate theory check-out?

There are two phenomena here.
FIRST PHENOMENON

When a student misses understanding a word, the section right after that word is a blank in his memory. You can always trace back to the word just before the blank, get it understood and find miraculously that the former blank area is not now blank in the bulletin. The above is pure magic.

SECOND PHENOMENON

The second phenomenon is the overt cycle which follows a misunderstood word. When a word is not grasped, the student then goes into a non-comprehension (blankness) of things immediately after. This is followed by the student's solution for the blank condition which is to individuate from it – separate self from it. Now being something else than the blank area, the student commits overt against the more general area. These overt, of course, are followed by restraining himself from committing overt. This pulls flows toward the person and makes the person crave motivators. This is followed by various mental and physical conditions and by various complaints, fault-finding and look-what-you-did-to-me. This justifies a departure, a blow.

But the system of education, frowning on blows as it does, causes the student to really withdraw self from the study subject (whatever he was studying) and set up in its place a circuit which can receive and give back sentences and phrases.

We now have "the quick student who somehow never applies what he learns".

The specific phenomena then is that a student can study some words and give them back and yet be no participant to the action. The student gets A+ on exams but can't apply the data.

The thoroughly dull student is just stuck in the non-comprehend blankness following some misunderstood word.

The "very bright" student who yet can't use the data isn't there at all. He has long since ceased to confront the subject matter or the subject.

The cure for either of these conditions of "bright non-comprehension" or "dull" is to find the missing word.

But these conditions can be prevented by not letting the student go beyond the missed word without grasping its meaning. And that is the duty of the Theory Instructor.

DEMONSTRATION

Giving a bulletin or tape check by seeing if it can be quoted or paraphrased proves exactly nothing. This will not guarantee that the student knows the data or can use or apply it
nor even guarantees that the student is there. Neither the "bright" student nor the "dull" student (both suffering from the same malady) will benefit from such an examination.

So examining by seeing if somebody "knows" the text and can quote or paraphrase it is completely false and must not be done.

Correct examination is done only by making the person being tested answer

(a) The meanings of the words (re-defining the words used in his own words and demonstrating their use in his own made up sentences), and

(b) Demonstrating how the data is used.

The examiner need not do a Clay Table audit just to get a student to pass. But the examiner can ask what the words mean. And the examiner can ask for examples of action or application.

"What is this HCO Bulletin's first section?" is about as dull as one can get. "What are the rules given about…..?" is a question I would never bother to ask. Neither of these tell the examiner whether he has the bright non-applier or the dull student before him. Such questions just beg for natter and course blows.

I would go over the first paragraph of any material I was examining a student on and pick out some uncommon words. I'd ask the student to define each and demonstrate its use in a made up sentence and flunk the first "Well…. er…. let me see…. " and that would be the end of that check out. I wouldn't pick out only Scientologese. I'd pick out words that weren't too ordinary such as "benefit" "permissive" "calculated" as well as "engram".

Students I was personally examining would begin to get a hunted look and carry dictionaries – but they wouldn't begin to natter or get sick or blow. And they'd use what they learned.

Above all, I myself would be sure I knew what the words meant before I started to examine.

Dealing with new technology and the necessity to have things named, we especially need to be alert.

Before you curse our terms, remember that a lack of terms to describe phenomena can be twice as incomprehensible as having involved terms that at least can be understood eventually.

We do awfully well, really, better than any other science or subject. We lack a dictionary but we can remedy that.

But to continue with how one should examine, when the student had the words, I'd demand the music. What tune do these words play?

I'd say "All right, what use is this bulletin (or tape) to you?" Questions like, "Now this rule here about not letting pcs eat candy while being audited, how come there'd be such a
I'd ask "What are the commands of 8-C?" And when the student gave them, I'd still have the task of satisfying myself that the student understood why those were the commands. I'd ask "How come?" after he'd given me the commands. Or "What are you going to do with these?" "Audit a pc with them" he might say. I'd say, "Well, why these commands?"

But if the student wasn't up to the point of study where knowing why he used those commands was not part of his materials, I wouldn't ask. For all the data about not examining above level applies very severely to Theory Check out as well as to Practical and general Instruction.

I might also have a Clay Table beside my examiner's desk (and certainly would have if I were an HCO hat checker, to which all this data also applies) and use it to have students show me they knew the words and ideas.

Theory often says "Well, they take care of all that in Practical." Oh no they don't. When you have a Theory Section that believes that, Practical can't function at all.

Practical goes through the simple motions. Theory covers why one goes through the motions.

I don't think I have to beat this to death for you.

You've got it.

L. RON HUBBARD
THEORY CHECK-OUT DATA

(Modifies HCO Pol Ltr of Sept 24, '64)

In checking out technical materials on students or staff, it has been found that the new system as per HCO Pol Ltr of Sept 24, '64 is too lengthy if the whole bulletin is covered.

Therefore the system given in Sept 24, '64 Pol Ltr is to be used as follows:

1. Do not use the old method of covering each bit combined with the new method.
2. Use only the new method.
3. Spot check the words and materials, do not try to cover it all. This is done the same way a final examination is given in schools: only a part of the material is covered by examination, assuming that if the student has this right the student knows all of it.
4. Flunk on comm lag in attempts to answer. If the student "er . . . ah . . . well . . .", flunk it as it certainly isn't known well enough to use. (Doesn't include stammerers.)
5. Never keep on examining a bulletin after a student has missed.
6. Consider all materials star rated or not rated. Skip 75%'s. In other words, the check-out must have been 100% right answers for a pass. 75% is not a pass. When you consider a bulletin or tape too unimportant for a 100% pass, just require evidence that it has been read and don't examine it at all. In other words, on those you check out, require 100% and on less important material don't examine, merely require evidence of having read.

THE "BRIGHT" ONES

You will find that often you have very glib students you won't be able to find any fault in who yet won't be able to apply or use the data they are passing. This student is discussed as the "bright student" in the Sept 24, '64 Pol Ltr.

Demonstration is the key here. The moment you ask this type of student to demonstrate a rule or theory with his hands or the paper clips on your desk this glibness will shatter.
The reason for this is that in memorizing words or ideas, the student can still hold the position that it has nothing to do with him or her. It is a total circuit action. Therefore, very glib. The moment you say "Demonstrate" that word or idea or principle, the student has to have something to do with it. And shatters.

One student passed "Itsa" in theory with flying colours every time even on cross-check type questions, yet had never been known to listen. When the theory instructor said, "Demonstrate what a student would have to do to pass Itsa," the whole subject blew up. "There's too many ways to do Itsa auditing!" the student said. Yet on the bulletin it merely said "Listen". That given as a glib answer was all right. But "demonstration" brought to light that this student hadn't a clue about listening to a pc. If he had to demonstrate it, the non-participation of the student in the material he was studying came to light.

Don't get the idea that Demonstration is a Practical Section action. Practical gives the drills. These demonstrations in Theory aren't drills.

Clay Table isn't used to any extent by a Theory Examiner. Hands, a diagram, paper clips, these are usually quite enough!

COACHING IN THEORY

There is Theory Coaching as well as Practical Coaching.

Coaching Theory means getting a student to define all the words, give all the rules, demonstrate things in the bulletin with his hands or bits of things, and also may include doing Clay Table Definitions of Scientology terms.

That's all Theory Coaching. It compares to coaching on drills in Practical. But it is done on Bulletins, tapes and policy letters which are to be examined in the future. Coaching is not examining. The examiner who coaches instead of examining will stall the progress of the whole class.

The usual Supervisor action would be to have any student who is having any trouble or is slow or glib team up with another student of comparable difficulties and have them turn about with each other with Theory Coaching, similar to Practical coaching in drills.

Then when they have a bulletin, tape or policy letter coached, they have a check-out. The check-out is a spot check-out as above, a few definitions or rules and some demonstration of them.

DICTIONARIES

Dictionaries should be available to students in Theory and should be used in Theory Examination as well, preferably the same publication. Dictionaries don't always agree with each other.

No Supervisor should try to define English language words out of his own head when correcting a student as it leads to too many arguments. On English words, open a dictionary.
A Scientology dictionary is available.

Remember that with Courses becoming briefer in duration, the number of bulletins and tapes which the student must know on a Star-Rated basis is also less.

General written examination for classification, however, remains on an 85% pass basis.

Be sure that students who get low marks constantly are also handled in Review, preferably by definitions of words they haven’t understood in some former subject. Scientology is never the cause of consistent dullness or glibness.

Processing of this nature can be on an Itsa basis. It does not have to be Clay Table. Just finding the prior subject by discussion and discussing its words usually blows the condition. I've seen it change the whole attitude of a person in just 5 or 10 minutes of auditing on a "locate the subject and word" basis.

Therefore, definitions exist at Levels 0 and I, but not with Clay Table or assessment, only by Itsa. You'd be surprised how well it works and how fast. "Subjects you didn't like", "words you haven't grasped" are the discussion question.

The subject of "wrong definitions cause stupidity or circuits, followed by overts and motivators", is not easy to get across because it is so general amongst Mankind. There is a possibility that past lives themselves are wiped out by changing language, whether it is the same language that changes through the years or shifting nationality. But however that may be, don't be discouraged at the difficulties you may have in getting this principle understood and used in Scientology departments-the person you are trying to convince has definitions out somewhere also!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.jp.rd
Remimeo
All Students
Student Hat
Supervisors
Examiners
Tech
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STARRATE OUTPOINTS

Ref.  HCO PL 24 Sep. 64  Instruction & Examination: Raising The Standard Of
HCO PL 26 Aug 65  Scientology training Twin Checkouts
HCO PL 4 Oct 64  Theory Checkouts Data
HCO PL 4 Mar 71 II  How To Do Theory Checkouts And Examinations
HCO PL 12 May 64  Theory Testing Expiration Dates
HCO PL 31 Aug. 81  Giving starrate Checkouts

(The following is a list of the most frequent mistakes made on giving starrate checkouts. This list was originally compiled at my request and is now being reissued to give it the full force of an HCO PL.)

1. Not flunking *immediately* on a comm lag but getting reasonable and allowing the student to carry on with the checkout. This stems from not knowing the reason for flunks on comm lags. (See HCO PL 4 Oct 64 Theory Checkouts Data, point number 4.)

2. Not spot-checking a student on the policy or bulletin. This stems from not knowing the purpose of spot checking or why it is okay to spot check a student. (See HCO PL 4 Oct 64, Theory Check-Out Data, paragraph number 1 and point number 3.)

3. Not knowing that Coaching in Theory means getting the student to define *all* the words and give *all* the rules. This misunderstanding comes from not knowing the purpose of Coaching in Theory. (See HCO PL 4 Oct 64, Theory Check-Out Data.)

4. Not asking the student to use the word in a sentence after asking him to define the word in his own words. You ask for the meaning of the word *and* the use of the word in a made up sentence. (See HCO PL 24 Sept 64 Instruction & Examination: Raising The Standard Of.)

5. Not knowing that a dull student is stuck in the blank space *right after* the misunderstood and that a dull student is handled the same way you would handle a glib student. (See HCO PL 24 Sept 64 Instruction & Examination: Raising The Standard Of.)

6. Not asking questions that demand an ability to *apply* the data, assuming that if you ask a student to demonstrate you have asked him to apply the data. This is the most important point in giving a checkout and is the purpose of giving a checkout. It must never
be neglected in giving a checkout. (See HCO PL 24 Sep Instruction & Examination: Raising The Standard Of, and HCO PL 4 Mar 71 II How To Do Theory Checkouts And Examinations, second to last paragraph.)

7. Not sending a student back to study when he flunks the policy or bulletin but instead showing it to him and then carry on with the checkout. Also doing this when a student flunks on a word and just having him look the word up and carrying on with the checkout without having him look up the word and restudy the materials. This stems from not knowing what happens when a student goes past a misunderstood word. (See HCO PL 26 Aug 65 Scientology Training Twin Checkouts, paragraph 1 and the sections under the two phenomena of a misunderstood word.)

NOTE: Sending a student back to study means the student gets his MUs found and cleared and re-studies the materials from the earliest misunderstood word found or from the beginning. It means full application of Study Tech.

Students who haven't fully grasped the starrate checkout procedures have missed out on one or more of the above points. These points are all covered in the policies referenced at the beginning of this issue and these policies must be known and applied by Supervisors and students alike.

It is only when lax, non-standard checkouts (or none at all) are given, that results suffer.

Tough standard checkouts are the way to keep Scientology working.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Assisted by
Research & Technical
Compilations Unit

Accepted by the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
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The only requirements for someone to give a starrate checkout are: (1) he has done the starrate checkout section of the Student Hat or Basic Study Manual, and (2) he has studied the materials on which he is giving the checkout.

It is optimum if the person giving the checkout has been starrated on the materials. But this is not mandatory.

Starrate checkouts are done by students on each other. They are not done by the Course Supervisor.

The only starrate checkouts on students done by a supervisor are those done on the Policy Letters to do with the procedure and technology of checkouts. This is done initially and as may be required at any later time to ensure that his students know how to give standard checkouts exactly by the book.

The supervisor observes his students giving each other checkouts. He sees to the quality of these checkouts. If the checkouts are excellent he lets the students get on with it. If correction is required he hands out a pink sheet to the student to word clear and re-study the appropriate checkout PLs and then he checks the student out on these PLs and the procedure himself.

The checkout materials are the only ones he checks the student out on personally.
The remedy for improper checkouts is word clearing and further study of checkout materials, not the supervisor taking over checkouts of all course materials himself.

Only in this way can you have effective checkouts and a supervisor who is free to supervise effectively.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

As assisted by Research & Technical Compilations Unit

Accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY of CALIFORNIA
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**Word Clearing Series 20**

**SIMPLE WORDS**

You might suppose at once that it is the BIG words or the technical words which are most misunderstood.

This is **not** the case.

On actual test, it was English simple words and **not** Dianetics and Scientology words which prevented understanding.

For some reason Dianetics and Scientology words are more easily grasped than simple English.

Words like "a", "the", "exist", "such" and other "everybody knows" words show up with great frequency when doing a Method 2 Word Clearing. They read.

It takes a BIG dictionary to define these simple words fully. This is another oddity. The small dictionaries also suppose everybody knows.

It is almost incredible to see that a university graduate has gone through years and years of study of complex subjects and yet does not know what "or" or "by" or "an" means. It has to be seen to be believed. Yet when cleaned up his whole education turns from a solid mass of question marks to a clean useful view.

A test of schoolchildren in Johannesburg once showed that Intelligence **decreased** with each new year of school!

The answer to the puzzle was simply that each year they added a few dozen more crushing misunderstood words onto an already confused vocabulary that no one ever got them to look up.

Stupidity **is** the effect of misunderstood words.

In those areas which give Man the most trouble you will find the most alteration of fact, the most confused and conflicting ideas and of course the greatest number of misunderstood words. Take "economics" for example.

The subject of psychology began its texts by saying they did not know what the word means. So the subject itself never arrived. Professor Wundt of Leipzig University in 1879 perverted the term. It really means just "a study (ology) of the soul (psyche)". But Wundt, working under the eye of Bismarck, the greatest of German military fascists, at the height of
German war ambitions, had to deny Man had a soul. So there went the whole subject! Men were thereafter animals (it is all right to kill animals) and Man had no soul, so the word psychology could no longer be defined.

**The earliest misunderstood word in a subject is a key to later misunderstood words in that subject.**

"HCOB" (Hubbard Communications Office Bulletin), "Remimeo" (Orgs which receive this must mimeograph it again and distribute it to staff), "TR" (Training Drill), "Issue I" (first issue of that date), are the commonest misunderstandeds. Because they occur at the beginning of an HCOB!

Then come words like "a", "the" and other simple English as the next words that often read.

In studying a foreign language it is often found that the grammar words of one's own language that tell about the grammar in the foreign language are basic to not being able to learn the foreign language.

The test of whether the person understands a word is "does it read on the meter as a fall when he reads the word in the material being cleared".

That a person says he knows the meaning is not acceptable. Have him look it up no matter how simple the word is.

---

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder  

LRH:sb.rd
Word Clearing Series 36

GRAMMAR

In all word clearing all Grammatical Words and small words should be looked up in a simple grammar textbook.

Very few dictionaries have full definitions for such words and they have no examples.

Words like "a" "the" "and" are really parts of language construction and are more complex than they at first appear.

A Word Clearing Auditor should have a simple grammar book to hand as well as dictionaries.

The best Grammar textbooks are those compiled for persons foreign to a language, like immigrants. These do not contain the supposition that the student is already an English professor.

Lots of examples is the real test of a good grammar.

When doing the Study Tapes or Student Hat lack of a simple grammar textbook can really throw the student off.

Those "simple" words can be the huge rocks that stand on the highway to becoming a word clear.

So a Grammar is needed.

If a student is very deficient (lacking) in grammar it is best to make him do a whole simple grammar text first before he begins to get into just words. The words won't hang together for him.

It takes less time to do a short textbook in Grammar than it does to struggle with grammar all the way through.

Grammar can look like a ghastly subject until one really looks at it. Then it's easy.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd
WORDS, MISUNDERSTOOD GOOFS

It has come to my attention that words a student misunderstands and looks up can yet remain troublesome. And that R6 materials are suffering from the same fate when meter activity lessens.

It's this way: The student runs across a word he or she doesn't understand. He or she looks it up in a dictionary, finds a substitute word and uses that.

Of course the first word is still misunderstood and remains a bother.

Example: (Line in text) "The size was Gargantuan." Student looks up Gargantuan, finds "Like Gargantua, huge." Student uses "huge" as a synonym and reads the text line "The size was 'huge'." A short while later is found still incapable of understanding the paragraph below "Gargantuan" in the text. Conclusion the student makes – "Well it doesn't work."

The principle is that one goes dull after passing over a word one does not understand and brightens up the moment he spots the word that wasn't grasped. In actual fact, the brightening up occurs whether one defines the word or not.

But to put another word in the place of the existing word, whether in Level 0 or Level VI is to mess it all up.

Take the above example. "Huge" is not "Gargantuan". These are synonyms. The sentence is "The size was Gargantuan." The sentence was not "The size was huge." You can't really substitute one word for another at Level 0 or Level VI and get anything but an alteration. So something remains not understood at Level 0 and the meter stops at Level VI. It just isn't what was said or thought.

The correct procedure is to look over, get defined well and understand the word that was used.

In this case the word was "Gargantuan". Very well, what's that? It means "Like Gargantua" according to the dictionary.
Who or what was Gargantua? The dictionary says it was the name of a gigantic King in a book written by the author Rabelais. Cheers, the student thinks, the sentence meant "The size was a gigantic king." Oops! That's the same goof again, like "huge". But we're nearer.

So what to do? Use Gargantuan in a few sentences you make up and bingo! You suddenly understand the word that was used.

Now you read it right. "The size was Gargantuan." And what does that mean? It means "The size was Gargantuan." And nothing else.

Get it?

There's no hope for it mate. You'll have to learn real English, not the 600 word basic English of the college kid, in which a few synonyms are substituted for all the big words.

____________________

And as an "aside" (like they use on the stage), may I say that golly some people have to reach a long way to find goofs.

(The data in this HCO B was given to me by Mary Sue Hubbard and called to attention by Ian Tam-pion.)

L. RON HUBBARD
Word Clearing Series 16 R

CONFUSED IDEAS

Whenever a person has a confused idea of something or believes there is some conflict of ideas it is always true that a misunderstood word exists at the bottom of that confusion.

Example: "I just don't understand this idea of opposing forces. I think it all ought to be rewritten and...."

Method 2 Word Clearer: "Is there any word there you don't understand?" Read! Student: "Oh no, I understand all the words. It's...." "What word is this that's reading on the meter?" "Er... ah... Forces?" "Yes, that reads and blows down. Let's look it up." "Oh no, I know what it means. It's the idea that...." "Let's look it up!" "Well, all right. Let's see D... E... F... Forces. Here it is. That which changes the motion of a body on which it acts." WD Clearer: "Use it in a sentence several times." Student does. "... er... ah. I've got it. Hell I thought it meant police brutality! Couldn't figure out why two police forces would fight!" Word Clearer: "Now how do you feel about this idea of opposing forces?" "Oh, let's see. Why that's clear enough. Just like I'd never read it before!" Meter: F/N.

Every green body of students will argue and fuss about ideas or confusions in the directions or material they are given to read.

They will generate weird ideas and erroneous concepts of what the text says. They do wrong things and say the text said to. They ask strange ideas of their instructors. They clamor for "clarifications".

And at the bottom of all this is simply misunderstood words.

There is not also misunderstood ideas. There is only the misunderstood word which breeds, then, huge towering wrong ideas.

A misunderstood word breeds strange ideas.
Confused Concepts Or Ideas Of Material

Misunderstood
Word
Detectable Only
By Meter

Picture of A
Student's Mind

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER
Superliteracy and the Cleared Word

SUPER – Superiority in size, quality, number or degree.

LITERACY – The ability to read and write.

Almost everyone these days is able to read and write. This was not true a century ago but, with modern stress on education, it is true today.

But is this enough today?

It is an instruction book world. The civilization in which we live is highly technical.

Education today goes into the twenties.

That's a third of one's life.

And what happens when one leaves school?

Can he do what he studied?

Does he have all his education or did it get left behind?

Literacy is not enough.

Today's schools and today's world require a new ability—the ability to look at a page without any strain and absorb what it says and then apply it right now without any stress at all.

And is that possible?

Am I talking about speed reading?

No. That is just being able to read rapidly. It does not improve the comfort of reading and it does not improve the ability to apply.

What is really needed is the ability to comfortably and quickly take data from a page and be able at once to apply it.

Anyone who could do that would be Super-Literate.

What happens?
The average person-literate – is able to read words and mentally record words.
Like this:

When he writes he writes:

In his mind words are “understood” as other words like this:
When one is Super-Literate, this is what happens:

Therefore as he is dealing in concepts (ideas or understandings) this can happen:

And he thinks in concepts to which he can fit words easily and so can write clearly.
In other words, when one is Super-Literate, one reads not words but understandings. And so one can act.
CONCEPTS

The idea of grasping word meanings conceptually is something new to the field of Linguistics. The endless Semantic circles pursued by Korzybski and company (see Data Series 1, "The Anatomy of Thought") never really led to the realization that a word and its meanings are embodied in the basic concept or idea symbolized by that word.

That conceptualization of meanings is foreign to dictionary writers and "experts" is evidenced by the fact that definitions are so subject to alteration and change with the passage of time.

For example, modern definitions of the word "understand" are found to be largely inadequate. A really full and meaningful definition of it could only be found in a First Edition of Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms, 1942:

"Understand. To have a clear and true idea or conception, or full and exact knowledge, of something. In general it may be said that understand refers to the result of a mental process or processes (a clear and exact idea or notion, or full knowledge). Understand implies the power to receive and register a clear and true impression."

CLEARED WORDS

Operating within a society steeped in misunderstood words and mis-definitions, Study Tech is subject to arbitraries. Thus, a cleared word is defined as follows:

A word which has been cleared to the point of full conceptual understanding.

In Metered Word Clearing this translates as:

F/N, VGIs.

There are many ways and combinations to achieve this EP. Using the word in sentences until the meaning is grasped conceptually is the most common. Diagrams, demos, clay, in fact the entire body of Study Tech and its methods are applicable.

These are vital tools. For use. Protect them and Keep Scientology Working.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
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METHOD 3 WORD CLEARING
BY THE STUDENT'S TWIN

In Scientology each student is assigned a "twin" to study with. A twin must know how to keep his student F/Ning (one who is tearing along successfully in his studies). The student's twin would handle anything that slowed or interfered with such a student's F/N.

Students don't put each other on a meter to locate a misunderstood word. It's the Supervisor who meters a student to find his misunderstood word as per these HCOBs, using the F/Ning Student system.

HCOB 28 JUN 71 W/C SERIES 6  METERED WORD CLEARING IN THE COURSE ROOM
HCOB 29 JUN 71 W/C SERIES 7  STEPS TO SPEED STUDENT PRODUCT FLOW
HCOB 1 JUL 71  W/C SERIES 9  THE THREE TYPES OF WORD CLEARING
HCOB 1 JUL 71  W/C SERIES 10  SPEEDING UP A SLOW COURSE.

For a student and his twin, using dope-off as the only detection of misunderstands is twinning at a below F/N level. The F/N went off long before the student reached the point of dope-off, so waiting for dope-off to occur before handling is waiting too long. As soon as the twin's study stats dropped for half a day or the twin isn't quite so "bright" as he was 15 minutes ago is the time to look for the misunderstood word. (It's not a misunderstood phrase or idea or concept but a misunderstood word.) This always occurs before the subject itself is not understood.

This is Method 3 style Word Clearing by the student's twin,

(1) The student notices his twin is not flying along and is not so "bright" or it could be just plain lack of enthusiasm or too long on one item on the checksheet or yawning or dis-interest or doodling or day-dreaming etc,

(2) The student then has his twin look earlier in the text for a misunderstood word. There is one always, there are no exceptions. It may be that the misunderstood word is two pages or more back but it is always earlier in the text from where the twin is now.

(3) The word is found. The twin recognises it in looking back for it or the student asks "what does ______ mean" if the twin can't find it by taking words from the text that could be the misunderstood word and seeing if the twin gives the correct definition,
(4) The student has the twin look up the word found in a dictionary and use it verbally several times in sentences of his own composition until the twin has obviously demonstrated he understands the word by the composition of his sentences.

(5) The student has the twin read the text that contained the misunderstood word. If the twin isn't now "bright", eager to get on with it, back up tone, etc, then there is another misunderstood word earlier in the text. This is found by repeating steps 2-5.

(6) When the twin is bright, up tone, etc. (an F/Ning student), the student has the twin come forward from where the misunderstood word was in the text to the area of the subject he did not understand (where step 1 began).

The twin will now be enthusiastic with his study of the subject unless a misunderstood word was missed or there's an earlier one in the text. If so do steps 2-5. If the twin is now enthusiastic have him continue on with studying.

Students do not have to be Word Cleared Method 2 on the total of any course.

Training & Services Bureau
By order of
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:JW:mes:ka
COACHING

In order to help you to do the best you possibly can in the course as far as being a coach is concerned, below you will find a few data that will assist you:

1. Coach with a purpose.

Have for your goal when you are coaching that the student is going to get the training drill correct; be purposeful in working toward obtaining this goal. Whenever you correct the student as a coach just don't do it with no reason, with no purpose. Have the purpose in mind for the student to get a better understanding of the training drill and to do it to the best of his ability.

2. Coach with reality.

Be realistic in your coaching. When you give an origination to a student really make it an origination, not just something that the sheet said you should say; so that it is as if the student was having to handle it exactly as you say under real conditions and circumstances. This does not mean, however, that you really feel the things that you are giving the student, such as saying to him, "My leg hurts." This does not mean that your leg should hurt, but you should say it in such a manner as to convey to the student that your leg hurts. Another thing about this is do not use any experiences from your past to coach with. Be inventive in present time.

3. Coach with an intention.

Behind all your coaching should be your intention that by the end of the session your student will be aware that he is doing better at the end of it than he did at the beginning. The student must have a feeling that he has accomplished something in the training step, no matter how small it is. It is your intention and always should be while coaching that the student you are coaching be a more able person and have a greater understanding of that on which he is being coached.

4. In coaching take up only one thing at a time.

For example: Using TR 4, if the student arrives at the goal set up for TR 4 then check over, one at a time, the earlier TRs. Is he confronting you? Does he originate the question to you each time as his own and did he really intend for you to receive it? Are his acknowledgments ending the cycles of communication, etc. But only coach these things one at a time; never two or more at a time. Make sure that the student does each thing you coach him on correctly before going on to the next training step. The better a student gets at a particular
drill or a particular part of a drill you should demand, as a coach, a higher standard of ability. This does not mean that you should be "never satisfied". It does mean that a person can always get better and once you have reached a certain plateau of ability then work toward a new plateau.

As a coach you should always work in the direction of better and more precise coaching. Never allow yourself to do a sloppy job of coaching because you would be doing your student a disservice and we doubt that you would like the same disservice. If you are ever in doubt about the correctness of what he is doing or of what you are doing, then the best thing is to ask the supervisor. He will be very glad to assist you by referring you to the correct materials.

In coaching never give an opinion, as such, but always give your directions as a direct statement, rather than saying "I think" or "Well, maybe it might be this way," etc.

As a coach you are primarily responsible for the session and the results that are obtained on the student. This does not mean, of course, that you are totally responsible but that you do have a responsibility toward the student and the session. Make sure you always run good control on the student and give him good directions.

Once in a while the student will start to rationalize and justify what he is doing if he is doing something wrong. He will give you reasons why and because. Talking about such things at great length does not accomplish very much. The only thing that does accomplish the goals of the TR and resolves any differences is doing the training drill. You will get further by doing it than by talking about it.

In the training drills the coach should coach with the material given under "Training Stress" and "Purpose" on the training sheet.

These training drills occasionally have a tendency to upset the student. There is a possibility that during a drill a student may become angry or extremely upset or experience some misemotion. Should this occur the coach must not "back off". He should continue the training drill until he can do it without stress or duress and he feels "good about it". So, don't "back off" but push the student through whatever difficulty he may be having.

There is a small thing that most people forget to do and that is telling the student when he has gotten the drill right or he has done a good job on a particular step. Besides correcting wrongnesses there is also complimenting rightness.

You very definitely "flunk" the student for anything that amounts to "self-coaching". The reason for this is that the student will tend to introvert and will look too much at how he is doing and what he is doing rather than just doing it.

As a coach keep your attention on the student and how he is doing and don't become so interested in what you yourself are doing that you neglect the student and are unaware of his ability or inability to do the drill correctly. It is easy to become "interesting" to a student; to make him laugh and act up a bit. But your main job as a coach is to see how good he can get in each training drill and that is what you should have your attention on; that, and how well he is doing.
To a large degree the progress of the student is determined by the standard of coaching. Being a good coach produces auditors who will in turn produce good results on their preclears. Good results produce better people.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
METHOD 9 WORD CLEARING THE RIGHT WAY

(Words in Type Style revised 19 Dec 1979 to include developments on how one goes about clearing a word. This revision is on page 7, section 7 "Clear the Word". There were five other changes, all minor. This 13 Sept 80 revision (of the procedure and the examples of correct M9 that follow) serves as a clarification and elaboration of the fact the method 9 word clearing must be done with comprehension of the material being word cleared. Earlier write-ups on this subject, not by myself, stated that the person's Mis-U was that word on which he stumbled. This is not the case. It is only occasionally the word on which he stumbled that is misunderstood. Usually, as was covered long since in study tech, it is the earlier word or symbol which has caused the stumble or twitch or blink or omit or mispronunciation or what have you.

HISTORY

Method 9 word clearing was first developed in a pilot project which sought to teach people to read who were not reading in their native tongue. The first versions of M9 were not correctly written up but the technology nevertheless began to spread in use. It was found that not only non-English students didn't know what they were reading but as the educational standards of the culture deteriorated, it was found that people reading in their native tongue could benefit with the use of M9. It was then found that college students could not get through M9. And the latest survey has demonstrated that 31 school teachers taken at random throughout the school systems flunked M9 on their common reading materials.
What has apparently happened here is that we have drifted down in literacy to a point where the culture can't read or hear. In a technical culture such as this, one should not ask further why it is failing.

Because there are not enough supervisors to personally M9 all the people on the planet, much less a medium size class, it has to be done on a turnabout basis by the students themselves. This caused a difficulty with M9 because one was asking students who couldn't read to understand how to do the method 9 which would find the things which prevented them from reading. Here again we have the chicken and egg problem. Therefore, the procedure has been demonstrated in a picture book which will be issued in due time as a part of a special course. This picture book shows the student how to M9 another student and he can, after being drilled by the supervisor on the picture book. So this has also been solved.

M9 is probably the top key method of word clearing today. You would be utterly amazed to find somebody who habitually reads western stories cannot pass an M9 on them. He sees, "He mounted his roan (a type of horse)" and he understands from this, "He roamed around the mountains." He has become so accustomed to not-ising his inability to understand what he is reading that he thinks it is ordinary. Isn't that the way everybody reads?

M9 brings it home forcefully to him that he really doesn't understand what he is reading. This is not why one uses it. One uses it to produce somebody who can read. But, like one of the English teachers who was M9ed on his own text, although he may begin with hostile protest that of course he knows what he is reading, he soon gets into the real reality of it and sees where he is at. His willingness to continue then has already been secured.

It will be found that the simple things are the main things on which he stumbles. Thus M9ing is usually preceded by M8 as covered in the new basic comprehensive reading course. This shows him by picture book how to use a dictionary and gets him to define the simple words of the language. Commas, semicolons, even capital letters will be found to be commonly misunderstood.

The usefulness of M9 has gone then from a way of spotting the points where a foreign language student is falling down to detecting and handling the professors and the rest of the culture. It is an extremely important method of word clearing and should be learned very well.

**HOW TO LEARN METHOD 9**

Method 9 word clearing is a way of finding the words a person doesn't understand in a book or other written material by having him read it aloud to the word clearer.

It is very simple and precise and it can be done by students on one another with great success as well as by a professional word clearer. Method 9 does not require expertise and it does not require a meter as many other methods of word clearing do. Method 2 word clearing is very similar to method 9 but it requires the use of a meter to pick up the misunderstands. The virtue of method 9 is that, while it is very thorough and effective, it is not restricted in use to those who can operate a meter and who have other expertise needed for method 2. It can therefore be learned very easily and used very broadly. To teach M9 the supervisor gets the student through the picturebook version of M9, which will be issued in due time as part of
a special course and drills him so that he can do method 9 word clearing and he can M9 other
students. One can also learn how to do it all by himself by going through this picture book
and this HCOB.

MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS

A student, when reading by himself, often does not know he has gone past misunder-
stood words. But whenever he does go by misunderstood words, he will have trouble with
what he is reading.

A misunderstood word keeps a person from duplicating what the written materials ac-
tually say. It causes the communication formula to go out.

A word can be misunderstood in many different ways and it is important that these dif-
ferent types of misunderstandeds are known to the person doing method 9. A word can be mis-
understood because of a false (totally wrong) definition, an incorrect definition, an incom-
plete definition, an unsuitable definition, a homonymic (one word which has two or more dis-
tinctly separate meanings) definition, a substitute (synonym – a word which has a similar but
not the same meaning) definition, a no (omitted) definition, a rejected (by the person himself,
usually due to a false datum) definition or an invented (by the person himself, usually due to a
false datum) definition. This is covered more fully on HCOB 17 Jul 79 Issue I, The Misunder-
stood Word Defined.

If a person has habitually gone past many, many misunderstood words in his reading
or his education (which most everybody in this present culture has), not only will his ability
to read be lowered but also his intelligence. What he himself writes and says won't be under-
stood, what he reads and hears he won't understand, and he will be out of communication. The
probability is that he will have sunk back to the first dynamic, the world will look like a very
peculiar place to him, he will feel that he is "not understood" (how true!) and life will look a
bit miserable to him. He can even appear to others to be criminal. At best he will become a
sort of robot or zombie. So you see, it is very important to clear misunderstood words. Lack
of the ability to communicate probably underlies the causes for the current drug culture.

You will be amazed that somebody who appears to be a criminal idiot all of a sudden
begins to look comparatively like a genius after he has been M9ed.

WHY METHOD 9 WORKS

A student who understands all the words on the page he is reading will be able to read
the page aloud perfectly. He will feel bright and alert and will fully understand what he reads.
But when a student passes a word or symbol he doesn't understand, the misunderstood causes
an interruption of his voice or physical beingness. His voice may change, or he may stumble
on a word or make a face or squint his eyes or react in some other way.

This is easy to understand if you remember that a person can go blank after he passes a
word or symbol he doesn't understand. He may make a mistake in his reading right there at
the point of the misunderstood, or he may continue reading past the misunderstood and make
a mistake on a later word or symbol. He will feel duller and he will try to make up for the dull feeling by reading with more effort. This will always be expressed by a non-optimum action of some kind which must be noted and handled at once by the word clearer.

A non-optimum reaction is anything the student does besides read the page easily, naturally, and perfectly. Examples of some of the non-optimum reactions that may show up are:

1. Student adding a word or leaving out a word or changing a word in the sentence he is reading.
2. Student stumbling on a word or saying it incorrectly.
3. Student pausing or reading more slowly.
4. Student frowning or looking uncertain.
5. Student going stiff or tensing a body part, such as squinting his eyes or tightening the grip of his hands, or biting his lip or some other physical reaction.
6. Student reading with effort.
7. Student reading with a glib, robotic attitude (which is how he gets after he has been forced to read "correctly" by someone who doesn't know anything about Mis-Us).

Other manifestations can occur.

Note that the above is not a complete list of reactions but is intended to give an idea of what to look for. In all fairness, one can stumble when reading if he is trying to read in a dim light or he is having eye trouble or the print or handwriting or pencilled corrections in the text are very hard to make out. Thus it is necessary to do M9 word clearing only in bright light and if the fellow is supposed to be wearing glasses, he should be wearing glasses, and the material being M9ed must not contain smudges and deletions itself. All possible reasons why he cannot see the text and unclear text must be removed. Otherwise, the student will simply say he couldn't see it or the light was bad or some other wrong why.

Anytime the person makes an error in his reading or reacts in some non-optimum way, a misunderstood will ALWAYS be found just before that point or sometimes at that point itself.

Example: The student is reading the page aloud. He reads, "Raymond walked home slowly and thoughtfully," then he frowns. The other student, who is M9ing him says: "That's it. Is there some word or symbol there that you didn't understand?" (If the student wonders why he was stopped, the word clearer tells him what reaction he noticed.)

The student looks over what he has read. He feels uncertain about the word 'slowly'. He tells this to the word clearer and the word 'slowly' is looked up in the dictionary and used in sentences until the student fully understands it.
When the word that was misunderstood is located and cleared, the student will brighten up and will begin reading clearly and correctly once again.

**THE GLIB STUDENT**

Glibness is often trained into students by the current educational methods used in schools. The student is drilled to suppress or go by misunderstood words and to robotically answer back with what the book says. If he can do this, he is said to be a "good student" and a "good reader".

With this method, a student's understanding of what he has read is actually considered to be separate from the act of reading. If the educators bother with comprehension at all, it is only to measure memorization, not understanding.

In today's schools, students are actually instructed to go right on past words they don't understand; to figure out how to say them and to continue reading whether they understand the text or not. One textbook even advises, "If you find a hard word, read it as best you can and continue to read." Students are expressly drilled to suppress reactions such as mispronouncing words, substituting one word for another, inserting extra words, repeating words, and omitting words. These reactions indicate misunderstandings have been bypassed, but under heavy drilling a student can learn to become robotic enough to suppress even these reactions, and read on, leaving misunderstandings piled up behind him. In all fairness, his teachers were not just trying to victimize him. The discovery of the effects of a misunderstood word and the reasons for such stumbles had not been discovered. Teachers did not know about them. Thus they invented various drills to force the student not to make these "comprehension errors". They did not have the tech or even know what caused these manifestations. You have the reasons for them in method 9 and in study tech.

You can spot a glib student on method 9 because he sounds and looks robotic when he reads. One step to take on such a glib student is to ask him if he has ever been taught to suppress reactions on words which, when he read them, he did not understand. One is asking him to take the "suppress" off. He will tell you immediately that he has been when this is true, and some emotional reaction can occur. One simply lets him talk about it until the charge seems to be off of it and then gets him to start his M9ing again. Some of it may be left, of course, but he will gradually get into it and become more honest and more there. He thinks, of course, when you're M9ing him that you simply want him to utter certain sounds. This is what he has been trained to expect. If he is supposed to read aloud, he is supposed to utter certain sounds. These sounds, of course, are meaningless to him but that doesn't matter. Previously, his whole purpose and training pattern in reading aloud was narrowed into getting passed. So it may be necessary for the supervisor to take up why he is being M9ed. But even though he is reading like a robot and suppressing everything, you will be able to see the suppression deepen when he hits the really big Mis-Us. He reads them even more robotically than he does the other parts of the text, so these too can be detected. As soon as he has found a few of these things out and found out what you are trying to do, he will begin to respond much more readily with M9. Method 9 on common reading materials will show up a student's lack of reading compre-
hension and show up his misunderstoods so that he can really see it for himself. It may be an entirely new idea to him that written pages and sound waves communicate something.

Another method, an extreme one, of handling the extensively mis-trained glib student is to get him to read a paragraph and then, employing a method known as "clay table", get him to demonstrate it. He won't be able to do so. Furthermore, he will realize he isn't able to do so. It was just sounds.

**METHOD 9 ON COMMON READING MATERIALS**

To do method 9 on common reading materials, the student chooses a paperback book or something that he reads for his own pleasure and he reads it aloud to the word clearer.

If he cannot read it perfectly, it is because he has gone by misunderstood words. At first it may not be real to the student that he has misunderstood words. But after he has found and cleared a number of them using method 9, the student will realize that he does have misunderstood words and that his misunderstoods are getting in the way of his ability to read.

When the student reaches the point of realizing that he does actually have misunderstood words on the materials he commonly reads for his own pleasure, he becomes very willing to find his own misunderstood words and he can usually do so easily. Method 9 of common reading materials can be ended at this point. The student is now much more aware of and able to find and handle his own misunderstoods and he is on his way toward reading naturally, correctly and with understanding.

**HOW TO DO METHOD 9**

1. **STUDENT AND WORD CLEARER SIT ACROSS FROM EACH OTHER.**

The student and the word clearer sit across from each other at a table or desk. Each person has his own copy of the text to be word cleared. The word clearer must be able to see the student and the page in front of him at the same time.

2. **DICTIONARIES ARE AVAILABLE.**

A good, simple English language dictionary, and any other dictionaries the student may need are available. (Above all things, do not use what is called a "dinky dictionary". This is different than a simple well-expressed dictionary. A dinky dictionary is what you commonly get off the paperback racks in drug stores. It quite often defines word A as word B and then defines word B as word A. It also omits all the alternative definitions and all the technical definitions. Always have to hand, at least in the classroom, the most extensive and voluminous set of dictionaries anybody ever heard of on all the subjects ever heard of under the sun, plus any encyclopedias that you can round up.)

3. **STUDENT RECOGNITION OF MISUNDERSTOODS.**
Before the student starts reading, he should be told that if he sees a word he doesn't know the meaning of, he should stop and look the word up and clear it instead of going on past it. And the student should be encouraged to find and clear misunderstood words himself. M9 brings about the ability to do this, so that the student will find and clear his own misunderstandings in future. The word clearer on M9 would never prevent the student from clearing a word that the student recognizes as misunderstood. Correctly done M9 will bring about the ability of the student to find and clear his own misunderstandings. . . . (If you don't want to spend ten years M9ing one page, it is best to get him through method 8 on simple English words. This will be part of a special course which will greatly improve someone's level of literacy.)

4. STUDENT READS THE TEXT ALOUD TO THE WORD CLEARER.

The student reads the text aloud to the word clearer. He is not on the meter. While the student reads, the word clearer follows his own copy of the same text, watches the student and listens to him.

The word clearer must be very alert and see or hear any non-optimum reactions of the student while he is reading.

5. NON-OPTIMUM REACTION EQUALS MISUNDERSTOOD WORD.

A non-optimum reaction by the student to what he is reading is the clue to the word clearer that the student has encountered a misunderstood word. The word clearer and student must now locate the exact misunderstood word or symbol. It will be found just before or sometimes at the point the non-optimum reaction occurred.

6. FIND THE MISUNDERSTOOD.

If it is not obvious to the student that he has reacted and he just continues reading, the word clearer says, "That's it. Is there some word or symbol there that you didn't understand?" It is the duty of the word clearer to steer the student to the misunderstood. It is either at the point of the non-optimum reaction or before it. The point is that the student must be steered onto it. And it then is looked up.

The student may be able to spot his misunderstood word right away and tell the word clearer what it is. Or he may have difficulty finding it and the word clearer will have to help him find it.

The word clearer helps the student by getting him to look earlier and earlier in the text from the point where he reacted until the misunderstood word is found. The word clearer can also spot-check the student. Spot-checking means choosing words from the text the student has already read and checking with him to see if he knows the definitions of those words.

If the student is uncertain about any word or gives a wrong definition, then that word is taken up and cleared in the dictionary.

7. CLEAR THE WORD.
Once the misunderstood is found it must be fully cleared in the dictionary. The person will be hung up on the definition of the word as it is used in the context of what is being word cleared, which will not necessarily be the first definition given in the dictionary. To try and clear any other definition before clearing the one he is stuck in would cause him to try and clear a word over misunderstands. Therefore he would rapidly go over the definitions to find the one that fits the context and clear that first. Then the remaining definitions would be cleared.

This is how a word is cleared:

The first step is to look rapidly over the definitions to find the one which applies to the context in which the word was misunderstood. One reads the definition and uses it in sentences until one has a clear concept of that meaning of the word. This could require ten or more sentences.

Then one clears each of the other definitions of that word, using each in sentences until one has a conceptual understanding of each definition.

The next thing to do is to clear the derivation – which is the explanation of where the word came from originally. This will help gain a basic understanding of the word.

Don't clear the technical or specialized definitions (Math., Biology, etc.) or obsolete (no longer used) or archaic (ancient and no longer in general use) definitions unless the word is being used that way in the context where it was misunderstood.

Most dictionaries give the idioms of a word. An idiom is a phrase or expression whose meaning cannot be understood from the ordinary meanings of the words. For example 'give in' is an English idiom meaning 'yield'. Quite a few words in English have idiomatic uses and these are usually given in a dictionary after the definitions of the word itself. These idioms have to be cleared.

One must also clear any other information given about the word, such as notes on its usage, synonyms, etc. so as to have a full understanding of the word.

If one encounters a misunderstood word or symbol in the definition of a word being cleared, one must clear it right away using this same procedure and then return to the definition one was clearing. (Dictionary symbols and abbreviations are usually given in the front of the dictionary.)

8. READ THE SENTENCE OR PARAGRAPH AGAIN.

The word clearer then asks the student to read once again the sentence in the text in which the misunderstood word or symbol was found. The student does so. The word clearer must now ensure that the student understands the sentence and/or paragraph that contained the misunderstood. If the student does not originate this the word clearer must ask him to tell him what the sentence or paragraph means. He does not just let the student continue reading with no comprehension of the text that contained the misunderstood.

If the student still doesn't understand the sentence or paragraph there will be another misunderstood word or symbol probably earlier in the text, that needs to be found and cleared. Only when he fully understands the section or the text that contained the misunder-
stood does the student continue on with the M9. He would continue reading from the sentence that had the misunderstood in it, not just the point where he had the non optimum reaction.

Any further non-optimum reactions are handled by finding the next misunderstood word or symbol and clearing it, as above.

9. METHOD 9 IS CONTINUED UNTIL THE TEXT HAS BEEN COMPLETED.

Method 9 is continued until the text to be word cleared is completed.

10. STUDENT GOES TO EXAMINER AT THE END OF METHOD 9 WORD CLEARING.

The student is always sent to the PC examiner at the end of a method 9 session.

And that's all there is to doing method 9!

**METHOD 9 CAUTION**

When the word clearer has misunderstoods of his own on the material being word cleared, he tends to go 'wooden' and just sits and does nothing to handle the student. The word clearer must always clear his own misunderstood words or else when the student stumbles on a word, the word clearer won't even see it or hear it because of his own misunderstoods. He can miss the student stumble and never get the student's misunderstood word.

The word clearer can also miss a student's reactions when he has so much attention on the page that he becomes unaware of the student or doesn't even look at the student.

When students are M9ing each other on the same study materials, they do not first just read the materials as this will only give them misunderstoods. They take the materials being word cleared one paragraph or section at a time and M9 each other on it. This is done by a student first M9ing his twin on one section, and then getting M9ed on what he just word cleared his twin on, plus the next section. It then turns around again. The twin gets M9ed on what he just word cleared the other student on, and on the next section. In this way one person is not constantly leading. Unless the M9ing reversals are done in this fashion, misunderstoods could be missed. The whole text would be covered in this way.

**EXAMPLES OF STUDENT REACTIONS AND THEIR CORRECT HANDLING**

There are many, many different kinds of reactions that can occur when a student passes a word he doesn't understand. There are also many different ways a student will respond to method 9. All that is needed for success with method 9 is for the word clearer to understand method 9 and to apply it exactly according to this bulletin.

Given here are some examples of student reactions and correct handlings by the word clearer:
A. THE STUDENT CHANGES A WORD IN THE SENTENCE.

Example:

The page says: "The boy then reached down and patted his dog."

The student says: "The boy than reached down and patted his dog."

The word clearer says, "That's it. Is there some word or symbol there that you didn't understand?"

The student looks at the words 'then', 'boy' and 'the'. He knows those words. So he looks in the sentence before that one. In that sentence he sees the word 'collie'. He's not sure what that is.

He tells the word clearer and they clear the word 'collie'.

The word clearer now has the student re-read the sentence that had the misunderstood in it and the following sentence. The student does this and the word clearer ensures he now understands the sentences.

They continue on with the M9 starting with the sentence that has the word 'collie' in it.

B. THE STUDENT ADDS AN EXTRA WORD.

Example:

The page says: "The child went to school."

The student says: The child went to the school."

The word clearer says, "That's it. Is there some word or symbol there that you didn't understand?"

The student looks over the sentence. He says he understands all the words, but thinks the sentence should say, "A child went to school" rather than, "The child went to school."

The word clearer says, "Okay, let's spot-check some words. What does 'the' mean in this sentence?"

The student looks blank for a moment and doesn't say anything. The word clearer says, "All right. We're going to look up the definition of 'the'."

'The' is then looked up and cleared.

After clearing the word 'the' the word clearer has the student take a look at the sentence again and tell him what it means. The student now understands the sentence perfectly so the M9 is continued from that sentence.

C. THE STUDENT LEAVES OUT A WORD.

Example:

The page says: "Robert then visited the city."
The student says: "Robert visited the city."

The word clearer says, "That's it. Is there some word or symbol there that you didn't understand?"

The student reads over the sentence. He can't find anything he doesn't understand. The word clearer asks him to look over the next earlier sentence for a misunderstood word. The student can't find any there, either. The word clearer has the student keep looking earlier and earlier in the text and finally the student spots the misunderstood word in the first sentence of the page.

The word found is then cleared.

The word clearer now has him re-read the sentence that the misunderstanding was in.

The student reads the sentence and frowns.

The word clearer says: "All right, is there another word or symbol there that you don't understand?"

They look even earlier in the text and find another word that the student went by that he didn't understand. The word is cleared fully and the word clearer has him read the earlier passage where the misunderstanding was found again. The word clearer then has the student tell him what that passage means. The student does so and now understands the passage, so the M9 is continued from that point in the text.

D. THE STUDENT LEAVES OFF A PART OF A WORD. SUCH AS AN 'S' OR AN 'ED' AT THE END.

Example:

The page says: "There was a huge pile of assorted tools in the woodshed."

The student says: "There was a huge pile of assorted tool in the woodshed."

The word clearer says, "That's it. You left the 's' off 'tools'. Have a look over that sentence or page and tell me what word or symbol was misunderstood."

The student says, "I don't have any misunderstood words on this page."

The word clearer acknowledges him and asks him once again to have a look for the misunderstood word or symbol.

The student looks over the entire page but still says he has no misunderstandings. So the word clearer starts spot checking the student on the definitions of the words on the page.

The word clearer asks, "What's the definition of 'tools'?" The student says, "It means 'implements of work'." The word clearer says, "That's fine. What's the definition of 'assorted'?" The student gives it to him correctly, so the word clearer simply backs up the sentence words one by one, getting the definition of each one until he hits the word 'was'.

Student says, "It's something you saw with." The word clearer says, "Let's have a look at 'was' in the dictionary." Each definition of 'was' is then cleared and it is suddenly discov-
erred that the person has never understood that it had anything to do with the conjugation of the verb 'to be'.

After this is fully cleared up the word clearer has the student re-read the sentence and tell him what it means.

The student says: "There was a huge pile of assorted tools in the woodshed. Oh yes, I understand that, it means that there was a large pile of different sorts of tools in the woodshed. That makes sense."

The word clearer now has him continue on with the M9.

E. THE STUDENT STUMBLES ON A WORD OR SAYS IT INCORRECTLY.

Example:

The page says: "I think I'll go shopping." The student says: "I th-think…"

The student stops after he stumbles. The word clearer says, "Is there some word or symbol there that you don't understand?"

The student says, "Well, it just doesn't make sense." The word clearer asks, "What doesn't make sense?" The student says, "I don't see why it says 'think' here."

The word clearer says, "All right. Let's have a look at 'think' in the dictionary."

'Think' is then looked up in the dictionary, but the student can't seem to get it, even though he understands all the words in the definition.

The word clearer asks, "Tell me, what part of speech is 'think' in that sentence?"

The student says, "Uh, I don't know."

The word clearer says, "Okay. Well, right here in the dictionary, it says 'Verb'. What does that mean to you?"

Student: "Mm…" (long pause).

The word clearer says, "All right." He gets a grammar book and says, "Have a look at this definition of 'verb'."

'Verb' is then cleared but while clearing it, the student says, "Hey, I always thought you could only have one verb in one sentence and that sentence has two verbs in it. Somebody threw me a curve." And as he has cognited and has now got it straight, M9ing continues. He uses it in sentences until he's really got it, then they go on to the next definition of 'think' in the dictionary.

After all the definitions of 'think' are cleared the word clearer has the student re-read the sentence. The student does so, with no error. The word clearer asks him what the sentence means and the student tells him accurately with understanding.

The M9 is continued from that point in the text.
F. THE STUDENT HESITATES OR PAUSES WHILE HE IS READING OR BEGINS READING MORE SLOWLY.

Example:

The page says: "The sun was shining on the flowers."

The student says: "The sun----was shining on the flowers." The word clearer says, "That's it. What word or symbol was misunderstood just before that point?"

The student very carefully looks back over the page, but he can't find any words he doesn't understand.

The word clearer says, "Okay. I'll spot-check you." He gives the student a thorough spot-check, but no misunderstood words are found.

The word clearer then asks, "Show me where you were last doing really well on this text."

The student shows him. It's three paragraphs back.

The word clearer says, "Good. We're going to check from this point back for any misunderstood words."

He extensively spot-checks the student in that area, and the student's misunderstood word is finally found and cleared.

After ensuring that the student understands the part of the text where the misunderstood was found, the M9 is continued from the sentence in which the misunderstood occurred.

G. THE STUDENT FROWNS, LOOKS UNCERTAIN, GOES STIFF, OR IN SOME WAY SHOWS LACK OF COMPREHENSION.

Example:

The page says: "The family ate dinner together every night."

The student says: "The family ate dinner together every night."

While the student is reading, there is a slight look of uncertainty on his face.

The word clearer says, "That's it. Look over this section you've just read and tell me what word or symbol has been misunderstood."

The student says, "But why did you stop me?"

The word clearer says, "You were looking uncertain as you read that last sentence."

The student says, "Well, actually, I did have some attention back on the sentence before last."

The word clearer says, "Okay. Was there any misunderstood word or symbol there?"
The student says, "I have some attention on the word 'for', but I've looked that up before."

The word clearer says, "Well, let's have another look at it."

'For' is then cleared and the student realizes that he hadn't fully cleared all of the definitions when he had previously looked it up.

Each definition of 'for' is cleared fully and then the word clearer asks the student to re-read these sentences and tell him what they mean. The student has a good grasp of the material and so the M9 is continued from the sentence that had the word 'for' in it, with the student reading smoothly and effortlessly.

H. THE STUDENT TENSES HIS BODY IN SOME WAY. THIS COULD BE TIGHTENING HIS GRIP, SQUINTING, TENsing HIS JAW, JERKING HIS BODY, STIFFENING ANY BODY PART, ETC.

1. The page says: "The girls were delighted to see one another."

   The student says: "The girls (tightens the muscles in his jaw) were delighted to see one another."

   The word clearer says, "That's it. Look back over this section you have just read. Was there a misunderstood word or symbol there?"

   The student looks at the page a long time. The word clearer can see he is looking earlier and earlier on the page. Finally the student says, "I can't see any words I don't understand, but this line seems a bit strange to me: 'It was Christmas Eve. Alice was listening to 'Silent Night' when Carol came into the room.'"

   The word clearer says, "All right. Let's do a spot-check in that area. What does 'Carol' mean?"

   The student says, "That's a girl's name."

   The word clearer says, "Good. What do the quotation marks show in that sentence?"

   The student says, "Hm. Well, someone said 'Silent Night' to Alice."

   The word clearer says, "All right. I want you to read this section in the grammar book on quotation marks."

   The student reads the section aloud and says, "Oh, I see. 'Silent Night' is a song and you use quotation marks around the names of songs. I've got it now!"

   The word clearer says, "Great." and has the student give some examples of the use of quotation marks. They then return to the text.

2. The page says: "The men walked quietly through the dockyard." The student says: "The men walked quietly through the dockyard." (Student leans forward and looks at the page more intently.)
The word clearer says, "That's it. Is there some word or symbol there that you didn't understand?"

The student looks over the sentence. "Well, I've never seen 'dockyard' used like that before. It doesn't make sense."

The word clearer acknowledges him and has him look it up. The student reads the definition and starts brightening up. He turns to the word clearer and says, "And all this time I thought a dockyard was a place where you built docks, I never could understand why…"

3. The page says: "The car drove off, leaving a trail of dust in the air."

The student says: "The car drove off, leaving a trail (student squints his eyes at the page) of dust in the air."

The word clearer says, "Is there some misunderstood word or symbol in that area?"

Student looks bewildered. "No, the sentence just doesn't make sense."

Word clearer says, "All right. What is the definition of 'trail'?"

"Oh, that's the impression of a horse hoof where a horse has been."

The word clearer says, "Okay, look up the word 'trail'." The word is cleared and the student sees that he had a totally wrong definition.

The word clearer now has him read that sentence again and tell him what it means. The student is still confused about the sentence and thinks it means that the car drove off a cliff or something.

They clear the word 'off' fully and find that the sentence now makes perfect sense to the student. The M9 is continued from that sentence.

I. THE STUDENT YAWNS. SUPPRESSES A YAWN, GETS WATERY EYES. ETC.

The page says: "A bright red apple was on the table." The student says: "A bright red apple was (yawn)…"

The word clearer says, "Okay. Let's find the word or symbol that was misunderstood in this section."

The student says, "I'm not sure I have the right definition for 'bright'. Could we look it up?"

The word clearer says, "Sure", and they look up the word 'bright'.

The student then re-reads the sentence and tells the word clearer what it means. The M9 is continued from that sentence.

J. THE STUDENT BEGINS READING WITH MORE EFFORT. THIS INCLUDES READING VERY CAREFULLY OR UNNATURALLY OR ROBOTICALLY OR READING IN SUCH A WAY AS TO SHOW THAT THE WORDS HAVE NO
MEANING TO HIM, OR THAT HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT HE IS READING.

The page says: "The families were having a picnic on the beach."
The student says: "The families were having a picnic on the beach."
The student reads the page correctly, but he is being very careful not to make any mistakes.
The word clearer says, "That's it. Let's find the misunderstood word or symbol that you didn't understand before this sentence."
The student says, "Yes, I started feeling uncomfortable while was reading the sentence before last."
The word clearer says, "Good. Let's look just before that for the misunderstood word."
The student finds his misunderstood and it is cleared.

After ensuring that the student understands this section of the text, the M9 is continued from the sentence where the student found the misunderstood.

The important point for the word clearer to remember is that where there is a student reaction, a misunderstood word will be found, usually just before the point he reacted.

The misunderstood word can always, always be located with good communication, persistence and a totally standard application of method 9 tech, as given in this HCOB. If the student can't easily achieve this, he must go to the supervisor for help.

**TRS AND M9**

To be a very successful M9 word clearer, one's TRs must be in. One has to be able to TR-3 the question and get the actual misunderstood, yet at the same time, one should never go robotic or rote on the method 9 procedure. For example it may happen that half-way through a sentence, the student stops, smiles, and then continues on. Upon questioning, you find that a bulletin he has read many, many times before is now finally making sense. You wouldn't then ask him for his misunderstood. Just acknowledge his win and carry on with your word clearing with your TRs in and your application of this bulletin 100% standard. The wins and gains of those you word clear will by no means be slight.

**QUARRELS OR UPSETS**

It occasionally happens that the students doing the word clearing get into a quarrel or upset. If this happens, you know that one of two things has happened, either:
1. "Misunderstoods" that were really understood were forced off on the student, or

2. Actual misunderstands were not detected and were passed by.

1. If this happens, you can clean up any falsely looked-up words by asking him if he was made to look up words he understood. If this is the case, the student will brighten up and tell you the word or words he was wrongly made to clear. This done, the M9ing can be resumed.

2. If the above doesn't handle it, then one knows that misunderstands have been missed. Have the twin who is doing the word clearing take him back to when he was last doing well and then come forward in the text, M9ing as he goes, picking up the missed misunderstands. It will usually be found that several misunderstands have been missed, not just one.

WORKSHEETS

Worksheets are a written record of the word clearing session. They contain the student's name, the word clearer's name, the date and the name or title of what is being word cleared. The word clearer keeps worksheets during the word clearing session and writes down which words have been looked up and cleared and any other important information concerning the word clearing.

Worksheets are stapled to the student's exam form when word clearing is complete. They are filed in his pc folder.

TEACHING THE STUDENT TO DO METHOD 9

This is done using this HCOB or the M9 Picture Book (which will be issued in due time as part of a special course). This is a simple picture book which is handed to the student. He goes through the book and then does some M9 drilling as contained in the back of it. The supervisor checks him out and corrects him if needed, using only the data in the M9 Picture Book and this HCOB. No verbal tech or opinions are thrown in.

The end result of a well done method 9 is a student who is certain he has no misunderstands on that material so that he can easily study the material and apply it.

Method 9 is a great civilization saver.

It is easy to do. It's fun and it gives tremendous gains. It is vital that method 9 is done correctly, exactly by the book. Otherwise, people will be denied the enormous wins that can be attained with it.

L. RON HUBBARD

FOUNDER
PINK SHEETS

A Pink Sheet is a study assignment given to a student when he has missed something he should have learned earlier. It calls for restudy and checkout of the specific materials he missed. It is called a Pink Sheet because it is issued on a pink sheet of paper.

I developed the technology of Pink Sheets in 1963 at Saint Hill. It was piloted on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course where much of today's training technology was developed.

The original pink sheet application was to the Saint Hill Co-Audit where all students audited in one big room. Later the use of Pink Sheets was extended to correct flubs in coaching sessions with great success as the supervision of coaching has always been one of the primary functions of a Course Supervisor. Then still later the use of Pink Sheets was extended as a corrective action for all study.

The technology on Pink Sheets is being re-issued here in HCO PL form, with some revisions, to give you the entire up-to-date use of Pink Sheets.

WHY PINK SHEET?

All the study in the world isn't going to make a professional. Learning the data and the theory of a subject is vitally important. Perfecting your practical drills is essential. However, the final test lies with the question, "Are you getting results with the data?" Whether you are getting results or not is totally dependent on whether or not you are actually applying the data and theory you have learned, and are utilizing the practical skills you have developed.

The bridge between the learning of data and development of practical skills and their actual application can be mightily bolstered by the Pink Sheet system of Training Supervision. A student's ability to apply Study Tech on himself and his twin can also be mightily bolstered by the Pink Sheet system of Training Supervision.

The student is responsible for all the materials and courses he has studied earlier. If he is unable to apply or use any of this material then a Pink Sheet is issued to handle the situation. A Pink Sheet is not a substitute for retreading or retraining. It is a quick and precise remedy.

A Course Supervisor or Case Supervisor who is C/Sing student auditing should keep a good supply of Pink Sheets on hand. Their application encourages fast precise training. They
HOW TO ISSUE PINK SHEETS

1. Put two sheets of pink foolscap size paper on a clipboard with a carbon between.

2. At the top of the sheet write the name of the student, student-auditor or coach being observed, the date and the name of the observer.

3. Head a wide column on the right hand side of the sheet with "observations" a narrow column to the left of center with "Theory and Practical Assignment" and two more narrow columns to the left of center headed "Coach" and "Supervisor".

4. Take the above with your ball point into the vicinity of the student or the auditing or coaching session to be observed, close enough to hear and see what is going on without intruding. (Or in C/Sing student auditing have a number of Pink Sheets to hand.)

5. Write in the wide column labeled "Observations" exactly what is happening in the session, coaching session, while the student and his twin are studying.

This is very difficult to do for most people (especially for someone at the case level of "only able to confront own evaluations"). Do not look for study, auditing and coaching errors. Just look and record what is happening. Do not write in evaluations. Do not write in invalidations. Do not attempt to correct or teach in the "Observations" columns. Simply observe the session and record what is happening.

6. After you have filled one or more pages of the "Observations" column now is the time to evaluate. Study what you have observed taking place and see if anything actually diverges from the standard use of Study Tech or the correct theory and practice of auditing or coaching.

7. Write in the column headed "Theory and Practical Assignment" the date and title of the exact bulletin or tape containing the correct data or the title of the exact practical drill which will correct the error recorded in the "Observations" column.

If a session observed was a complete shambles, it means that. some basic, basic fundamental of auditing or coaching is absent in the student's repertory. Don't overload the student with tons of drills and theory assignments. Look over your "Observations" column carefully and it will suddenly dawn on you that this student hasn't a clue about the auditing cycle or doesn't note the difference between the needle and the TA on the meter. If you still can't find the main difficulty, you can always sit the student down and ask something like "What happens when you sit down in front of a PC?", or "What's the meter for?" You'll be surprised with some of the answers you'll get. Find the main error or difficulty and write your Pink Sheet to get him corrected on that.

On the other hand, you might find that you'll fill up a couple of pages of pink sheet without recording any errors. The student didn't happen to goof, or the coaching drill is going well, or standard Study Tech is being used. That's fine - send it to him without any assignment. It will still help him.
8. Send the top copy of the Pink Sheet to the student and file the carbon copy in the Pink Sheet folder. When the completed top copy is returned by the student, with all the necessary signatures, throw away the carbon copy and file the completed Pink Sheet in the student's folder.

PINK SHEET EXAMPLES

1. The following would be an incorrect Pink Sheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory and Practical Assignment</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRs OT TRO-TR4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor TRO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor can't read the meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4, starrate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lousy handling of auditing cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 6307C25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM CYCLES IN AUDITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example the observer has evaluated, invalidated, only made general comments. The above may all be true but the student auditor is not helped by them and the assignments don't pinpoint his major difficulty.

2. The following would be a helpful Pink Sheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory and Practical Assignment</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| M9, starrate                    |       |            | Auditor leaning on table toying with the TA and pen. Running "Look around the room" and "find something you could have." After saying "the chair," pc said "I don't think that answered the question." Auditor: "Look around the room and find something you could have." PC: "That's an interesting picture on the wall." Auditor: "OK." and gives next command. Auditor misses the F/N when pc says he can have the entire room and continues running the process.
| Tape 6307C25                    |       |            |
| COMM CYCLES IN AUDITING         |       |            |
| TRs OT TR0-TR4                  |       |            |

In the above example the observer states exactly what is happening in the auditing session. The majority of observations noted show an inability to complete an Auditing Cycle.
(Even the Missed F/N was an incomplete cycle.) The student is therefore assigned material that will help him learn and apply the auditing cycle. There may be other things that can help him like Meter Drills. However, adding these to the Pink Sheet will only disperse his attention which should be applied to learning and using the Auditing Cycle.

3. The following would be an **incorrect** Pink Sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory and Practical Assignment</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M9, starrate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCOB 24 May 68 COACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9, starrate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO PL 7 Feb 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSW Series 1 KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn't know how to coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Got angry with twin and, tried to explain text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example the Supervisor has evaluated, invalidated and only made general comments. The above may all be true but the coach is not helped by the observations noted and the assignments do not pinpoint the major difficulty.

4. The following would be a **HELPFUL** Pink Sheet for the same situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory and Practical Assignment</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restudy, M4, starrate: Tape 6407C09 Study Tape 2, STUDYING: DATA ASSIMILATION and Tape 6408C06 Study Tape 4, STUDY- GRADIENTS &amp; NOMENCLATURE M9, starrate and drill: HCOB 7 Oct 81 W/C Series 31RC, METHOD 3 WORD CLEARING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student became groggy. Coach had his twin find an MU and student brightened up but still had trouble understanding material. Coach had him demo it but when twin took a long time, coach became irritated and demoed the concept for student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 2WC with coach found he didn't know to continue clearing up MUs until twin has VGIs and can easily demo the material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this 2nd example of the same situation the Supervisor does not try to evaluate but
simply observes and notes down his observations. He steps in and two way comms with the coach to get more data and the trouble becomes very apparent. It can then be corrected with an exact assignment of the correct material.

THEORY AND PRACTICAL ASSIGNMENT

The Pink Sheet should be done with a twin in both Practical and Theory. The twin first reviews the observations thoroughly with the student, finds and clears up the misunderstood words, starrates him on the issues as assigned and drills the student until the correct data is completely learned and understood and until the student can perfectly execute the drill.

Once this is done, the twin signs his name opposite the assignment notation on the Pink Sheet in the coach's column. The student is then ready for a checkout by the Supervisor on the Pink Sheet material.

SUPERVISOR CHECKOUT

In checking out the assigned material on a student's Pink Sheet, the Supervisor should carefully go over the "Observations" with the student and have the student spot the specific errors he has made, then have the student give the correct data from the assigned bulletin or tape or show by doing the practical drill that he has now mastered the skill that was poorly applied while studying or in the auditing or coaching session.

Specific attention should be paid to points that the student was observed to be weak in applying to his study, auditing or coaching. Be doubly strict on these points to be sure the student doesn't continue to make the same errors again and again. If each Pink Sheet thoroughly corrects only one gross error, really knocks it out, the student's study, auditing or coaching ability will improve markedly in a very short time.

CONCLUSION

Pink Sheets are never used as punishment or to make the student wrong. They are used to improve the student's study, auditing or coaching ability by having him thoroughly learn data and practical skills he is weak in.

A student's weakness in data and skills often will not show up under the normal conditions of theory and practical testing but they will stand out very plainly when he has to apply them in an actual auditing or coaching session or while actually studying. Therefore, a Pink Sheet Assignment does not mean that the student hasn't learned the material if he has already passed it in Theory or Practical. It does mean that he hasn't learned it well enough to utilize it while studying or under the duress of an actual Auditing or Coaching Session. If a student has gone a few days without receiving a Pink Sheet, he should start screaming. If his auditing or coaching is not being observed and his weak points picked up, how does he expect to improve? So, make a fuss, Student, if you are not receiving Pink Sheets. And, Supervisors, keep a tabulation of when a student is issued a Pink Sheet so that you are sure to observe each stu-
dent often.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER
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Accepted by the
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IMPORTANT STUDY DATA

Number of times over the material equals certainty and results.

Results in the student's own case is a guarantee of successful application by the student.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt
STUDYING: INTRODUCTION

A lecture given on 18 June 1964

Thank you.

Well, I'm glad to see you, too. What's the time? [laughter]

*Female voice: June the 18th.*

I'm getting so I think in terms of broader periods of time. It's quite amusing to me, but I notice the 16th took two or three days to go by and the 17th has taken two or three days to go by, and now we're on the 18th, so this is 18 June AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

The things are swinging along beautifully and it's quite a tribute — this is not germane to the lecture, the lecture is on something quite important, but – the lecture is about studying — but it's quite interesting that a very — a rather indirect tribute can be paid to the auditing of Saint Hill students who've been through their lower materials and come on up to the co-audit, and so forth. They have actually kept their pcs going, over a considerable quantity of bypassed charge.

That isn't said as a gag, you see? It's the truth, see. Because the top of the reactive mind, you see, the top of a GPM, is the hardest thing to find out what's in it. You haven't been over this — these humps, and you probably won't have to be, but just let me give you this in passing.

The hardest thing in the world to find are the top items of a GPM. I don't know how many potential opperms and terminals were discarded before the actual ones were found, see. It's up — oh, I don't know, the arrangements of that bank are almost uncountable. You have, at the moment, a perfect line plot. That's why you're getting away with it. But the top of a bank, you see, the whole reactive mind would be equally hard to get to because the thetan is sitting on all that charge, you see?

Similarly, the top of a series, you see, would be the hardest thing to find the root words of, don't you see? And that is the scramble which has been going on before the thing was finally taped. It's very funny. I've got the rest of the root words of the series, you see? They just run out like hot butter, there's nothing to those. But getting those exact top ones, that was the tough one. And in putting that material in exact lineup, of course, we had momentary stumbles on the line of exactly what was this thing. Of course, you know, you could have laid off and knocked off and not done any auditing on this, you see, for a couple of years and let me have run the whole bank out, don't you see? But you were running this danger, is by the time I've run the whole bank out, I might not be interested. [laughter, laughs] Gag.
But it was a considerable tribute to the fact that there was – there was some missing elements there, perfect line plot they started with – didn't start with a perfect one, but had one within 24 hours – and the materials pretty well lined up, exactly how they went, what the patterns were, and that sort of thing. This was pretty well ironed out, but nevertheless, nevertheless, there were quantities of bypassed charge, huge quantities such as no co-audit will ever face again, you see? And the auditors in the co-audit actually were sufficiently smooth as auditors, and so forth, that their pcs just kept going along and they didn't have any big casualties or anything else.

Now, in the clumsiest look, they would have killed somebody with that much charge, see – the clumsiest look. And if their auditing had been the least bit crude, and so on, why, those people would have just been flying apart at every joint, you know. There would have been ARC breaks and rabble rouses and so forth, and max – mass exoduses and people checking out and… [laughter] You know, I mean, it'd been – it'd been horrible. Because if you can see the amount of catastrophe caused by just missing one item, and so forth, well, here they had a whole series missing. And yet they were auditing over the top of this and actually were making very nice gains and gave me yesterday afternoon a very beautiful series of reports. Everything was going along fine. [laughter]

Now, by George, that's pretty good auditing, that's pretty doggone good auditing. So I wish to give them a compliment right now, on the subject of their auditing. They must be awful good. [applause] All that's straightened out now, and I imagine in today's sessions the cases just took off like rockets. They must have gotten into the top of that other series and so forth, and it just must have run swish! In fact, I never saw anything connect up with such reads as the – as connecting up the missing element with what had been bypassed. That really shot the lot, rerunning it and connecting it up.

So the upshot of the situation was that I was very, very pleased with that. They're making terrific progress and everybody is very, very happy about this and very enthused about this. And I get a side note occasionally on letters going out of here and I'm not having to say, "This is it," now. "This is it" is a very, very calm statement compared to some of the statements I've heard going out of here on various lines. And there isn't, I don't think, any doubt in anybody's mind who is in the co-audit, they'll eventually make it. They may make it with only one leg or something like that, they're figuring at the present moment, [laughter] but they'll make it, they're on their way and the door is open, wide open.

All right, the situation with regard to auditing depends on another subject and that is a subject called study. If you can't learn anything, why, then you can't find out how to do anything. So just as I talked to you in the last lecture and told you that communication was not an end-all of processing but was absolutely vital if an auditor was ever going to get to a pc to do something for him, so it is true that study operates as the door, open or closed, to learning how to audit.

If an auditor can't learn anything, then of course he won't be able to audit, regardless of the attitude he has towards the human race or his wish to do something for people or his desires in any way, shape or form. These all would be barriered by just this one point – he couldn't learn anything.
So in order to teach somebody how to audit, it's necessary that they be able to learn. Now, this is terribly fundamental, awful. This is down there scraping the bottom of the barrel with regard to fundamentals, and yet all great successes are built on attention to fundamentals. Everything is built on a fundamental. Unless you can isolate these fundamentals, you of course leave your building with a – with an incomplete foundation. It's sort of sitting in the air ever afterwards unless you find the fundamental with which to proceed. You wouldn't build any skyscrapers if you didn't put down a foundation.

Well, what is the foundation? That foundation in auditing is, of course, study – the ability to learn. And failing that, why, an auditor has an awful hard time.

This next datum I am going to give you is something – is something I really don't want you to park behind the left lobe and skip, because this is going to make all the difference in the world to the future of Scientology. And that is a knowledge of this one point, this one point: That better than 50 percent of Scientology consists in the discipline of application, consists in the technology of application, consists in the know-how of application. And that's better than 50 percent of the subject – better than 50 percent.

Now, perhaps that datum is not very impressive, but let me amplify this and I think you will see how that datum is impressive. You could give the entirety of the processes which have produced results in Scientology – and there are a great, big, many of them – you could give these in their entirety to a field of mental practice, carte blanche – that's just the processes, you understand, just the commands – and they wouldn't be able to do a thing with them. They wouldn't be able to get any result with them of any kind whatsoever.

They would turn out an asinine statement like the University of Chicago. It's a college. That's what we used to say about it at GW. We used to be tolerant about Chicago. Most of us wanted to go there because you only had to go a couple of years before they handed you a sheepskin and we were bored. But this outfit uttered this asinine statement: "We have tested all the techniques of Dianetics and found out it didn't work." Well, in the first place it's asinine because all the techniques of Dianetics didn't exist in published form and were not available to them to test, see? So right away, that was nonsense. For instance, I know of techniques that were released at the first Foundation in Elizabeth which have never seen the light of day; I have never seen them published or anything else.

Matter of fact, I saw three or four splinter groups suddenly start up on stuff that was merely designed to take care of one pc or something like that, and then they decided that this would apply to all pcs and so forth. There are several brands of therapy which are adrift today which simply consist of one technique developed for one pc at Elizabeth. So for any outfit – for any outfit to grandly look down its nose and say, "We have tested all the techniques of Dianetics," you know? Well, what a statement, see? They haven't got them to test. How would they even know if they had tested "all the techniques"? Right away they are irresponsible. And then to say they didn't work would also be asinine because if they had tested even sloppily, they would have gotten some result someplace, unless they were simply uttering a publicity statement to protect the vested interest.

But that is aside from the point. The point is simply this: Yes, they could have had all the techniques. They could have had them all. They didn't, but they could have. And they
could have, in their haphazard, bunged-up way, have tested these techniques and they wouldn't have worked, because they didn't have a Dianeticist in the lot of them. There was nobody there trained in the basic disciplines of Dianetics. And that was 50 percent or better of the technology which they might have gathered. Quite important, don't you see?

Now, give you another one: Reg and I, sailing around on the deep blue sea, invented a – dreamed up a course that was – had nothing to do with Scientology but had to do with business and commerce and nevertheless was a very broad application of Scientology to business and commerce. But the course was for another reason entirely and Reg thought this was a good idea, and he went ahead and he executed this course. And this course has been marvelously successful. It's running, I think, at the present time and it's doing fine, you see?

Only trouble is, everybody else is now trying to get into the act. It's a goodwill gesture. All this course is, is a nice goodwill gesture; it's trying to increase the salesmanship, and so forth, of retail merchants and their clerks, you see, so as to move more equipment and that sort of thing, see? That's what the course is designed to do. And everybody tried to get on the bandwagon, you see? There were other people started teaching this course, teaching their own courses to accomplish the same end, you see? And recently some company or another requested that Reg's course be taught to all of their staff and so forth. They get requests of this particular character.

But Reg made the broad statement there that is particularly applicable to this lecture. He says, "Well," he says, "you don't have to worry about any competition or other people giving this course. They'll start and they'll fail, and so forth, but they won't be able to duplicate the course."

Well, that's been the facts of the thing. This course could go on, they could (quote) "teach similar courses," do this, do that, do the other thing, but of course, they are always aware, if only this, that they are teaching a substitute, that they are not teaching the real one. And people are always faintly aware of the fact that they are not taking the real course in salesmanship.

Well, this in itself, you see, enters enough – even on the copyist – in the way of an overt or something like this, so that he then goes into an obsessive alter-is and the statement that Reg made was, "They can't duplicate it," becomes completely true. They can't and they won't duplicate it and that is the end of that. And these other courses have probably risen – I don't know what the history of this – I haven't kept up with it too well, but I think there are other courses have risen up and faded away by this time and a lot of enthusiasm has been generated in this quarter or that on duplicating this course and I think this course is still going on. Very successful. Probably one of the more delicate goodwill gestures that's been entered into by a company for a long time.

Well, of course, one of the reasons it's successful, it's somewhat orientedScientologically. But that course wouldn't be duplicated and therefore wouldn't be tremendously successful.

Now, supposing they taught the exact same methods; that is, they used the technique or something on these other courses that are being taught which are copy courses of this course, you see? Supposing they did that, and so on. There would still be some element miss-
ing of some kind or another. That element would be the missing thing that would make the course that was being taught fail.

I don't wish to belabor that particular simile, but it is merely interesting that even there on such a thing as simply teaching some salesmen how to be nice to their customers and that sort of thing, that this thing, too, fails when you move it out of its own perimeter of discipline. So even on a thing as slight as that, you see, that one fails, too; and so it goes along the line.

I don't know how much technology a university loses because every professor makes 90 percent of his salary by making the students buy his personal books. I think by the time you've rewritten James Watt, I think you've lost steam engines. And it's highly probable that there probably isn't a steam engineer in the world today that has really got the technology of steam. It has been perverted and twisted aside and misduplicated, and so on.

And I go back to some of these old boys that knew their business, and so on. One time I was covering an air meet and there was a fellow standing there – it was a bright sunshiny day and he was standing there with rubbers on and an umbrella. The umbrella wasn't unfurled, but he had that umbrella handy. It was a beautiful midsummer day, you see, and I wondered what this character was doing at an air meet – all these daredevil racing pilots and that sort of thing around; and I was covering this thing for The Sportsman Pilot. But I thought this was good side color, so I surreptitiously took a shot at him with my press camera and got his name.

His name was Young, and he was the second man in the world beyond the Wrights to fly. Ha-ha! He was probably one of the most famous early birds there was. My face was a little bit red, you see? He had become cautious in his old age, but in his day – I imagine his caution still didn't extend to flight – but in his day they used to fly a plane off the ground with an ambulance running along below it. [laughter] That's right! They saved more pilots that way. This was a man who was a wild man along this particular line. Well, I was very interested in talking to him; I did an article on him eventually, and he showed me his scrapbooks, and so on.

And I was particularly fascinated that there were 13 methods of flight, heavier-than-air methods of flight – 13 of them – of which the motionless wing was only one, and by the way, one of the less favored ones. And one of the reasons it was favored at all or done at all is because it didn't take much mechanical ingenuity to build it. But there were twelve other methods of heavier-than-air flight; heavier-than-air; that's not ballooning or zeppelins. There's all kinds of methods of keeping aircraft aloft.

Because they concentrated on the one wing, it won, see? And you now have aircraft all over the world which are going along with this stiff wing out there from the fuselage, mostly because the early birds didn't have any of the wherewithal or anything else to build something a little more esoteric or different, so it got the concentration of research and that is what we now call an airplane.
But it was interesting listening to old Mr. Young – who was designing these things back when – it was very interesting to listen to him on a tone of disappointment that they had chosen that particular one to push forward in research because it was one of the less workable and one of the less efficient.

Here was this vast body of technology, see, which had never been developed and which is lost back there in the first ten years of this century. All kinds of methods of flight; none of them ever went forward. Well, this one that was easy to do did get developed.

Well, it's very interesting that one of them emerged and went forward; that's probably the one thing one should look at. But it is customary almost in civilizations for a body of knowledge to come into being, then get grooved into a certain specialization – some piece of it, don't you see – then that piece of it poorly duplicated and the rest of the technology to be lost.

Boy, would I like to talk to James Watt on the subject of steam engines. He probably could tell you all about high-pressure boilers. See, he just didn't have the time, money, materials, to build one. But maybe there were dozens of methods of utilization of steam which have just been lost, you see?

What you're studying now is lost technology, lost technology. "Now", you say, "the civilization goes forward and wins anyway." Well, may I invite you to go almost in any direction from where you are at this moment at Saint Hill, for a distance of ten or twelve miles and try not to find the remains of civilizations which did not win. They are all over the place here – civilizations that are dead, civilizations that are missing, civilizations that no longer are with us. They are all on the basis of lost technology. They start specializing in one gimmick, there's nothing to amplify that gimmick, they finally lose the pieces of it and it vanishes. The civilization may be very well dependent upon that one gimmick; they have nothing to back it up. They lose it, in other words. Fascinating, the changes and turns and twists that these things take.

Now, you could say a lot of other things about these civilizations, but the only thing I am pointing out at the moment is they're not here. See, they're not present. We don't have them with us. And they were good civilizations as they went: the Roman-Briton civilization, the Danish civilization that was here, the Saxon civilization here – all these things terribly different – the Norman civilization that was here. They're all over the shop.

How about the Celtic civilization that existed before? Must have been quite a civilization. You read casually about wicker chariots charging through the Ashdown Forest. What's this – wicker chariots charging through the Ashdown Forest? Well, our good friend Caesar reports as such.

Well, this civilization has went. We know nothing about this civilization. It must have been pretty well advanced. And yet the scene of this battle, and so forth, is within about ten miles of Saint Hill. Well, where did that civilization go? What was it all about? That's a pretty esoteric civilization – wicker chariots, see? Maybe somebody forgot how to weave wicker. Who knows what happened to that civilization, see?
Now, the situation here is that technology gets lost and we have to study how it gets lost. And it's – gets lost because people can't study. That's really the only reason it gets lost. That's quite an interesting fundamental, to reduce everything down to that particular fundamental. We don't, then, go into the esoterics of "They couldn't duplicate" and "They couldn't this," but that's only why they couldn't study.

Civilizations tend to rise forward to a certain peak. And then under the stress of combat and the various elements and so forth, they start losing their technology. Well, they lose their technology simply because nobody studies the technology.

How about this fellow, the silversmith of England? England's no longer today turning out the silver it once turned out. Its silver craftsmen used to be very, very famous. And then they got a Labour government, and it put the tax up on silver to a point where British silver no longer could be sold. They might as well have stood the British silversmith up against the wall and shot him because he drifted off then into other trades and the technology became lost; and it's practically a lost technology at this moment. Now, this has only been lost in the last decade or so. You'd have to talk hard to jewelry store managers and that sort of thing before you understand why it is that you can't buy silver. You can buy antique silver, you can buy yesteryear's silver; there are two or three of them still in business, and so forth.

Well, what about these fellows? There are fellows around who learned this and there are plenty of textbooks on this subject and that technology still exists but it's going to be lost. That's for sure, it's going to be lost. How about the one old craftsman who is left in the plant? You see, he knows all about that. He's surrounded by people, and all of a sudden there might be a resurgence in that. Well, everybody merely depends on him; they don't learn the craft. You see, they simply depend on him to know it. It all comes up against the dead end of not being able to learn, not being able to study.

Well, I always prided myself in being a very quick study, so I, myself, can speak from fair expertness in this particular line. But I know my own history on this and I know my own blind spots on this. When you become less worried about your mental status or something like this in the world, you can actually look at it and find out if there is anything wrong with it and dare admit that it could stand a few improvements here and there.

One of the things about study itself is that there are a great many things around that are false and you could study a lot of false things and therefore become disabused of studying because you had studied something false. This would be one of the reasons why you might cease to study. I really don't see that that has anything to do with it, except that it enters the idea of judgment of what you're studying. So if one studied without any judgment whatsoever of what he was studying or ability to evaluate what he was studying or know what he was studying, why, his ability to study would be very poor indeed. He'd just be Chinese in aspect.

Nothing wrong with the Chinese, but I remember going to school, the eighth grade, I think. I spent some months going through grammar school, all on different stations and places. And the situation that arose in the eighth grade was that nobody could get an A mark except two Chinese who were in the school. And they had – they had learned how to study but so have parrots learned how to study if that is their study.
And they would get up and they would reel off the page number and the paragraph and everything else of the history book assignments, you see, and they'd give it to you verbatim. Most marvelous job of total duplication you ever heard of, you see, but they would not be able to tell you what universe. And if you had – if you had varied one comma or asked for an opinion on that material studied in that way, they would have come a cropper at once, and very frequently did. They would have to remember whether it was in the middle of the book or the back of the book, as to what period that it applied to or something like this.

Most marvelous job of carbon-copy duplication that I ever saw, and it used to irk the rest of us, you see, because they would always get A-plus, and it held up such a horrible example to the teacher that the teacher would, of course, then give nothing like an A-plus to any mere knowledge of the subject, you see? So our renditions of it were quite rapidly thrown away and we usually got D. I'll never forgive them. [laughter]

But anyway, joking aside, these – this is – this is a case of perfect, perfect, complete perfect duplication without a grain of sense connected with it; and that's absolutely deadly, so that isn't how you study. Deadly! But perhaps you should be able to do that, but I would consider that a mental feat, and I don't think study has anything to do with mental feats. Study has to do with understanding.

Study has to do, basic and most formally, with just really one thing: willingness to know. That's the first little gate that has to be opened to embark upon study: willingness to know. If that gate remains closed, then you're liable to get into such things as the total verbatim, rote system; you are liable to get into all kinds of other systems, none of which will add up to any knowledge.

Now, when you recognize that in Scientology we have one thing – one thing – which is not very easy to put into texts and which may never be put into texts: the discipline of how you do it. But when you recognize that that one thing actually is difficult to transmit in – by the written word – and is very easy to transmit by example. And when I call your attention to an earlier part of this lecture, when I said that it amounted to at least 50 percent of what we were doing, and I'll point out to you that there's a frailty involved in the relay of this information that's the future success of Scientology, and that frailty is right there. It could very easily, very easily become an unworkable subject.

You could take all the GPMs in the world – what do you think would happen if you took all the GPMs and the total map of the bank and everything exactly right and gave it at this moment to psychiatry? I know what they'd do. They would immediately analyze Poe to see how many times one of these words had occurred in one of his books, and then get the fractional recurrence of and then try to explain why Poe was mad, or something like this, don't you see? This is probably what they'd do with this material. It'd be monkey tricks, you know?

I even thought vengefully one day of sending all of the whole plot to the American Journal of Psychology – which, by the way, would absolutely fall on its face and bound its forehead to flinders if I were to give them an article. That's one of the reasons why they're a little bit mad at us. I have been soundly berated by them for not publishing it with them at least one of our case histories, because it would revolutionize all… You see, it can't revolu-
tionize anything unless published in their magazine. [laughter] I've been scolded by them for this but I thought vengefully of just giving them the whole plot and let them publish it, see? And that would eliminate that. [laughter]

But the point, the point I'm making here, is that all of this technology that can be written down, and so forth, could be relayed with the same result of the University of Chicago: no result, see? Because it has this element missing from it: the discipline of how you do it.

Now, when I tell you that an auditor can get so good that a gross bypassed charge exists in a session and his auditing is sufficiently smooth that nowhere and on no student in that co-audit did it get keyed in – wow! See, this is an almost impossible auditing feat. That's walking around the edges of the lion's cage, you see, so neatly and adroitly that there didn't even have to be bars there. This is pretty terrific, see?

Well, what did that? That's auditing discipline. That's the communication formula, that's this, this is handling the meter, this is what you do with a pc and what you don't do with a pc, and so forth. This is omitting from the auditing sessions the things that Mary Sue comes down as GAES on TV demos; weeding these things out, keeping that line straight – over 50 percent of it.

We must, at this particular time, then, do this rather superlatively well here at Saint Hill. Because if any serious goof existed on the part of any of those auditors in the co-audit, any such consistent GAE as we see when a person first arrives here, he would have just wound his pc up in a pile of junk because there was enough there to have jammed the pc into a pancake against the brick wall, see? There wasn't any slight bypassed charge to be triggered, see? They weren't even aware of the fact that it was there and they were auditing around it sufficiently smoothly that it didn't cave anybody in.

Well now, on the reverse side of the coin, on the reverse side of the coin, if they had had all of their materials absolutely perfect right at the outset and if their auditing discipline – their ability to audit – had been as poor as it might have been, with all the materials and technology perfect and the process being done, they would have turned their pc into a pale pink pancake up against the brick wall. Do you understand? That's the other side of the coin!

Now, if you appreciate that, you can appreciate the remark I make when I tell you that the technique is one thing but the way it is applied is what makes the car go down the road. And that thing is the most likely thing to get lost. So therefore, we're in business as long as an auditor can learn how to audit.

You see, you don't have to learn anything actually to run GPMs. You can be handed it on cards. Did you – you realize this? You could probably be handed it on cards and you could reel it off one way or the other in some kind of pattern. You wouldn't even have to learn it, you know? You could just let it sort of go off like water goes off the ducks back, you see? You could parrot it, you see, from a – from a list or a card or something like this. It wouldn't have to be learned. You're not up against learning in that burrow. In fact, if I ever hear of an Instructor making some new student memorize a line plot so that he can run it better, I'll give him a GAE with exclamation points – the Instructor, see? That would be the most gruesome thing. So actually, in that particular case the technology is not something you would learn.
You wouldn't even learn the – what's called the technique – you wouldn't dare! It'd just kill the student; that'd be it.

If you ever have a – have a – find yourself, bird-dogged by a spy from the Federal – I don't want to be – pardon me, I'd – there are ladies present – why, just decide that he had better learn by heart – don't even pick out anything very rough, just give him one of the Helatrobus line plots and tell him, well, he has to start in by learning that by heart. [laughter]

So therefore, when I am talking to you about learning, we're practically not on the subject of technology at all. We know what grade certain technology belongs in and so forth, but – I do it myself very often, write the process out rapidly below the meter, so that I can put my pencil – let's say it's a multiple question. I don't want to involve my wits, which should be involved with auditing, with remembering what question the pc is stumbling along on. I don't want to involve my wits with that, so I'll just write down the four or five commands, or whatever the thing is in rotation, and just stab the one with my pencil that is currently in action, you know; and when I come to the next one, why, I see that all is well and I look down at the paper and refresh my memory of the thing and give it to him again, don't you see?

Well, that leaves me free to audit; has nothing to do with that. In fact, there's tricks like you're running a multiple alternate question, and so forth; your positive is your index finger and the negative is the middle finger, and so forth, and just touch them with your thumb. Well, your thumb is on your index finger; negative question, your thumb is on your middle finger, and so on. You don't get mixed up that way, and you don't mix up the pc either nor do you have to sit there saying, "Now, let me see, what am I now…" you know? That's for the birds.

So frankly, aside from classifying and know where the technology goes, I wouldn't say there is anything to learn in that zone at all. You're not going to learn auditing commands. You know what type of command should be there, you're going to learn that but not the command. You're not going to learn line plots or GPMs or something like that. Well, this changes the complete complexion of, "What – what – what are we supposed to learn? Then what learning is he talking about?" I'm talking now about learning how to do it, how to apply it. See? That's what I'm talking about.

Well, it's quite fascinating that there's many a guy shows up, he just wants a couple of processes so that he can learn these processes, and so on, and then he thinks he's educated and he can go on his way because he knows he can apply those; and then somehow or another they never seem to work for him, and he's always missing as to why they're not working for him.

Well, what he should be learning is the subject of auditing. Bulletins connected with good indicators, bulletins connected with comm cycles, and this type of thing. What are the tools of the trade here? Where – what's the categories of these tools, and so on, and how are they applied and what judgment do you use in connection with them? Learn those well enough so you're relaxed about them. Now, that's something to learn. And yet, I guarantee you, that that consistently will get brushed off lightly in comparison to some gimmick or trick or process, see? The person, in other words, will be very happy to learn what are the auditing commands for something or other but have nothing whatsoever to do with a comm cycle.
Now, a comm cycle takes some learning, man, as you know! You can't even glibly say, "Well, it blah blah blah, and it starts and continues and it finishes, and — and that's all there is to a comm cycle and now we know all that. All right, now what's the auditing command, you see? That's what's important."

No, that's not what's important. The auditing command won't work unless you arrive, unless it arrives with the pc. And it's got to arrive with the pc along with certain "How do you do it? How do you act like an auditor? How do you sound like an auditor?" That's the stuff, that's the stuff that gets it there.

Now, I had a recent experience which is quite amusing. I have my lighter moments and I decided that I had better make an independent study. There's no sense in getting too concentrated on any one particular point, and I was going along like a shot rocket in the direction of Class VI materials and working on them very hard and very concentrated and that sort of thing, but I didn't figure that was going to keep my mind that involved. I find — I felt I might as well take up another subject which was entirely independent, you know? Give me a nice shift of attention.

So some years ago I had incautiously and in a moment of weakness bought a course of photography. Of course, I've been at photography since I was a kid; a nice hobby, and I have a lot of fun with it, and so forth. And at one time or another, why, I've sold pictures and so on. It's just one of these hobbyist things that you fool with. I'd probably classify as an advanced amateur; one time I classified as a pro, when I was in college. Used to make a lot of money, *National Geographic* and so forth. I think there's some geography books around that still carry pictures of mine in them.

But the upshot of it is, that I decided that in view of the fact that my mind was very heavily in this direction, I might as well put it in another direction. So I took up this correspondence course in photography — the New York Institute of Photography, one of the best — and rolled up my sleeves, and found out I'd never gotten deeper than about the third lesson. So I decided I would learn a little bit about studying and I would start and study this thing up and I would get myself pushed along the line and get all my lessons done like a good boy, and send it all in, lesson by lesson, you know?

Well, what do you know? What do you know? First time in my life I learned something about studying. I learned something very subjectively and very real about studying. The only reason I'm telling you this is not to amuse you particularly, but you might be able to use this. And it's just this: I began to wonder why I had stopped at the third lesson. I was tolerantly going on forward studying the remaining lessons, and so forth, but why had I stopped at the third lesson and why was I bogging here and there along the line? Because this was not going easy.

Now, of course, this is a very, very wild, occasionally very dry, very often very stupid subject, the subject of photography, because it gets into optics. Well, you want to take a picture, not study optics, you see? But optics are apparently something that people who want you to know about photography hold very dear to their hearts and they nag you about, you see? [laughter]
And then there's the subject of chemistry, and chemistry is very interesting. There are numbers of chemicals and they have something to do with the picture appearing on the thing, but that's something you really don't know too much about. If you can walk into a darkroom and turn yourself out a good negative and a good print, who the devil wants to know anything about chemistry, don't you see? This was more or less my attitude.

But I went on studying like a good boy and passing my examinations at the end. Every booklet has an examination. And all of a sudden it dawned on me that although I'd been interested in this since I was 12 years old, I didn't know anything about it! Horrible, dark thought. I've taken pictures, I've published pictures, people have paid me good cash money on the line, my pictures have been on covers of magazines, a very slick fellow. And I don't know anything about this subject! It struck me like a thunderbolt! This is a subject I had been at, if you please, since I was 12, in this lifetime. And I suddenly realized I didn't know anything about it. And it wasn't a case of sudden amnesia or something. It was just… [laughter] "You what?" you know, and "It's – it's which?"

And I suddenly rapidly reviewed what my reactions had been and made a very careful analysis of the whole thing and exactly what had happened. I'd had a particularly great subjective reality on this. I was studying an allied subject; I was forcing all of you to study; I should know something about the subject of study. And so I had, more or less, to some degree, started out to learn something about study and I learned something right then.

The tolerance that I had toward them had brought me up to a point where I was perfectly willing to learn a few gimmicks from them, and that was the state of mind I had entered that course upon. I was perfectly willing to learn a few gimmicks from them. I realized that my arrogance on the subject has absolutely – unprintably unspeakable. My arrogance was absolutely fantastic!

But look, I've been at it since I was 12. I studied photography under some of the – some of the old boys that were kicking around at that time. Some of the government photographers and scientists up in the National Museum were patient enough to teach me about photography, I read books on the subject, read this and that, even worked in professional darkrooms.

And the evidence was right in front of my face. Good heavens! People pay you money for pictures. I used to take pictures for Underwood and Underwood.

And I had always said that the trouble with my photography as I came on up the line – I had it all beautifully explained – the trouble with my photography as I came on up the line was they kept changing their methods. [comm lag, laughter] I had it beautifully explained. So therefore – well, actually, since I started photography, miniature cameras have come out, panchromatic film, different types of developers, flashbulbs have come out; they've changed all these things. As a matter of fact, they're changing one on me right now. I had one film made by Ilford so tame that I could turn out a fine grain negative on this stuff, and they went and changed the speed rating of the film. Now you can't get the old film, so I don't know how to do it now. I was – this was blame on my part, you see? They kept shifting materials on me.

And what had dawned on me is, what I was being struck with in these texts – because this is a good professional course, see; this is nothing for any amateur – what I was being
struck with in the text was known by Mathew Brady in the American Civil War. The basics and fundamentals that I didn't know had been present in that subject since 1860! Had nothing to do with changing materials. I didn't know the first fundamental of why the picture got took in the first place!

And all of a sudden, at that moment, it dawned on me with a tremendous crash that I had been very arrogant and that I really didn't know all there was to know under the sun, moon and stars on the subject of photography; I really wasn't the world's past master on the subject of photography because I had gotten a few results in my day, but that there was something there to learn. That's what I was struck with. And boy, I buckled down and started to study.

Now, the speed of advance is very interesting: three books in three and a half years; eight books in two weeks. And one is prior to that realization and the other is post that realization. I suddenly looked at it the night before and realized I was halfway through the course. Three and a half years it took me to get the first three of the fifty-some books that comprise the course.

Why was I unable to move through that? Well, I was studying something I knew all about. I could not bring myself into a relaxed frame of mind of "Here is something to study. Let's study it." No, I was studying it through this screen: "I know all about this. I know everything there is to know about it." Well, will you please tell me why the devil I was sitting there studying it, then? If I knew all about it, why was I sitting there studying it? And yet I was putting up this pretense of studying it. I was even pretending to myself I was studying it. I didn't realize that I was pretending. I thought I was really studying it, you see? I'd read it, you know, and so on. [laughter] But it was all from the viewpoint that I knew all about it. And my arrogance was such that I was perfectly willing to learn a few tricks from them, and I think that was very tolerant of me.

Now, the funny part of that is, in subsequent study and so forth, my whole viewpoint has shifted on the subject, the whole viewpoint of what I'm willing to take a picture of; and my critical standards of what's a good picture have shifted utterly. I'm even criticizing their examples of perfect pictures, see? Very critical, but very well-founded criticism.

I couldn't learn because I knew that I knew all about it, you see? Now, that passed from a realization that I didn't really know a thing about it; I had to get right back to fundamentals and study those fundamentals. Once I got those fundamentals in and had those fundamentals well studied, and so on, and moving along the line up there, then I got to a point where I was not only perfectly willing to learn, I was also perfectly willing to talk back. I wasn't in any slavish state about learning. I knew my fundamentals now. I could see where they applied, and so forth, and within the scope and limits of that educational course was able to talk up. In other words, I could have an opinion. I could now have an opinion, I could exert judgment.

I had no judgment on the subject before. I merely had some fixed ideas, just fixed ideas, and these fixed ideas told me that I really knew all was to know about the subject. When I finally found out – the big breakthrough was I found out there was something there to
learn – that I didn't know. It wasn't a matter of a few gimmicks. Then this reversed around the other way, and with hard study, all of a sudden made another breakthrough:

I freed my own judgment.

I'd talk to any of these birds now. [There are] texts there by some very famous photographers. Good, hard, tough slugging this thing is, but one of those guys, I'd say, "Ah, come off of it," you know? "You're talking like this, but this picture here, man, I – how come? Look, you've burned out all of the..." This would have been legitimate. He would have talked to me about it, too. I'd say, "Look-a-there. You've burned out all of the highlights. You just burned them right straight through. Why? You might even have at least remedied it in the darkroom, for heaven's sakes."

And he would have said, "Well, I didn't think anybody would notice."

I'd say, "Well, I noticed."

Critical. Not that criticism is bad, don't you see; but I developed a critical eye, did not have to slavishly say, "This is a picture by Sam Falk, New York Times magazine, one of the greatest exhibition photographers of all time. Therefore it is holy." Gone completely through that and up to a point of where, "That's an awful good picture. That guy really has a good sense of composition, terrific sense of composition. What the hell was he doing that day in the darkroom? Drunk?" See what I mean? And I could have put my finger on a point which I'm sure that Sam Falk himself would have agreed with.

He'd say, "That's right. I didn't even hold back the enlarger light on that burned off highlight over at the side, and it completely washes out that bird's features over there. That's right, you're right. Attracts the eye over to the side of the picture, not to the principle subject. You're right, could have been improved, could have been improved in the darkroom." He wouldn't have argued about it. Or he could have said to me, "You don't know how bad the negative is!" [laughter, laughs]

You see what I mean? Then this would have been a sensible discussion because in the meantime, by burning the midnight... dawn actually; I've been using this to go to sleep on.

But the point had come up here, where one's fixed slavishness to something was there because one really didn't understand it in the first place, so he had to have fixed opinions to safeguard himself.

"Perspective: Perspective is handled by making something dwindle into the distance. Well, there is – if I don't have something go 'dwindle into the distance,' the picture won't have perspective." You know, this kind of a slavish fixed idea on the subject of perspective. Not "There are a lot of ways to give pictures a three-dimensional effect." See, that'd do you a different point of view, see. And "Perspective is accomplished in several ways." A different viewpoint, see? Then, once you understand that, then you can look at a picture and say, "Well, that photographer had a good command of perspective," or "He didn't." See? You say, "This guy had stepped over here another couple of feet to take his picture, he probably would have had a different depth, and it would have looked a lot better," see? Because, look, here's a couple of advantages he could have taken that he didn't take.
In other words, you have a flexibility, you have a flexibility of route, so therefore you can have an opinion, not a fixed idea or a prejudice. There's a big difference between a prejudiced or a fixed idea and the ability to have an opinion.

An opinion could be based on many things. But when an opinion is based on an inability to find out what it was all about in the first place, a man looks like a fool, and he suddenly looks like a fool even to himself when he makes a breakthrough.

So that my ideas on the subject of photography were not resulting in a finished picture. That's one of the first things I suddenly recognized, you know? The lightning struck. That was not necessarily what broke me down on the line. I'd broke it down before that, but I recognized that afterwards. Well, a guy's as good as he can finish a picture. It doesn't have anything to do with anything else. It obviously can be done, so therefore, why, there it is.

And this also included overshooting the mark, which you might find interesting. Previous to this breakthrough I made the realization that I didn't know what the devil I was doing when I took a camera. I know how to clean lenses and do all sorts of things, but I didn't know what I was doing when I picked up a camera. I mean it was just ridiculous to even think that I did, "Ridiculous!" A few lucky breaks, you know, and you seem to be so hot, but what about this?

It's a bum day and you want to get a picture and if you're real shaky and you don't know your business and so forth, you say, "Well, it's a bum day. That's one day I don't get a picture." See?

Well, if you really knew your camera, you wouldn't pay any attention to the fact that it was a bum day. You'd say, "Oh, yeah. Well, all right." Bang-bang. "What do we want the effect here? Bright sunlight. Good." Bang, boom! You'd say, "That's kind of interesting; awful foggy out there. Well, let's make the fog a little bit worse, and let's get it – real spooky-looking picture," see?

If you knew your business, then you could turn the tool to your advantage, any which direction you could, see? You weren't the victim of everything that occurred. You weren't the victim of every little splinter on the road, see?

"Well, it's too bad a day. The sun's not out and – oh, we'll take that picture tomorrow or some other day when the weather is nicer," you know? Well, what's – what's this? You mean – this can exist to such a big goof that you don't get a picture at all then? How do you like this?

And yet a guy would not be able, who couldn't say, "All right, let's see," pick up a camera and take a picture, see? He's supposed to get a picture. Well, he should know his subject well enough that he can get a picture. That's fairly easy. All he's got to do is put himself in the vicinity of what he's trying to take a picture of; if he knew his tools real well, if he knew his darkroom technique real well, he'd p... he'd get a picture. See, he'd get a very acceptable picture. Now, the degree of picture that you would get depends a lot on practice and that sort of thing.
So, I learned that lesson, too, in a big way, that the conditions of the activity around me did not necessarily monitor whether or not I got a result or not. "Pc nattery today, therefore we couldn't get much auditing done."

What the hell! Are you an auditor or aren't you, see? I mean that's it. Nattery pc, snattery pc – who cares? You're going in to do a session? Well, do a session. So it takes you a little bit longer to get the session wheeling. Well, get it wheeling. That's the difference, don't you see?

But these are the things I learned through this little side study, and I found it, myself, very interesting to pick up a completely alien subject to what we are doing – it had been lying around for quite a while; it merely exists in the field of hobby – and find all kinds of applicable materials on the subject of study, and to find out that the first thing that barriers learning is the consideration that you know all about it. And if you want to build up a ridge on the subject of learning, man, that's it! Just consider you know all there is to know about it.

And the next thing – the next thing is, don't let your idea of what you know – this is most amusing – don't let your idea of what you know get contaminated in any way by the fact that you're not producing. You're not getting any result, see? You're not getting any result and this is quite – rather obvious to you that you're not getting a result, but this doesn't challenge for a moment the idea that you know, see? Yeah, this never causes you to question it for an instant. See, you're not getting a result; you know that you know; and the fact that you're not getting a result doesn't challenge your conviction that you know.

The other thing is the fixed – the idea of the fixed opinion. One has to have certain fixed opinions to protect the fact that he's stupid on the subject and that he can exercise no judgment of any kind whatsoever as long as he's mired down in a bunch of fixed opinions. And that afterwards, that judgment, then, depends on a freedom from fixed opinions and an actuality of a – of a good assessment. You know what you know, you know what you don't know, see? You know what you know, you know what you don't know. In other words, you're not protecting your nebulous reputation to yourself about how wise and how marvelous you are. You're relaxed on this subject, you see? You can say, "Well, there's one section of this I don't know anything about. Have to look into it some day." But at the same time this doesn't bring you into a feeling that you don't know what you do know.

Utilization of judgment, then, depends on a very thorough knowledge of a subject, and if you haven't got judgment on a subject, why, it's because you don't know the subject. That's just that. If you find your judgment is very often false or bad in some line, well, you must realize that this signals to you in some way or another that this – maybe you don't know all there is to know about this certain situation, see? If your judgment on it was bad, why, it must have been bad because of an absence of knowledge of the subject.

So, what it boils down to, what it boils down to is an auditor's ability to learn depends not necessarily on his saying how stupid he is, but depends certainly on a willingness to learn – just a willingness to learn. He's willing to learn, and so forth. And the biggest single barrier is a preconception that he knows that is not attended by any singular result.
For instance, let's hear a remark something like this: "Well, I – I know Scientology. I've studied Scientology a long time and I know it very well. In fact, I audit very well. Of course, I don't get very good results." Well, this is that thing – same thing in a nutshell: this – the fact that he isn't getting results – results can be gotten; he's heard of these things, he's seen them around, and so on; results can be gotten. But this fact does not at all challenge his implicit confidence that he knows all there is to know on the subject, you see? Doesn't challenge him for an instant.

Well, of course, that's just a lack of perceptiveness. A fellow can't see. He's not capable of judgment with regard to his own skill. His judgment, then, with regard to what he's doing is at fault to that gross error. He is uttering the fact that black is white. He can't do it, yet he knows all about it. He knows all there is to know about doing it, yet he can't do it. Well, that's a silly statement, and that is the lowest ebb of judgment on any one particular subject.

You get into a – you can get into an area of examination of this sort of thing, you find out that nearly everyone is put up in some particular sectors to status. Status has an awful lot to do with this, you know? And he gets pushed up into a feeling like he has to protect his own status by a certain arrogance or pretense, even to himself. He has to think well of himself, don't you see, by pretending that he knows something or appearing very clever to himself or so forth. He's really – really, you can head it under the heading of "self-esteem," one of the methods of bolstering self-esteem. Nothing particular wrong with this. I'm pointing this out in a very mild way. It's necessary that an individual feel somewhat confident in some direction. But it's also very interesting that this need for status and self-esteem evaporates in the presence of real knowledge and a real esteem takes its place. And it's that real esteem which is most impressive to self and to others because it's producing results. The – competence – there is no argument with competence, no argument with it at all.

It doesn't then really come down to a test of "What does a person know?" but it comes down to a test of "What can a person do?" And if you just adjudicate this on the basis of it's not – well, psychiatry should serve as a wonderful example to you in this, man. I hate to run these boys down because they are being kicked to pieces anyhow, but let me tell you, I have never been as surprised over things as I have been by that particular crew. It's not that I'm even terribly fascinated with what they're doing. But do you know, I read one time what an examination for a diplomate in psychiatry consisted of, and do you know, it only consisted of the date and the context and title and the place of publication of Freud's lectures! Not what was in them! Not "What could you do in the field of psychiatry?" But it was just that: "When was the lecture given? What was its title?" don't you see, and "What publication did it appear in?" And that's an examination for a diplomate, the highest degree in psychiatry!

Oh, some psychiatrist will come along because they're always trying to make a liar out of everybody, they come along and tell, "Oh, that's not true, that's not true, that's not true." And you say – they're doing this down in Melbourne right now.

"Oh, that's not true, that's not true, that's not true. And well, he doesn't really know anything about psychoanalysis," and so forth.

"Well, does psychoanalysis assert that sex is the basic mainspring of life?"
"Well, yes."
"Well, does the article say this?"
"Yes."
"Well, is that true about psychoanalysis?"
"Well, yes; but, you see, Hubbard doesn't know anything about psychoanalysis."
"Well, what doesn't he know about psychoanalysis?" See?
"Oh, well, he wouldn't know anything about it, because he just wouldn't know anything about it," and so forth.
"Well, what psychoanalysis are you talking...?"
"Well, we don't know. There's various brands of psychoanalysis." [laughter]

You always would get into this kind of an argument. It's something like walking into a swamp when you – when you try to talk on this particular subject, you see? So it's not very sensible.

Well, I'm just pointing out to you that that is really pure idiocy -- that's really pure idiocy.

One, could you learn anything from that lecture? And two, how have you been able to apply it? And three, if the fellow really knew about it, he'd be able to answer the next question. If he really knew up to this point, he'd be able to answer the next question: Well, what opinion do you have of it? What opinion do you have of that subject matter? See? If he really knew the subject and he'd studied that, and he really knew that and he could apply that, and so forth, then he'd have a free opinion on it. He wouldn't have to be protecting himself with his free opinions. See, it'd have nothing to do with esteem or anything else. He'd just have a free opinion on the subject, you see? In other words, he'd have judgment.

But if you fix it on "Give us the lecture and the date and where was it published and that's all you have to know about it," you know, you of course have taught the man nothing more than you could learn from a card-catalog system. Well, it doesn't have anything to do with doingness.

Well, in photography -- which I've just used as a somewhat amusing sidelight to this to you – the test, of course, is whether or not you can get a picture. That seems rather obvious, doesn't it? That would be -- it's different than in -- well, you conclude photography now is an art, which is interesting, because it's only graduated into that field very recently. Metropolitan Museum, and so forth, has exhibits on it now as a fine art, but -- didn't used to be.

Now, a critic could exist in the field of painting, merely through his knowledge of painters and paintings, and that sort of thing, and he could have opinions on the subject. These things would probably be very basic, and that's all very fine because here's a very wide, very complex field. And maybe you could have a critic in the field of photography who didn't really have to be able to produce a picture. Maybe he could just criticize pictures and maybe to a very good extent.
But the odd part of it is as you enter into a technical subject out of a purely artistic subject, this burning question comes up: How the devil would he know whether or not that was a good darkroom piece of work? He would have to be able to know what can be done in a darkroom, so he'd have to answer the question, "What is done in a darkroom? Is this better than what is done in a darkroom or worse than what is done in a darkroom?" because you're up against this technical fact.

A technical fact intrudes here, unlike art. You can take a handful of mud and throw it at a rock and say, "That's a great painting." See? Well, maybe it does have form and design. Who would know? Because there is no real technical backup with regard to art at large. It's great, great, wide, huge subject, you see? Depending on, mostly, on whether a person is pleased or displeased with some form, color, object or significance. It basically forms an opinion anyhow.

But the second that you get into a technical fact, when you get into the technical line, well, you have to know what can be done, you have to know if it is done well, what is being done and what isn't being done, see? This, then, you would have to know pretty well before you could have much of an opinion on the subject.

In other words, there could be an art critic quite legitimately, but I don't think there could actually be a photographic critic who didn't really know his photography. See, he'd have to know his photography to be a – be a critic of it, because he'd have to know what the devil to compare it to.

And actually, there wouldn't be any auditing critic who couldn't audit. You couldn't criticize auditing if you couldn't audit. You'd have to know what could be done and what couldn't be done.

I think anybody that's been over the jumps of the co-audit here recently, and so forth, he'd be quite a critic of auditing – not on a basis of my giving an examination and finding out what he knows about auditing but just on the basis of the trial and error of just the last two or three weeks. I give you that as a very broad test, man. I don't think there ever again will be such a test, never again. Probably won't be that much bypassed charge, you see? But that's a terrific test; wasn't given to them willingly or anything of that sort, it just occurred that way.

What a fantastic test! Those people must really know how to audit, see? That's the test, because under similar circumstances, you ARC break a pc on itsa – oh, you get the comparison; very simple. Ha-ha-ha, you see?

Well, God, all you have to do is drop a toothpick in R6 and you ARC break one. That must be pretty smooth. Now, I don't think there's anybody – doubts in anybody's mind in R6 that they aren't going places and that the technology in running GPMs isn't doing some fantastic things, one way or the other, for pcs, and so forth. The result is being produced; the result is being produced smoothly. It'll of course be produced much more smoothly and much more rapidly, as a matter of fact, with the top of the bank being cut into, exactly correctly. But even with that, it's producing results, see?

All right. Then that tells you that there must be an awful difference between a Level VI co-audit auditor and somebody who would ARC break a pc on itsa.
But I'm willing to make you a bet that the auditor now in Level VI co-audit, asked for an opinion of auditing, would probably give you a very honest, offhand, very certain, very firm opinion – boppety, boppety, boppety, bop.

You ask him something about, "Well, is that person's auditing good or bad?" or so forth. Or "Was that a proper way to do it?" and so forth. He'll give you quite an opinion, see? Boppety, boppety, bop. Wouldn't be any status connected with it, see? He'd just give you an honest opinion on the subject, you see? And you ask this person that can ARC break a pc on itsa for an opinion, he'd give you a couple of fixed data but he wouldn't be able to give you much of an honest opinion.

Something else that would be different, something else that would be different: I'll just bet you that a person in the Level VI Co-audit at the present moment, you gave him something to study and so forth, he could find out what was there and know what knowledge was there, without questioning whether or not it was good, bad or indifferent that he learn it or whether or not it was damaging for him to learn it or whether or not it was this or that or whether or not he knew all about it. You wouldn't run into much of that argument.

But the person who would ARC break a person on itsa: Don't challenge that arrogance, man. He knows all there is to know about it; he has known all there is to know about it from the beginning; he knows all there is that will ever be known about it; he knows all this perfectly, and he would be deeply insulted if you even inferred there was something on the subject that he didn't know. Do you see? There would be this significant difference. If you asked him at the same time if he was willing to learn about it, well, he'd hedge. Of course, he isn't. He isn't willing to learn about it. He's on the false premise that he knows all about it. Well, you want to ask him, "Well, what are you there for? Why are you studying it then, if you know all about it?" This might shake him up.

But you only really have to shake up this point in that auditor. He isn't being bad, he's merely being arrogant. He lacks the humility of vast wisdom, and in its place he has the arrogance of "know it all," when he knows nothing. He doesn't even know what he doesn't know.

And there's the gates of study; they're right there. That's the gate of study. That's the gate you got to crack, that's the one you got to kick down before you walk any road in toward any subject. And I don't care whether that subject is auditing or photography. I think you would hold – it would hold good uniformly and straight through, and so forth.

So I've been over the jumps on a completely alien and different subject and I have found certain things held true and I compared them to the experiences I've had in trying to relay, interpret or teach Scientology, and so forth. And I've found that they held good. I've found out that they held good straight through. I can give you dozens of case histories and I can't really give you a lot of exceptions outside of this field, and I can even tell you – you say: "Well, there's the case of the fellow who can't see, and doesn't know the language," and that sort of thing. I don't know, what's the matter with him that he can't see and doesn't know the language? He must be arrogant indeed! Very, very funny, but you'll find that that would hold good, too.

If you don't believe it, talk to a field mouse some day. Talk to a field mouse about the ways of man. It might be a very entertaining conversation, if you could talk to him. And there,
man, you would find arrogance. Electronics, nuclear physics – he's never heard of them but he knows all about them. [laughs]

And there is the only place that we in Scientology are going to break down, if we break down at all. And there is about the only place where our technology will break down. It won't break down just on the basis of getting lost and drifting off and all that sort of thing. It won't get lost that way, because we'll take good pains that it doesn't. The only place it can get lost is an unwillingness to learn about it, and the only place that can get lost is just not knowing it at all, and not knowing particularly that the reason why one can't learn is one thinks there is nothing there that he doesn't know, and he feels he knows it all, so he doesn't learn it. And that's a very silly fundamental, it's almost an idiotic fundamental. It's like "The way to cross the river is cross the river," you know? I mean, it's one of those stupid data; but stupid data are the ones that have a habit of getting lost, and in the final analysis it's brightest to remember.

You will always have difficulty if you do not get down to the true fundamental and the true fundamental is always stupid and is always nonsensical and is not really worth knowing, which is why it remains un-as-ised till the end of time. So it itself stays in for the same reason: nobody bothers to know it.

Trying to teach some savage how to tie his shoes will always be a very upsetting procedure, if he doesn't have any reason to wear shoes and doesn't know what they are, and so forth. So you go in it upstairs trying to teach him how to tie his shoes; you haven't taught him that if he wants to look civilized he should wear shoes.

You see, you can always fail utterly in teaching somebody something by not cutting in at the lowest level of entrance and reality on the subject. There is always a first lesson to teach. And where you fail in instruction is you haven't isolated the first lesson to teach. There are numerous examples. I could give you tons of data on that subject, all by itself. Very interesting.

But on the subject of learning itself, the first datum to teach is this little – and the first barrier to crack is this datum about "Why are you studying it if you know all about it to begin with?" This is your first datum, there is your fundamental, there's bedrock on the subject of learning a subject. And if you just remember that, you won't have any trouble trying to teach somebody. You realize he's having an awful time, it's taking him an awful long time to learn this; well, then, you'd better get right in at rock bottom on the subject of education, and the first thing you're going to find out is he knows all about it; and the next thing you've got to make him find out is, if he knows all about it, why is he studying it?

And then somehow or another you've got to crack that door open. If you get that door cracked open, then he can learn anything from there on like a shot.

Okay?

I hope that will be of some help to you.

Thank you very much.
STUDYING: DATA
ASSIMILATION

A lecture given on 9 July 1964

How are you today?

*Audience: Fine.*

What's the date?

*Audience: Nine July.*


All right. Now, what are you weakest in?

*Female voice: Auditing.*

Auditing. Yeah. Frankly, I haven't anything to talk to you about because you're all doing so well. It's I who am lagging, you see? But I've given you quite a few lectures about study and how to get through it and how to do this and how to do that and there's very little that can be added to what I have told you, but I better add that very little.

In trying to – in trying to assimilate a piece of information, these are the points to watch and these are the points that trip you. Nomenclature.

Nomenclature: what does a word mean? And that's what trips you basically, because then you cannot read a sentence with that word in it and know what the sentence says. So nomenclature is a major stumbling block in any study.

Now, there are no vast, well worked-up glossaries in Scientology, but there is a glossary on Class VI material, and part of nomenclature is the recognition of what the definition is. It's one thing just to have the definition and it's another thing to have an idea of what the definition means.

Now, you get yourself a thing like a GPM. All right, let's take that as nomenclature. "GPM" means Goals Problem Mass. Unless you combine such a thing with an observation and work on the clay table, and so forth, even the nomenclature is relatively meaningless. It is a thing, in other words. There is something called a GPM. It's not an idea. It is a GPM. Now, there are – there's one or two pcs around (not necessarily in the course) who are stumbling all over the place on a GPM, because they are in disagreement with that piece of nomenclature. And they are saying, "Well, it doesn't have mass, it's just Ron's idea that it has mass, see, and it doesn't have mass. So therefore, of course, there is no such thing as a GPM."
Well now, trying to audit somebody on something of which there is no such thing as, is just a little bit difficult. Now, if you're running GPMs correctly, the mass simply expresses itself as heat and pressure. It does not express itself as a visio. You never see it unless you've made a mistake. When you've made a mistake you'll see it. You get an end word in the wrong situation and you can see this long parade of mass going out there. Well, there must be something wrong with it to see the mass.

So here is the oddity about this – the GPM. It's true it's a goal's matched items, one against the other, and very matched and held in midair, from which it gets problem, although that isn't too good a word because "problem" is an end word also and "mass" is also an end word. So, that nomenclature is adapted to the subject at a time when not all is known about it, so it can be described and worked with, don't you see?

Now, we move on a little bit further and we find out there probably could have been better nomenclature, but by this time everybody knows this as a "this" and you would get a total catastrophe if you went and shifted the thing, and we can't go on referring to it as "the thing." [laughter] So we go on calling it a GPM. Well now, of course, GPM means "Goals Problem Mass," but that's not important. It's not important what the "G" means or the "P" means or the "M" means. This is a symbol that stands for something. Well, what is this thing So, if you're simply content to say, "Well, a GPM is a thing and it has this form and construction," and work with it on a clay table, all of a sudden you begin to understand what it is.

Now, you're in a never-never land that has never been explored. There is no language to adequately represent any of these parts of the mind. If you used any terminology that is used by the psychiatrist, you don't know what you're getting into. You, frankly, have no clue what you're getting into because he's way out, man. And when he uses a word to describe something, there may be innuendoes in relationship to that word that would, if we then used it, would impart a totally incorrect zone or area and would make somebody think he knew what you were talking about, when you hadn't a clue what you were talking about. So, you've crossed up your terminology with some other field that meant something else.

Well, the reason you can't cross it up: it has a different purpose – that other field – it has a different target and it has an entirely different basis of operation. Their – well, their purpose is to make people quiet, to give you how wildly different this is. You want to get upset when you see a very quiet pc, man. His idea of treatment is based on the common denominator, as far as he's concerned, that men are animals that rose spontaneously from a sea of ammonia and he wots not of and all thinking is done by the brain, and so forth.

So, this is a different – completely different – zone or area. And it has not produced results, so we needn't pay any attention to it. We don't care how loudly somebody beats the drum and says, "This is authority." Those people are the authorities who can get the results and those are the authorities. A painter is somebody who can paint a picture. An "authority on painting" has been Hobson-Jobsoned over into somebody who can criticize a picture. Well, anybody can criticize a picture, so I guess any child, then, is an authority on painting. So that the thing doesn't hold up when you take it from a critical viewpoint, you see?
No, an authority is the fellow who can do it. And the world in apathy and failure, driving out in various lines and directions where they have been unable to do anything, have elected authorities on subjects that can't do them. So, therefore you would become all crossed up with fields that have failed. And that would enter, all by itself, an ingredient of failure into Scientology.

So, we have to leave their technology alone. We have to leave their nomenclature strictly alone. We cannot talk about "ids" and "egos." We can't really talk about the unconscious – which, by the way, is another end word in GPMs. [laughter]

We can't discuss, in other words, what we are doing in terms of what they were doing, because they didn't do anything. And we would immediately come a cropper and we would be in very bad shape indeed. So we have to have technology named in a certain way as to convey a meaning. And we are the people who can get results in the field of the mind, so therefore we are the authorities.

So therefore, we don't have to pay any attention to anybody else who sets himself up an authority, because any raving madman could go down here at the crossroads and say, "I know all about grapes," see? "I am the world's greatest authority on grapes." And any raving madman could do this, you see? He could just go on screaming, "I am the world's greatest authority on grapes!"

Well, he could get a few other madmen who would come around and say, "You're the world's greatest authority on grapes."

Nobody ever would think of asking this madman, perhaps, the question, "Have you ever eaten a grape, seen a grape, raised a grape, or done anything with a grape?" and of course, if the answers were all "No" to those questions, then of course, it would be quite obvious that he was a raving madman.

And that's the psychiatrist, you see? He has never seen a mind, he never created one, he never changed one and he never brought about any results in this particular field. And the only thing he can brag about is being a bit destructive on the subject. And he's screaming that he's an authority, so therefore, somehow or another, you should borrow his nomenclature.

Now, any one of you, sooner or later, is going to run into this down at some crossroads, "Why don't you use standard terminology?"

Well, the answer to it is, "Whose standard terminology?" It would have to be the terminology of a person who could produce a result, before it could be said to be even terminology.

So man has had not much understanding of this particular field and has even gone into an inversion, where he has elected to have the nomenclature of the field standardized by people who know nothing about it. Now, that's a wildest inversion that anybody could ever dream of. Not only is there no terminology, but there is a great deal of false terminology. That terminology is false. And you start to lead down that line, you're going to be in trouble. Somebody's going to say to you sooner or later, "Why don't you use standard nomenclature, why don't you do this and why don't you do that?"
Well, my rebuttal on it, of course, is always very savage. When somebody starts in on me like this, I have no idea that they're trying to be helpful. I never make that mistake, so I just cut them up and serve them for dinner. And it's something on this particular – particular line, I would answer, "Well, why haven't you developed anything that could be used?"

So Doctor Spinbin is standing there, "Well, why don't you use standard terminology so that somebody can understand you?"

"Why the hell haven't you invented any?"

"What do you mean?"

"Well, why don't you know something about the mind? What do you stand around being such a fake for?"

"Well, really! I have a degree!" "I know that. That degree doesn't mean anything. Take one of these patients out of one of these rooms that you've got down here. Bring him out here and heal him. I want to see it!"

"Well, you can't do anything like that."

"Therefore you're a fake. To hell with you!"

This is my idea of a polite conversation with one of those guys. [laughter] I hate fakes. And it's interesting that the only mud they can throw at us is that we're somehow fakes. See, "The overt doth speak loudly in accusation." Shakespeare rewritten. [laughter]

Now, therefore you can't help but have trouble with terminology – nomenclature. I've had trouble with it, don't think I haven't. How do I dream up some word that will describe something, that can be found, can be examined and does exist, that will not conflict with some other school of nomenclature, which has failed? How do I move into that perimeter? Oh, we could probably do a much better job, but part of the trouble is you.

You accept certain lines and start using them in your common communication and then the last thing in the world that I could do is pull them away from you and say, "Well, actually a better word is so-and-so, what little Scientology terminology you know, is now dead and nonexistent. We're going to substitute a brand-new terminology," and you would be upset. Right?

So, terminology has to deal with this factor of evolution in use. We not only have evolved it and they've wobbled a little bit on their meanings occasionally, but then they get into use and they get fixed on the printed page. They get into bulletins and they get into your certificates, and so forth. Certify an HCA, well, he's supposed to know what a reactive mind is. Great.

So the next day we're going to call it something else; we've immediately wiped out part of his education, haven't we? And we've made it hard for him to communicate with anybody who is trained later. If we want dissonance, why, we're going to get it in a very large cacophony if we go knocking apart the terminology we have developed. So we have to safeguard the terminology we've developed. So therefore, when we learn more about the subject, you see, the word may become unreal, but we're still using it.
So, the only thing we can do is actually elect those things which are the most important in the mind and keep that terminology as standard as possible. First try to evolve it as cleverly as possible, so that it won't conflict – first try to evolve it cleverly, so it won't conflict and bring about a misunderstanding in some older activity. And then we've got to carry it forward as a standardized item and then not go changing it all over the place just about the time everybody learns what it is. So, there's a certain necessity here to maintain a constant on nomenclature and terminology. And the word "GPM" will never, never be changed. It's in too much, too long, too often, don't you see? And even though "Goals" – end word; "Problem" – end word; "Mass" – end word. But it becomes just "GPM." Well, it could become "XYZ" – it wouldn't matter much.

Now, another responsibility is not develop too many of them, not to – not to go whole hog on the subject, not to try to name everything in sight some new peculiar name that nobody would ever get around the end of. The vocabulary of Scientology is probably about 472 major words, which is a small enough technical vocabulary. The medical vocabulary is something on the order of 20 to 40 thousand, somewhere in that range – of very peculiar words that don't mean a thing.

So, your task in learning "Scientologese" is relatively short, relatively brief compared to other technical fields.

Now, you could complain about any technical field on the subject of its nomenclature and its nomenclature is just, very often, five times as silly, if you look at it that way, as Scientology is inapplicable. Some of these specialized fields are really marvelous. But if you have a bent for it, if you have a knack for it and are amused by these nomenclatures and terminologies and special languages, you might say, you can have a lot of fun with some of these.

I know I recently have been hobnobbing in the world of the circus. Well, fortunately I know a little of the circus terminology, but from an American circus viewpoint. And I don't know that this holds good in the English circus, you see? Well, you daren't use – I'll show you now the upper class of terminologies.

They're all "snob": These languages are all snob languages, including Scientology, see? The boy that comes out of his HCA class, you see, and he throws off a couple of words; there's two or three who understand what he's talking about, and so forth, and they chin-chin together, see? They – it's like the lodge has just passed the password, see? Other people stand around with their jaws dropped and say they are listening to the upper elite. Well, to that degree they are, you see? Somebody has a superior understanding. But this is a signal system and actually, I couldn't take that away from the subject if I had to. If I didn't invent it, you would.

Give you – in the circus world if you use carnival – the carnival, you see, is pretty downscale. To the circus, a carnival is almost beneath contempt. These things are quite definitely fixed on the social strata. So you daren't use carnival terminology, of which I know of about four or five hundred words in carnivalese. You daren't use that in referring to the same identical objects and actions in the circus world and the circus world has maybe seven-eight hundred, a thousand words, you see, for these same things. It's – you've seen the same thing, there, you run into it in Low Dutch and High Dutch, in languages and so on.
So you have to be very careful about some of these. But quite the reverse, you can tell a real organist – this is in the world of music. You can tell a great concert pianist by the awe with which he speaks the word "Steinway" and with which he speaks of his instrument and with which he speaks of his scores and so on. You can tell him. He acts the part of a snob in his longtailed coat and his flowing gestures and his poseurs with his hands over the keyboard and all that sort of thing. You know this boy for what he is, you see? He is a classical pianist, a classical concert pianist.

Now, his terminology is quite staggering. If he and a symphony orchestra conductor were to start a conversation in your immediate vicinity you would be snowballed. You'd never know that many musical terms taken into or out of Italian and other – and German and that sort of thing, could exist. And it would, frankly, be over the head of most of the very men in the symphony orchestra. They would say, "God, listen to that," you know?

But the field of the organ does a complete reverse. Now an organ is an instrument which a piano is not. An organ is a percussion instrument, only to the degree that you turn on a percussion key and beyond that, you can get music out of it. But a piano, of course, is solely and only a percussion instrument. This is according to modern classification, see? They classify it as a percussion instrument.

Well, it's a pretty trick percussion instrument and you have to be very virtuosity on it, but an organ will also – you can throw a key on an organ and make it sound like a piano. You can also make it sound like a clavichord. You can make it sound like almost anything. And I've been hobnobbing recently with pro organists. Real pros, you know? Theater organists, circus organists, guys like this, you know? And I actually – my hair's been standing on end. These boys rank in their field just as high as the concert pianist ranks in his field – in fact a bit higher. Because you've got to grow – you've got to be like Vishnu, before you can play an organ, you know? Eight arms. And their terminology would absolutely bowl you over.

There's two fields of terminology and when you get to be a real pro in the field of the organ, where you're an organ designer as well as performer, you know, real upscale, you actually shift gears on terminology and the organ terminology with which you're familiar is the organ terminology which is referred to by the musician, the normal musician. But when you go up scale, you go into a new field of terminology. So there's two fields of terminology in the field of the organ.

And the real pro and the real snob in that particular field does a volte-vis – complete volte-vis when he leaves the field of mere music into the field of playing an organ and designing them. Second we get into that field, we're in another pasture. It doesn't even look or smell the same thing. And that is so rarefied that when I first heard those boys talking, and so forth, I wotnotted anything they were saying, you know? It was just like listening to the Hottentots jabbering about the next feast of roebuck – I didn't have a clue.

Well, I finally got hep to it, and did a bit of organ work and designing and that sort of thing and hobnobbing with these birds and I still don't have but a small edge on their terminology and they're always startling me. But I've gotten to a point now where I know what they're talking about, you know?
Well, for instance, the organist at Saint Paul's Cathedral who probably would be – probably the top-top-top amongst mere organists, you see, in England, refers to the "pedal-board," see, those are that board that you walk on, you know? Well, he calls that a "pedal-board." When you get into the real snobs that is no longer a pedal-board – that's "firewood." [laughter]

Now, the top organist at Saint Paul's undoubtedly refers to "notes" and "pipes" and "footages" and the real snob calls them "noises." They're "noises," and he says this with a complete – complete straight face. So, the first time I heard this I thought they were gagging, you see? And every time I've heard one of these things I've made the repeated mistake – which I am now beginning to recover from doing – of laughing like mad, you see, [laughter] thus displaying my great ignorance of the whole subject. I've gotten so I can chatter back and forth on it now.

What the hell was it that I heard the other evening? I think it was a "Blackpool snarl." "This organ was capable of a – was capable of a good, solid 'Blackpool snarl.'" I think I've probably got the word "snarl" wrong, but it was – it was capable of making a "terrible, clashing dissonance which would reverberate," see, and that was the way it was described, see? You catch up with it after a while.

I'm getting there though. I'm getting there, I'm getting there. I'm getting up to a point where I've now developed something that I don't think they've thought of yet with regard to firewood. And I can play a piece on firewood that they haven't thought could be played on firewood, so I'm practicing this very hard and the next time I'm going to get even – I'm going to throw them. [laughs]

But the point is, as you enter into the inner sanctum of any profession, you quite normally leave the purely snob language and get into a "slanguage." Lord knows what a medical doctor calls tonsils while he is dining with other medical doctors, see? But he probably calls them something else. His terminology shifts, then, from the very formal with enormous, forced formality that almost has worship mixed up with it, you see, and shifts, then, as his familiarity increases with his subject into something that sounds more like slang.

And we have not bothered, then, to go through the country of pomposity to reach the world of slang; we've just short-circuited the whole thing. This is true what I tell you about nomenclature; as nomenclature really gets up amongst the knowing, it is never serious. It is a very unserious subject. The things which great electronic engineers that can whip you out a rocket for the moon – wiring circuit or connection – probably what they call it is not what is taught in college, you see? They've got this stuff and it's a rattledybang, it's almost jive talking moved upstairs into the profession, you know? It's pretty wild.

Well, we've taken a straight road. Since none existed, we haven't really developed a secondary language. We're in our secondary language. So that is another way that the thing has been narrowed down. We could develop a highly pompous, formal nomenclature; a vocabulary, perhaps, of two or three thousand words, and expect you all to learn it verbatim and be able to discuss it with great solemnity – only to have you eventually evolve a much less lengthy vocabulary which is in the field of slang. We've taken the step at one jump. So, our
language does not sound dignified, see? Our nomenclature is not pompous since there was no reason to enter this other extraneous step into it.

Now, anybody then who is talking to you about not using proper psychoanalytic nomenclature probably himself is the veriest tyro in the field of psychoanalysis, see? He - he's just a - well, if he graduated well and kept his nose clean he'd become a neophyte, you know, or he wouldn't be expressing this reverence for nomenclature, because it's symptomatic of the stage where you are simply memorizing without knowing. After a boy gets to know something, and so forth, he normally shortens his nomenclature quite markedly and rapidly.

And of course, what an organist has to know who is up in the field of engineering and design, and so forth - this circus organist, Kit Francis, for instance, hasn't any "stop." Well, actually the stops on his organ do not agree, I'm sure, with what it says on the stops and he's pulled out most of the stops - he's thrown them away. When he had the organ rebuilt, he threw them away. What he did was just get the noise combinations from the generators and he put a stop on each variable noise combination of the generators, knowing how they hooked up and he knows that if he throws bing-bing - and why, he's got then these two noises come out of the generator. They will combine and they'll sound in a certain way. He's setting it up by electronic sound; electronic combinations of sound. So he's even done away with all of the izzards and piccolos and diapasons and nothing says anything, you know? There it is. It's just…

As a matter of fact, the other day I saw him throw a 64-foot pipe together out of an upper scale. There weren't any even 32-foot pipes in the thing, but he just got a couple of things that would then sound like they built down and he threw those in. And the next thing you know, why, he had Saint Paul's Cathedral going at a very mad rate, but that organ doesn't happen to have any such stops. So, he doesn't even refer to noises by their traditional names anymore, see?

In other words, when a guy gets to know his business he generally throws away - when he really knows his business - he throws away the nomenclature he doesn't need. He gives it the yo heave and he quite commonly, amongst his brethren who are in the know and part of a lodge, develops a short-circuited slang-type nomenclature to describe what he is.

Well, knowing some of these things, and so forth, I've tried very hard to reduce the nomenclature of Scientology as far as possible and keep it only in the realm of slang where it would have evolved to anyhow. And that would save you a lot of trouble.

But if you went back over the years and found the name of everything that had been named, you would probably arrive with a much larger vocabulary than 472. But a lot of those things have been given the yo heave. But a lot of old-time auditors would still know what they were. You talk about a DEDEX - most any Johnny-come-lately would look at you with his eyes "What's that?" you know? Well, actually it was a DEDEX, that's what it was.

Now, the dependence of knowledge upon nomenclature is extraordinary, and as a matter of fact, almost never appreciated by teachers or students. They are trying to talk and use a language they don't know. And this can get so bad that they think the subject is incomprehensible or that they are incapable of understanding it, when as a matter of fact this is not what is wrong at all. It's just that they haven't grasped the meaning of some of these symbols that are
being used to designate. And they haven't got an instantaneous grasp of these meanings. They've got a "fumble grasp" of them. That is, if they thought for a while they might possibly be able to remember what an engram is, see? Now that's the grasp of it.

So they read a sentence and it says, "Of course, there may be an engram in the middle of the GPM." That's not necessarily true, but it's certainly true of implant GPM. And they have to think, "There might be an engram – an engram – an engram... I don't quite – know quite what that means, so I'll just learn this much of it. There might be something in the middle of a GPM." And they go on into the next paragraph and this has made an impression on them, that there's something they don't know about a GPM and that's what carries on into the next paragraph.

And as they go on studying past these points of uncomprehended nomenclature, they begin to stack up an opinion that they "Don't know about it." And it isn't "it" that they don't know about. To get a persistent thing, you see, you'd have to have a lie, and the lie is that it isn't the subject they are having trouble with, it is simply the nomenclature they are having trouble with. They don't know about the nomenclature so they, however, wind up with an opinion that they don't know the subject or that there is something very incomprehensible about this subject. No, it isn't the subject at all, they just don't know their nomenclature.

Now, it may start back someplace in HCA, see, or HPA class and one day, why, somebody jumped up and he said, "Well, that's a lock," and the individual... you know, he said, "Well, you see, that's not important, because it's just a lock, you see?"

And the person says, "Just a lock – a – lock-lock-lock – what's a lock?" And then he was interrupted before he could think the thought through and remember what a lock was. So this, in actual fact, stays there as a little basic incomprehension of nomenclature and that'll hang up on the track and he will develop an automatic comm lag around this word "lock."

He'll get up to a point where he's reading a sentence here at Saint Hill and it says, "You want to check this out, because it might be just a lock." And again that hunted feeling comes over him, you see, and now he thinks he doesn't know much about checkouts because he will misassign, the other being out of sight. So, his opinion now is that he doesn't know much about checkouts. No, he didn't know a word in a sentence discussing checkouts.

You see how important nomenclature is? But a comprehension of the nomenclature which is used is primary to the study of anything.

Now, for instance, I'm studying a parallel course to get insights into study of Scientology. And a very, very smart thing – an extremely smart thing to do – is to take a page of material and look over it for words you don't know – words that don't instantly react to you.

Circle each one of those words or make a list of each one of those words and look up and study their definitions or ask people and get definitions for them. Find out exactly what those words mean. Don't tackle the subject of the page. Just tackle the nomenclature of the page. Get that nomenclature slick as a whistle, tackle the subject, you'll find out the subject was very easy. All the thing was trying to tell you is that if you went ahead and ran a service facsimile which didn't give TA action on exploration, why, the pc would get loused up because you were running without TA action. And this is all this whole thing is devoted to.
But one runs across this thing: "Service facsimile – ohhh! What's that?" Another word: "Ohhh! What's that?" you see, and "What's that?" and "What's that?" Well, if you want to put yourself in a total mystery, go ahead and study pages you don't know the words on. Then you can put yourself into a gorgeous mystery.

Now, this language is so common to your instructors, it's so common to people around here and their "snob action" – which we have – don't doubt about that, see, and will continue to have, because it is an index of status and competence, will cause them to explain these things to a student with a bit of a sneer.

And they're liable to cure you of asking, "What is a service facsimile?" because you will hear in the answer that comes back to you at least the tone for, "Well, you idiot! Why don't you look it up in your bulletin, you know? Fancy anybody not knowing that!" see? This is sort of reflected in the atmosphere you get back when you ask these things. And that, again, makes you feel stupid for not knowing. Well, actually nothing can be done to minimize this latter.

Why, I could say, "Always answer a student's questions politely," and you'd probably only build up a covert hostility. [laughter] They'd answer the questions politely and flunk all tests for 24 hours, you see. Something wild is liable to go awry when you start to put the brakes on some natural action.

So, the only point I'm making here is: Don't let yourself be put off because somebody thinks you're stupid because you don't know it. You're not stupid because you don't know it, you're simply uninformed. Well, if you're uninformed, don't get so status happy of thinking that you must appear bright in order to be thought well of, when it has nothing to do with it. You're here to learn and anybody is studying anything, is studying it, I suppose, to learn it, not to acquire – he may acquire status through having learned it, but he doesn't acquire status by pretending he knows it when he doesn't. As a matter of fact he acquires himself quite a headache.

So, the point is, in spite of any rebuff that you get, or of difficulty digging into some book to find out what it means, you actually put yourself in a soup at once, the moment that you leave one word in a sentence behind you, you do not know the meaning of. One unknown piece of nomenclature left behind you can absolutely ruin your comprehension of the whole thing you're studying. Now, if you want to speed up your grasp of the situation, apparently do it the slow way. This obviously is a slow way to do it, isn't it? But it's not the slow way to do it because it snowballs.

You'll get faster and faster and faster, whereas if you don't do it this way you will get slower and slower and slower. So, never leave a word behind you in a study that you don't know the meaning of. And when you hear me use a word in a lecture – and I try to minimize nomenclature, actually, in lectures – when you hear me use a word in a lecture that you don't know the meaning of, for God's sakes, write it down in your notes and right after the lecture find out what it is. "What is that word?" see? It's something that has passed you by.

Well, it's that which you don't understand, not the mind, not Scientology, not the theories and practice of Scientology. The stumbling block, first and foremost, is simply nomenclature.
Now, nomenclature will be there regardless of any reform undertaken, because, in the first place, we are examining things which are not hitherto known. So they have to have a name. Now somebody uninformed may try to tell you that some of these things were known but that's merely his misinformation talking. He doesn't know what you were talking about so he thinks it was previously known. He will try, for instance, to compare an "id" and a "thetan," see? And he says, "Well, Freud described all that. He said, 'id,' and an id was – something, and..." Well, probably a person saying this to you really doesn't know what Freud said was an "id," see? His nomenclature failure is prior to his misunderstanding where you are, see?

So, if you want to wind yourself up in a ball and become very confused and get a lot of slow passes and go slower and slower and slower and slower, just start leaving words behind you you don't know what they are. You get halfway down the page, all of a sudden there's a word you've never seen before. Just say, "Well, I'll catch that later," and go on. Why don't you just say, "Well, I'll cut my throat right now and add several weeks onto my course progress?" Because that's just what that'll do. You cannot help but wind up at the end of that page.

Now, the next thing is the subject matter itself, arrangement and understanding of Now, this is your second one. Now, it's all right to name something and get a definition for something, but what is being named? And if you were very, very clever, you would worry it and worry it and snarl at it and walk around the circles of any piece of subject matter; now we're talking about the – a thing, see? We're talking about – we're not talking about the name of the thing, we're talking about the thing. You'd walk around any one of those pieces of subject matter until you had a good comprehension of what that was all about. "What the devil are we talking about?" see?

I'll give you an idea: You say, "Well, a person has a bad opinion of another person because they have an overt against that person." All right, there is a thing, you see? That is the – a mechanism that surrounds the overt-motivator sequence. That's one of the phenomena. Joe is mad at Bill and if you search a little bit, you'll find out he's mad at Bill because he's done something to Bill. Joe has done something to Bill. Now this is contrary to the explanation everybody makes in life, so it is very easily read this way, see? Because life is that way you can get this thing – scoong! – wrong way to, in your skull, see?

So "Joe is mad at Bill, because Bill has done something to Joe.' Yes, I understand that." Well, you missed the whole point. Thereafter, if you've done that, you will really never then understand how to pull an overt or why you must do so. See, that has just gone up in smoke, see? Very important mechanism! "Joe is mad at Bill because Joe has done something to Bill." All right, that is the thing.

Now, several things can get in the road of the acceptance of this thing and first and foremost is, it isn't usual or ordinarily thought of this way and that gets in your road by misinterpretation. You think you've read something you haven't read, see? Because it's so usual for it to be the other way you think you've read it the other way. Or it is so widely accepted the other way that it is simply unbelievable.

So there's the next thing that gets in your road, is the unbelievability of it. You say, "Well, that couldn't possibly be true." Now, for heaven's sakes, make sure when you come to
the unbelievability of something that you know what you're unbelieving. Now, that's im-
potent - that's important. Let's know what we're unbelieving.

Now, to know what we're unbelieving we have to take the first step again – the no-
omenclature, you see? Did I get the word right? Now, the thing, the mechanism – phenome-
non here, have I got that right? And you'll find in about ninety percent of the cases that a reexami-
nation at this "unbelieve" step – you are unbelieving the wrong thing. You weren't unbeliev-
ing what was there. You were unbelieving something else, see?

So, when you run into a total "gawp," see – you know, you say, "That couldn't be, you
know? Wha-wha? I – that – that couldn't be. I – no, that couldn't be!" see? And instead of go-
ing out and jumping in the lake or something like this or taking cyanide, the thing to do is to
check over nomenclature and the description of the thing itself. Now, if you check those two
over, you'll find out you probably had something in crosswise and that this "unbelievable"
was not unbelievable at all but is quite – quite easily seen. That's about ninety percent of the
time.

The other ten percent of the time you just can't see how that works that way. Go back
and check your nomenclature, check what the thing was that you're not believing, and so
forth. Get down to this other thing, you still can't see how it's that way – set yourself up some
examples of how it's not that way and how it is that way.

Now, this is the – really the first place where you really have to apply it to you and
life, where it becomes an abs... a complete must. You must apply it to you, you must apply it
to life. "Does this thing exist in life or doesn't it? Has it existed in my life or has it existed in
anybody else's life that I know of? Is there any incident here that demonstrates this phenom-
ena?"

And you'll start looking at it and you'll find out that the reason it wouldn't go that way
is normally a button got in its road or something like that. You know, you didn't dare believe
that it was this way; something like that – just an examination of it, trying to, "How does it
apply to me? How does it apply to life? Has it ever applied to life? Did anybody ever see this
thing?", you see, and "Do I know of any incident or anything of the sort which would exem-
plify this thing?" Why, the other ten percent that I've been talking about here, that will tend to
evaporate, too and you'll say, "Ah, yes, now we got it."

Now, this procedure followed actually gives you a terribly firm grip on what you
know. And careful study is not necessarily either thorough or brilliant or wise or anything
else. It's merely careful. And if you work right along at it on the subject of being careful with
it and what you're careful about is – as you're going down the page pocketa-pocketa-pocketa,
you all of a sudden see this word "boojum" see? "What the hell is that?"

Now, I'll show you how you can be stupid: that's to go on. Read the next word to it in
the hopes that somehow or other the explanation will all drop out into your lap. Gloss over
that word, you've done yourself in. "What's this word 'boojum'?" Boy, you better find out
right now. You might glance at the rest of the sentence: "Does there – a parenthetical descrip-
tion what 'boojum' is in it as you sometimes – occur? Or a – there's nothing there. It's evi-
dently a word I'm supposed to know. It's not a new word, because it's not explained in this
paragraph, so it's a word I know..."
Boy, you go any further than that, you've just hung yourself up in a nice little brass mystery and there you'll be: going around with a lamp looking into the dark corners and wondering what you're being mystified about. And then you'll think you're mystified about the subject, you're mystified about anything – it's tracing back to this time you read this paragraph and you didn't understand a word in it so, of course, then it didn't communicate.

By not understanding the word you inhibit any communication. You've inhibited communication between what you're studying and yourself. You've also inhibited your communication between yourself and other auditors and you also, oddly enough, have inhibited your communication with yourself and a pc, because this is something in a pc that you will not thereafter recognize because you don't know what it is.

Now, following down some sort of a – of a routine like this in study, you'll find out that you can study. It's all right for somebody to come around and say, "Well, you can't study and you just don't apply yourself," and that sort of thing and they're – they've done this to people in school – they've done it to me; they used to say, "You don't know how to study." And I used to say, "Gee, that's very interesting, you – I don't know how to study," and I accepted this – that I didn't know how to study. And I don't know that I made much of a ruckus about it, but I did manage to finally find out that this was not accompanied by any method of study.

In other words, you were saying – somebody was saying to you, "You don't know how to hang up a skyhook, and therefore you're very stupid indeed, because you don't know how to hang up a skyhook." And it's sort of like catching snipes, same kind of a gag, see? You're supposed to stand out in the woods for hours holding a sack while they drive them in on you. Actually they're home having some coffee, and you're standing in the damp woods for hours, you see? It's just that crude a gag.

They say, "You don't know how to study." Well, what pretentious people! They don't know how to study either, see? There is no – there's no subject called "study." If there was a subject called "study," they'd start teaching it to you in kindergarten. They would certainly start teaching it to you before you were into the – your high schools and that sort of thing. They'd say, "This is how to study."

I've run across various systems, but they're not in the formal textbooks. I've seen them in – remember the Pete Smith specialties from way back when that used to show on the screen, and so forth, gag, one-reel comedies and so forth? Well, I've seen methods of remembering things, and methods of knowing things, and so forth, come up in that form. But I've never seen it on a textbook basis.

I myself developed a method – a (quote) "a method of study" in defense and I remember vividly applying this in the field of history; it's just not going onto the next paragraph unless I could shut my eyes and rattle off the last paragraph, see? It didn't increase my knowledge of history. I actually get along better just by reading a history textbook. At the end of the line when I finish off the history textbook and somebody asks me for dates, I look in the book. I find that is the best method by which to do this.
The only other method of study that I ever developed for myself in school might be of some interest and that was just to get every book on the subject I could get hold of and read all of them and not try to concentrate on any of them, you see?

I think one of the most stellar grades I ever got and bragged about all over the place, and so forth, and called upon to give lectures on every hand, made me feel a little guilty. I was taking American history and I simply got hold of every textbook I could find on the subject of American history and read them all, including Woodrow Wilson's five-volume history of the United States, you see? That's one of those things that you put on a bookshelf to hold it down in case of an earthquake. [laughter]

And I read all these textbooks, but I don't think I ever told the professor that because I was allergic to its very, very bad prose, that I had never read that class's textbook. I'd never read the class's textbook. I'd read all the other textbooks I could lay my hands on, but I couldn't stand its prose. Its prose was horrible, and I – it was sort of socialistically weirdly put together and it was pedantic in the extreme.

It wasn't that it was full of difficult words. As a matter of fact the fellow was sort of underplaying – the places where he should have used a good, big, pompous word, you know, why, he'd put some offbeat word, and so forth. He didn't know how to write, see, and so I didn't read the school's textbook, but I read all the other textbooks and I got – oh, I don't know – A pluses and gave lectures on history for them and got gold stars and silver cups and all this sort of thing as being a terrific student. Well, actually it was just to the degree that I just covered everything in sight. And I find out that's fairly reliable as a method – fairly reliable when there isn't any training available, you know, like an American school.

When there's absolutely no training available, why, what you want to do is just get a hold of every book on the subject in sight and then just read them all from cover to cover, see, making very sure – I would now and do and always did – that you didn't cross over words you didn't know. Get yourself a great big dictionary and get yourself some kind of an anthology or something that went along with it and look up a word you didn't know and find out what that was related to and then get that word real good and then go sailing on your way.

It wouldn't matter if you read a book in five hours, you see. It wouldn't matter how fast you read the book or didn't read the book. That's in absence of formal knowable training on any subject. That's a very good method – excellent method as a matter of fact because you wind up at the end of the thing – you've seen this word so often, you've looked it up so often, you eventually know what it is, you know?

You say, "There again is the 'Rembrandt Profile.' Now, what the hell does it mean, a 'Rembrandt Profile'? Well, a 'Rembrandt Profile' is actually – well, I guess it must have been something painted by Rembrandt, but they must mean something here. I'll turn back over here – I saw a mention of it over here. Here's a description of the thing: Yeah, well, so on and so on and so on and so… Ohh, oh I get it! It's the main light is not showing on the front of the face. Oh, good. Yeah, it's just the fill shows on the thing. Ahh, that's good, yeah. I got that now. All right."

Sail along the line, and so forth, and finally, why, forgot all about that, you see, but chapters later we run into a "Rembrandt Profile," see? "A what? Oh, something about a fill.
Yes. Well, I know where I can find it. I'll go back – ah, yes, yes. Main light back of the person, fill in the front of the person. Yeah. Main – face mainly in shadow. Yeah, I got it. Nothing to it." All right, running down the line chapters later, in another textbook on the subject. "'When shooting a Rembrandt Profile so on, so on, so on, so on...'Oh, that's how you do! You add a spotlight to it also. Okay." You see, the word no longer operated as an impasse to your study.

Looking up words and meanings and so forth, is sort of the erosive course of the river and it eventually grinds away on the banks until it has a good, strong flowing stream, you see?

Actually, I don't think there are bright students and dull students. I don't think this at all. I don't think so, because I've never seen any real coordination between knowledge of the subject and the brightness and dullness of a student. But there is a careful student and a careless student.

Now, a student can be very fast and still be very careful. It hasn't even too much to do with speed. But he knows when he's whipped. That's about the only thing he knows. He's reading down this paragraph and all of a sudden he wakes up to the fact he hasn't the foggiest clue what the devil he's talking about – what he's reading about so he goes back and finds out where he got tangled up. Ah, well, here was a word and here was a phenomenon he didn't know anything about.

Now, if he's a careful student he puts it all away until he finds out what that word and what that phenomena is and exactly what that is and he gets that straight. He may cruise around in the thing just a little bit further to find out if it's defined in that particular publication, see? But he's looking for the definition – he's not any longer doing it.

Now, there's a careful student. And his brightness on the subject is dependent upon the degree he does this. It isn't dependent on any native talent or anything else. It isn't even dependent on his buttons.

And in Scientology, because of the tremendous amount of breadth of study we are doing and because we are studying what we study with, why then, it's necessary to have some command of the subject of study. It becomes absolutely imperative in our field to know something about how to study and it's no longer walking up to some poor luckless student and saying, "Well, the trouble with you is, you don't know how to study," then walking off, you see? Or saying about some other student, "Well, he's just stupid. That's all, you see? That explains it all, see?" Frankly, it doesn't explain a doggone thing.

We've talked – we hear about the lightning-quick student. We hear about the very, very fast, fast, fast student and we hear about the very, very, very, very slow student. And we hear about the grind and we hear about the brilliant student and honest, those classifications have no more validity than the field of psychiatry. Why? Because they have never produced uniform fast study. They're apparently merely excuses and justifications of something. They're an effort to classify on something nobody's cracked. So, why should we talk about dull students and slow students and brilliant students, and so forth?

There are certain phenomena in study which are worth commenting upon and one of those is the oddball who can memorize almost at a glance and who can go back and spit out
the memorized words. I've known Chinese students that got anybody whipped I ever – in the Anglo-Saxon world or in the Western world – anything whipped on this line. I know Chinese students who could go ahead and give you pages of mathematical formulas and things of this character and descriptions of it, and so forth. About the wildest thing you ever listened to and they'd come to school the next morning with their lessons and *ka-wow! You* ask them, "All right, now let's go into the slope formula."

"Well, the slope formula is so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so *kow-kow, pow-pow, kow-wow." It's all there, see?

You say, "Wow!" Don't say instantly, "Well, then this is the very man we need to build the dam," because building dams has very little to do with study of that particular kind or character. We don't even know if he could solve the problems on the page, but he sure could remember them. Now, that's a test mainly of memory.

Now, if you want to be sure of this person, in examining this person you'll find immediately what's going wrong here. Immediately you'll find what's going wrong. There's a way of examining this person that would only be fair to the instructor and to the student alike.

Take any oddball word that occurred in the first paragraph you have just got back so glibbishly and ask for a definition of that word (the definition is not given on the subject matter which the person is doing). And if you want to see a hunted, horrified look come into anybody's face – it's the perfect memory repeat, see? And you've thrown an ax into it because you've asked for something which isn't memory.

You've asked for the definition of a certain word. And if this person – now look at this – if this person could give you this whole paragraph and tell you all about it but couldn't define a word in it, that person must be in total mystery about that.

So the missing ingredient is understanding. And then naturally the missing ingredient, application, will show up soon afterwards. Do you see how that would work?

In other words, this very, very fast study falls down exactly as the slow study would fall down. In other words, everybody caves in on this same point uniformly. Now, if somebody comes up and he takes this same thing and he stumbles all over the place and he tries to get it out and he spits it out, and so forth, the examiner could ask him, too, the same word. "What's the definition of that word?"

And he'd say, "...Well, I don't know." Puts him in the same boat as the fast study, doesn't it?

So, the direction and end purpose of study is understanding and, of course, you – with an unknown word in the middle of it, and an unknown phenomenon in the middle of it – you're not going to get understanding at all. You're going to get disbelief, noncomprehension. You're going to get mystery. You're going to get, of course, also nonapplication.

Now, if we examine study a little bit further, the main complaint about study is that it does not immediately and at once result in good, clean, clear application. This is one of the primary scolds about modern education – primary criticisms – is if you educate an engineer – or it was – you educate an engineer and you don't dare send him out to build a bridge,
Well, that's in the field of application or practice of application. But if this man can't go out and build a bridge after he's been taught to build a bridge, the familiarity ingredient, of course, is missing.

But even so, if somebody had borne down on him like mad for the definition of every word that he was stumbling across in the direction of bridge building, he should be able to go out and unroll his sextant and transit and get to work. He should; he should. He's now got the horrible task of acquiring his familiarity, but he wouldn't be doing it across the barrier of a misunderstanding of his terminology and a misunderstanding of his tools and he theoretically could do it.

I found myself doing it the other day. I just had a textbook command of a certain problem on this line—parallel line—I'm studying. I just had a textbook command of the thing; nothing but and I saw it, saw it happened and applied the textbook and it resolved, bang! And I had about something on the order of maybe two or three seconds to do the whole thing. Because something was happening and I had to straighten it out fast, see? Just textbook. It worked—it worked perfectly.

So therefore, you could and should be able to take a purely textbook thing—if it was a valid textbook and a valid subject—and apply it directly without familiarity. Now, think of what a whiz you would be, however, if you also had the familiarity at the same time. And that's why we study auditing while auditing, see?

But if this other ingredient of careful study is missing, the nomenclature is missing, you can't make the boat. It just won't make the boat.

I studied—been studying this parallel subject very hard because it is a bearcat on the subject of terminology, too. It's terminology that you'd think anybody that had been around photography very long would be very familiar with. He couldn't help but be familiar with it—oh, no, no, no, no, no. Not when you're studying text after text after text after text after text!

Well, if you were taking some little course that didn't have much to do with the price of fish, that didn't intend to make a pro out of you along any line and "This is, see, this is how you develop pictures"—the Eastman book for the home beginner, you know? I've read those by the ton. No, that hasn't got anything to do with it. It says, "Hammer, pound, hit 'em with the grape, you know—no holds barred. Now we charge with the bayonets. You take the metabisulphite and pour it into the yattapin," and you say, "You take the what?" you know.

And then you're busy in the very next lesson studying a completely disrelated field of the same subject, "Make sure that you adjust the headscreen."

"The what? Where the hell did this come from? I've never met it before around here anyplace. A headscreen, a headscreen. Now, what is a headscreen?" Scatter, scatter, flutter, flutter, look in the dictionary, and so forth. "What do you know? It isn't in the dictionary. It's so common they don't have to define it. But I don't know it. No worry now about how stupid this makes me, you see? Flutter, flutter, bing-bang. Finally figure it out by context and by illustration. There was a picture of all of the photographic material needed. A headscreen? Obviously a headscreen was what you hold back a corner of the main light force so as to get a
prominent ear to be less prominent. Obvious, isn't it? Headscreen! Who would have dreamed it, man?" A nonsensical but very usual piece of equipment.

The guy writing the textbook, being so familiar with his subject, would make the same statement that you would make, you see? You say, "Well, you set your E-Meter down on the table first, of course." You have said it almost sarcasically, you see? "Well, you set your E-Meter down on the table, of course, before you start auditing." If you want to be really sarcastic, you'd make such a remark, you see?

This guy, this bloke, this expert on portraits to end all experts on portraits says, "Well, of course, you adjust the headscreen to hold back that. That's the way you subdue the light." He just says this parenthetically, you see? "This is how you make less prominent, undesirable features on a subject in portraiture. You hold back the light on them."

"What do you hold back the light with?"

Get the same answer out of the textbook. "Oh, don't be an ass."

"Yeah, but what do you hold back the light with, you know?"

"You hold it back with a headscreen, of course, you idiot!"

"What's a headscreen? What is a headscreen? What is this thing?"

"Put it over the piece... Put it over the lens of the camera so it doesn't show the fellow's head?"

So, this has been – it's been very amusing, because I can look at a subject, you see, from an oblique – look at the same study problems that you run into. And I've been analyzing these problems and putting them together. What I've been talking to you about and what I've talked to you about in recent things has been the views I've had on this as worked out and as I know they apply in our own field. And I think you've been making some progress as a result.

But there are just these points about study and you expected there would be probably a lot more complex points about study, but there are no more complex points about study than I have just given you.

Now, of course, if you didn't read or write English there would be a further study on nomenclature. But remember it would just be a further study on nomenclature. So, it even falls into that particular field. Now, the person who can't talk at all, or let us say, an animal trying to arrive at this particular line – he's totally out of communication, he hasn't got the vocal chords, he can't be educated in the first place. You say, "Well, that's a totally lost field." Well, I'm – I'm not completely willing to lose that field utterly because I've already raised animals in tone to a remarkable degree and I've already met dogs that could talk, see?

Yeah, I met a dog one time – he used to say "Hungry" every time he wanted chow. He managed it somehow. He used some Hollywood scheme of how you breathe from the diaphragm, you know? But he could say it clear as could be – that he was hungry. Startled people almost to death because they'd say, "Well, that's funny. The dog probably makes a grunt, you know? And this mistress that's taught him and so forth is just being too too for words." And then they'd hear this dog and this dog would say "Hungry" and they'd go "Ahhhh!" And I was talking to an elephant the other day that wanted his picture taken, as I told you and I've
run into animals that know their cues much better than their trainers and have to pull the trainer through the act somehow and make him look good. [laughter]

So I don't know what the barriers to communication are. I have a greater insight into the fifth dynamic lately than I have had before and I have found that they're – you can go a lot deeper into the fifth dynamic. In fact, I've pretty well got an idea of what GPMs, and so forth, certain animals and insects and so forth get stuck in. And just about how they go into that particular zone or area and how they go out the bottom. I've had a little – quite a little bit more insight into this.

But anyway, that being as it may, the point is that the communication of the nomenclature of the language – of the ability to talk or communicate – would be the first barrier, don't you see? And so it remains into – the fellow who does know English, who can read, who sits there and so forth – it's still his first barrier. But, of course, he is so high on this level of communication he is contemptuous of these little inabilities to communicate and so neglects them. And neglecting them, then of course, he comes an awful cropper when he gets into the field of study. And that is about the first place where he really falls down.

There are many ways you could make a person fail in studying, but mostly it would be in denying them an insight into the necessity of understanding the communication symbols used. That would be a big failure in delivering the field of study.

We never published a dictionary as such. There are several manuscripts of dictionaries around but they unfortunately all depend on my re-editing from beginning to end and they just go fantastic quantities of words and it is just those extra twelve hours on top of the forty-eight in the twenty-four – to get such a job completed. It's a very rough rough beef. And I particularly would not want to attempt the job until I felt it was pretty wrapped up, so it's just about now it would be wrapped up. But I did have definitions of the various words at Level VI, and so forth, codified which I'm sure has been issued and – so that you could look those things up and know what the score was on that.

But despite the lack of a glossy dictionary, you nevertheless can look up these words and they are known and people all over the place know what they are here, and there really isn't much excuse going to one. So it takes you a half an hour to learn what this word is. Boy, that's a half an hour that won't get multiplied and added on to the end of your course, when you're busy floundering around wondering why you just can't seem to get to first base on that particular quarter.

Well, I hope what I've told you today will be of some use to you.

Thank you very much.
Thank you.

This is the what of what?

_Audience: August 4th, AD 14._

August the 4th, AD 14. A memorable day, because it's the day after bank holiday parade and nobody has pneumonia from the usual rain that they have on bank holiday. Very memorable day.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, August the 4th, AD 14.

All right. You seem to have hit a few records here lately, in your examination grades. Your examination grades on lectures and so forth, are coming up, up, up, up and I'm very proud of you with this. Thank you very much.

Aside from your own brightness on the subject, some of this is attributable to the fact that I've been talking about and teaching you something about study, and I think you have learned quite a bit about study in the last many weeks; and that is the subject of this lecture.

I want to give you, in this lecture before it gets cold, a brief summary – no matter how rough and ragged and no matter how well worked out later – of the things I have learned about study. And I break my record by lecturing from a note. But I don't want this to go too far before I make it a matter of lecture and record because I found out it was already getting dim in me skull. And I keep very little information in my skull lately, and that I do put in sometimes tends to get dim because it gets lost. So I didn't want that to happen and I want to give you this information about study.

Now, there's not been a technology of study or a technology of education. Now, that sounds like a very far-fetched, fantastic statement, but it's true – it's true. There was a school technology, and – sort of – but it didn't have too much to do with education. You see, there was the technology of how you go to school and how you get taught in school and how you teach children to go to school and how you go through grades and how you go through the college and so forth. There was an awful lot of this school technology. And you should differentiate between a school technology and an educational technology – it's the first thing I'd ask you to do – because education very seldom, in its final touches, has anything to do with a school.

The engineer who goes out reports to the job and he's been beautifully taught along various ways on how to do the calculus curve of mensuration on how much gravel there is in an irregular pile. And by getting the calculus curve of several sections of this pile measured
and formulized very carefully, he is then able, in looking at this barge and measuring it up, to
finally tell how much gravel there is in this barge.

This actually happened – happened in Cavite before the war, many years before the
war. This young engineer had just gotten out of school and he did just that. He went down and
he calculated the amount of gravel in the barge by calculus. And it was very arduous.

And he'd been sent down by the chief engineer of the yard to find out if they had
enough gravel. And he didn't come back for most of the afternoon. So finally, the chief engi-
neer got very, very curious about this and he went down there to find out where this young
new engineer was and what he was doing and whether or not the sharks had gotten him or
something. And he found him down there just putting the finishing touches on it, and he gave
him – the young engineer gave the chief engineer – with great triumph, the fact that he had
150.7-9 cubic yards of gravel on hand. He had pages of calculations. And the yard foreman, a
Filipino, standing near at hand, looked very sourly at the young engineer and he said: "Is that
what you were doing?" And before the chief engineer could even get in there and find out
what it was all about he said: "You see those white paint marks on the front and the back of
the barge? Well, they tell you how much gravel is in the barge!"

I've had a wonderful example of how pedantic schooling can be as opposed to educa-
tion. I read a dissertation last night on the subject of slides. The preparation of lantern slides.
And boy, this was the most intricate calculations of how close you had to be to a screen and
how – the density of the lantern slide had to be in order for you to get a proper lecture hall
projection. And these went on and on, and if I hadn't myself had experience in this particular
line, I would have taken all this quite seriously. But it was somebody – I guess his pen just
got to going and he couldn't stop it. Because what you do if you have dim lantern slides is get
a brighter lamp. You don't move a projector backward and forward in the hall and calculate
the superreflectiveness of the screen and all that sort of thing. Now, with great experience
then – and it is considerable experience, you see, I know slides and densities and that sort of
thing, by experience – I knew that this data I was being fed so laboriously had very, very little
importance. See, it was interesting. You know, it was interesting that anybody would write
that much on the subject.

But Reg and I and Bonwick at a circus not too long ago, with a mismatched voltage
line and common bed sheeting hung up between two circus poles, enlarged a picture four to
five diameters above anything ever intended for either the picture or the projector. Everybody
was delighted; they looked beautiful. We had a twelve-by-twelve screen of bed sheeting
which even had puckers in it. There was only one slide that it made look odd – one slide out
of about two hundred – and it just happened to fall, this pucker did, in a young man's face and
it just fell wrong. Not a critical proposition at all.

You take any old density of slide and show it in – throw it into a projector, then, with
enough lamp – and you put up a sheet that will reflect and you've got yourself just about the
finest lantern slide show you ever wanted to see and there isn't anybody going to say a word
about it. Two pages of text out of how you calculate the density of a lantern slide – not a criti-
cal problem.

So, education would take into effect, as opposed to schooling, the relative importance
of the data being taught. That's very, very important. The relative importance of the data be-
ing taught, by which, one would say, the relative applicability of the data being taught – the applicability. Now, schooling, as opposed to education, has in actual fact no thought, no real thought of applicability, no such thought.

It is just as important to the pedantic or scholastic school of education, this technology, that "Pliny, in the year umpty-ump-dash-ump, did hereinto aforesaid with semicolons, discover that there were sturgeons." Now, what you going to do with that datum? Yet a man's whole career could have been wiped out, you see, by an inability to have vociferated this fact. This is under "fishing," heading of "ichthyology," see; fishing, fishes. Guy goes down to the bureau of fisheries, see? On his final examination paper he was asked, "Who and what and when discovered sturgeons?" You can just see him now – young fellow in the bureau of fisheries out there off the north coast of Norway, blowing about forty degrees below zero trying to count the number of herring boats out there he's going to have to rescue in the next twenty-four hours, using this datum about Pliny. You can just see this now. Inapplicable!

So, there's a sort of a pomposity that goes along in the field of schooling that has no real basis in education. You'll find this in the arts. You will find people who really think they are artistic and really know something about art, who are simply capable of rattling off a number of pictures. "There's this picture and that picture, and there's the other picture and so forth and it was painted – it was painted by Jules Drool, you know, and in 1710." See?

You say, "What did Jules Drool paint it with, bud? What did he use?"

"Oh, uh – ha-ha. I think it's an oil." But he knows it's 1710, see? And he knows it was Jules Drool, and he knows the name of the painting is Shameful Morning or something.

But you ask this bird – you ask this bird, you say, "What did he paint it with?"

"Oh, I think it was – uh, I think it was an oil. I-I think it was an oil. I-I-I think it was an oil. It's an oil."

He ain't got the point. It's very valuable to know what they were painting with when. See? That's quite valuable. You can use that. Well, you'd – just a crudest possible use – you see something that is painted with ICI Best House Paint, as represented of having been painted in 1510, you know that's wrong, because they didn't make peanut-oil-emulsion paint in… I mean, that's crude, see? But you can see that it does have some applicability in the detection of authenticity. What did he paint it with? That's very – that's a good applicable datum, you see?

I'll give you a parallel datum like this. I was tearing apart encyclopedias yesterday to find out if anybody else had ever mentioned a certain art form. I could find it no place but I did find in the dictionary that "doré" meant "gold colored." I thought that was very interesting because the name I was looking for as an art form was a doré-type and so I didn't know which way I was going on this thing. I thought it was probably a man's name, probably interfered with – with Gustave Doré, you know, and his etchings. No, it wasn't after a man's name and so the thing has never survived as a name, because it wasn't a man, you see? It was simply a goldish form of art reproduction. So they called it a doré-type and the name is so esoteric that it has only survived in the super-super-professional lines. If a guy was really on the ball and he delved into everything, he'd know there had been such a thing as a doré-type, see? But oth-
erwise, he wouldn't know anything about it. Everybody knows what, for instance, a daguerreotype is, see? Nothing like that. But what was a doré-type?

Well, that becomes important in examining the development of picture display, the display of pictures and so forth. So there was a type which did a strange piece of picture display. Well, you should be able to run such things back. Beyond that, in actual fact, whether it was Mr. Wall or Mr. Pall who invented it when – has nothing much to do with it. But how it was done, you see, at such and such a time – oh, that would have quite a bit to do with it, see?

So, when you're dealing with education you have to be very careful not to lean over into the significance. Don't lean over into the significance exclusive of the mass. That is a very interesting datum. Now, when you get into significance versus mass, you get into action; and action could be defined as significance versus mass, of some kind or another. That's rather drawing a longbow, you understand, but the reason one engages in action or doingness and so forth, is he has some kind of an idea of accomplishing something or making something or avoiding something or… He has – there's a significance there, you know? There's an idea about it. Even though – even when we look at a lot of particles flying around in the air and we say: "That's a confusion," we've added significance to the mass, don't you see? Do you see that?

But in education when the significance is never added to the mass but stands in pristine purity all by itself, you tend to get a jammed curriculum – no doingness. Let's get down to earth about it, you see? I've just given you an example of it – I've just given you an example of it, of who – who invented what, see? And now we say, "And there was a great deal of conflict between these two men at that particular time. One of them – one of them had a greater idea of the destiny of his development than the other one did." Oh, what's this got to do with anything? It's a disrelated datum, don't you see? It's just a significance. It hadn't anything to do with the doingness or the action, had nothing to do with the mass that you are now confronting. All it does is throw you a curve, you get the idea?

So, school is expert at throwing curves until one begins to wonder whether or not school ever has education in mind. So, you could have a school technology which would teach, which would never really educate, never really train anyone. You see that? But it could be marvelous. You could fill your whole university through courses of The work of Thomas Hardy. You could have The Plight of Miners in Roman Times on the Cornwall Coast. You could have The Number of Synonyms and Antonyms used by Hunters and Huntresses in the 16th Century. You could have courses which flunk people because they referred to the wrong word, they used the wrong word in connection with the wrong group of animals, you see? You know, like you have "a covey of quail," you see, and "a covey of foxes," you know, that kind of thing, see? Very pedantic!

But what is the basic error here? The basic error – I'll come back to it now – the basic error is simply failing to add the mass or doingness to the significance, see, failing to add the mass or the doingness to the significance. You say, "This fellow was a good painter. He painted and he painted and he painted and he painted and he painted. Well, he painted a lot." You could say this in 90,000 different ways. "He drove seven – his first seven wives batty by the fact he never paid any attention to anything but his painting." Well, it's good curiosa but it is not an educational datum. It's just curiosa. What did he paint, see?
Your student then must be taken into consideration. Your student is trying to get to be a painter. And I'm afraid they've spent so much time teaching them on how many wives the painters have had, or haven't had, that their idea of painting is to get married and divorced or to become a walking catalog.

Well, of course, if you're a judge, if you're going to be a professional judge or a professional critic, not a painter but one of these birds, naturally you want to be practically a walking catalog, see? You want to overwhelm everybody. It's good one-upmanship, you know? You walk through looking at things this way – this way. "Yes, this man over here, he's copied – he's copied Hans Verboten." [laughter] "Yes, that's a very obscure painter of the 1416." See, you want to know things like that, you know, if you're going to be that.

But to be a painter – and that's why you'd almost never turn a member of the arts out of a university. That is almost impossible. It's unheard of, and... to teach short story. They ruin more writers! Well, it's of interest how they do this, and they detach the significance and the action. They separate these two things so it becomes a pure significance without any action or mass connected with it. And when you have done this you have then sort of wound a guy up in a no-confront of the subject and you've introverted him. And the way a student becomes introverted is to give him too much significance and too little doingness and too little mass.

That's still knocking you for a loop. You keep looking at me with your heads tipped over here and I want to know what's so incomprehensible about it? No, it's slipping somewhere.

I don't know how to state it, really, any more plainly than I'm stating it. If you're going to teach a fellow about roller balls, give him a roller ball! Is this – is this difficult, see?

Don't teach him the history of roller balls! Am I making more sense?

_Audience:_ Yes.

All right. Does it – does that make sense? It doesn't?

_Audience:_ Yes, yes.

So, when you have detached the significance from the action and separated these two things apart, you can have schooling but you can't have education. And that's basically how it's done.

If you want to wind up with a whole bunch of do-less graduates, if you want to wind up with a whole bunch of painters who can't paint, a whole bunch of doctors who can't doc, [laughter] engineers who can't eng, then by George, you're going to just – all you have to do is take the doingness and the mass connected with the subject and park that over here as something you really don't want to have much to do with and go into the total significance of it all. And then you make a highly impractical person. And this is the only way it's done. There aren't a number of other ways to do this. You wind it up hard enough and he never does go out of school, he never does leave school; he becomes a professor.

Now, I've learned that for a person to teach who cannot do, is a terrible mistake. Let's get right down to earth here, in Scientology. If our Instructors couldn't audit – _guahhhht_! What goes on? If our Instructors couldn't audit, what catastrophe would we face in all educational lines? Supposing they all knew the history of auditing and then supposing they could give you
chapter and verse of everything ever written on the subject and tell you exactly where to find this and tell you how many pages it had; supposing they could do that – but they couldn't audit. This would be somewhat catastrophic. And any trouble that an Instructor has in teaching has a little bit of something to do with something he doesn't confront about the doingness or the mass of the subject. You got the idea?

So, this Instructor finds that he really doesn't like to teach geometry or something like that. Well, he can't do anything with geometry. Do you see? He's got a blind spot in this particular direction.

Now, this became so notable from my inspection and study of study that I was practically struck dumb on the subject. It goes to this degree: that a person who is simply writing the reports of people who can do is too far removed for the execution of a good textbook. A person writing reports of people who can do, no matter what people this person consulted, is too far removed from the doingness and mass to make a studiable, good textbook.

That is remarkable.

Now, you understand all this background I am giving you here on this particular subject – came about when I realized that if we were going on upstairs and we knew something about the mind, that we had to wrap up another subject which is entirely separate to the subject we were trying to wrap up. This is our inheriting the dropped balls of yesterday. They didn't wrap up the subject of education, so we have to wrap up the subject of education, you see, in order to educate; just for our own practical application, see? Well, they didn't do it. They got a lot of money for it, they were paid to do it and they didn't do it, see? So you feel the same crossness that you would feel at the switchman that you had down there on the railroad tracks and he drew his pay to throw the switch and he didn't, you know? And the Twentieth Century Limited went off the rails, see? And you say, "That blas, of blah, blah, blah – that was his job and he didn't do it," see? Same way, same way. Here we are. We've got a difficult subject to confront because one is studying what one is, and we should have had the whole subject of education beautifully wrapped up. But instead of that, it's just muddied up. There are many preconceptions in this line.

So, I recognized that it was necessary – even though we had made great inroads on this – I recognized that it was necessary that I get a new viewpoint on this subject. Therefore I picked up an analogous, or a similar line of study, in that it's a practical subject – if you know certain things and you do certain things, you get a certain result, see? That type of a practical subject – and yet one that sort of borders over into the field of the arts, don't you see, so that you have to have some judgment and taste and so forth. And I picked up this subject – one, because it was available, two, because I had some interest in it – but basically because it did show a fairly decent pattern of what an auditor would do.

In other words, he has certain theories and actions which he's supposed to perform which, when applied, will produce a certain result if he uses judgment and good taste. Now, you'd – it isn't the same thing: auditing and photography are very long from the same thing. But auditing does have this in common with photography, that when you do certain things, and you do them right, you then wind up with a result, with a certain result. But if you do these things a bit wrong, you don't wind up with a result, you see? But also, if you do these
things and you do them without using good sense, see, you also don't wind up with a result, see? It's a comparable action.

So I picked up this particular field and took a full, blasting, exclamation point, professional course on this from the word "izzard" straight on through. Now this was all sandwiched in during the last few months of everything else I've had to do. And I learned, however, a great deal about it just by experiencing subjectively something that was off the subject of what we are doing, something that I had a dilettante knowledge of and so forth. And as I showed you the other day, I think it was starting to come up with a professional result. So then therefore, the course was well studied and did lead to a finite result at the other end of things.

I've gone past the point now of just studying it and I can actually develop those points and portions of it necessary to produce the better result, don't you see? It's gone over that borderline. For instance, it's all right to do this and that and the other thing and you do that exactly by the textbook. But if you're terribly good by the textbook, why, you can then give it that extra frill over here that makes it come out on top, don't you see? In other words, you can use the textbook so well that you can think while you're doing it. Do you see that? Now, that is what I have been going through.

And I noticed a great many points very early that would never have struck me if I were not working in a completely new field of study. This is not a field, by the way, that I was absolutely new to. I've actually been trained in darkrooms and that sort of thing from a practical viewpoint. So, from another viewpoint here – that I got an idea of – that actually just practical training isn't enough. You can't just give the guy the tools and say, "All right. Well, dabble around with it and go to work on the Daily Express and watch the birds rushing in and out of the darkroom at the Daily Express and if you do that long enough, why, you will become a good photographer." That's not true! I have fabulous evidence that this is not true. The evidence lies before you every morning when you glance at the paper. What they commonly call a news photograph is so bad and oddly enough most of those boys are untrained. The top-notchers that you see around, the real headliners and that sort of thing, oddly enough, are trained.

It isn't, then, a gift that they suddenly pick up, see? It isn't this vast talent – fellow sees a camera – "Oh!" you see, and this huge streak of light goes through his skull of that brilliant inspiration and he clicks the shutter and then he has pictures all over the front of everything. It doesn't work that way. And he can go through all of the menial jobs he wants to in the field of photography, cleaning plates and all the rest of those things, through to the last bitter end of the thing and he will never become a top-notch photographer. They're doing it all the time because this is the way the newspapers get the young men to come in and work in their darkrooms. They tell them this and that's not true.

Top-notch photographers of England are most severely trained photographers you ever had anything to do with. They are just a little bit too severely trained, if anything. But they're hot. You get Tony Armstrong-Jones, my God! If you ever saw a man use standard photography, this guy uses it with a capital "S" with an exclamation point. He can't even take a picture of his own new baby without setting up the exact textbook lighting for a baby picture, see? He doesn't even get thrown by the event of being a father, you see? He goes and gets the exact
lamps and he sets them up at the exact angle and he fixes them up this way. He got a fluke picture by doing this – it's just one of those flukes. You run into them all the time – you take advantage of them. Nevertheless, his lighting was absolutely textbook. This guy is a headliner, see? He's taken design photography now, and in the – in the big Sunday Times Magazine Section – he had an article in there a couple of Sundays ago and I know he just laughed like mad when he published that lead picture in there. He's standing outside of a building, he gets the perfect architectural texture – he's been elected to the Design Council and so forth – he takes – stands outside the building, he gets the perfect texture of the brick, perfect texture of glass, perfect texture of everything, and shoots the inside of the building like daylight. And I know what he did. He said, "Nobody will notice it but a pro, but let them figure out how I did it," see?

He knew the public would just be interested in it sort of as a picture and so forth. But I'm sure that it was in the back of his mind, "Let somebody figure out how I did this," see? I don't know how he did it. I know how I would have done it but you don't shoot from the outside of a building in glaring sunlight and get the total detail of the inside of the building without doing cutouts or something and this is no cutout. How did he do it, see? And I know he sort of laughed to himself because he's put together, of course, two brands of very standard lighting. Knows his subject cold, you see? So he – but he uses it in this peculiar way with color film to get this fantastic result. You never stand outside of a building, see it in perfect detail and look into the room inside and see it in perfect detail at the same level of light. And then you don't shoot this in color. No latitude to the film.

But a pro can be counted on to do things like that. But when you break him right on down, why can he do things like that? He knows all the right ways to do it and therefore he knows how to fail at doing what he's doing and then he can think that extra step, see? He knows his equipment and so when he can think that one more step, that makes him a champion.

The leading glamour photographer of England is a fellow named Tom Hustler. They're always calling in Tom Hustler to shoot some star or something of the sort. They rave about his pictures. Well, it's quite amazing, because Tom Hustler never took anything in his life except a standard professional photograph. He never took anything. He doesn't even add that extra. He is so standard that he's painful to look at if you're a pro, see? The hair light is always exactly where the hair light is supposed to be – that light that you see in portraits that gives the little gleam to the person's hair, see? His main light, the big one, and the fill, they're always in exactly the right position. His background is always exact. It's just a technically perfect photograph, do you see? There isn't anybody else in England taking them.

Lancere, the great theater photographer, I am told – I am told – their great theater photographer. I saw some pictures by this character the other day, he's about as standard as a pig lost in the swamp, see? And the pictures look it – they're faulty. And his lighting is not standard and he doesn't know what to do with the lighting. I think he's got baby picture lighting he's lighting stars with or something of the sort. He's just not a pro. You see? Shows up – bang! People look at the picture; and you show them one that is perfectly lighted, you say, "How about this one," you see?
They say, "Oh! That's a beautiful picture," you see? And you show the next one and it's got a technical imperfection in it and they, well, they don't like that so well. They can't tell you why, this is a common guy off the street, see? Now, photography has got the common denominator of the public taste. What does the public want to see and what does the public like to see?

So now, we have a new subject in photography – this is another reason I chose it – brand new subject. Just a little over a century old. About 1810 – 1810 somebody said, "You know, I get a poiple shadow on a piece of paper when I paint it with some funny chemicals" and there it all began. Color photography is so far from new that they were actually projecting color photographs on the screen for the edification of audiences – not hand-colored or anything – as the same time as Mr. Brady. But, that's all new. That's a Johnny-come-lately subject, isn't it? It's not really had time to pick up too much snob. It's not had time to get lost.

So, to make my point, when you give it all mass and doingness and no significance, you also fail. In other words, you can send this fellow up as a darkroom assistant to the Daily Mail, have him packing cameras for somebody or other, and have him standing in there at Lancere's adjusting lights for half a lifetime without his ever really becoming a pro.

So, professionalism has to do with the significance and the doingness and the mass. It has to do with all of those things. You can't have all doingness and no significance, and you can't have total significance and no doingness and wind up with a final result in the way of a student. Education, then, would consist of a balanced activity which would treat with equal importance the significance and the doingness of a subject. You would treat these things equally. Now, this is not a new thought – it's not a new thought. It's been with us for some time.

But it was terribly confirmed to me on an inspection of what is standard photography today and having been over the jumps and being almost finished with this course and ready for my finals, I thought I had better just make all these notes of it and so forth. But one of the things that stuck me in the eye all the way through the line is the pro, the real pro, was the fellow who knew the significance and had experience in the doingness and the handling of the mass. And that was a real pro; a real professional.

Now, you say, "Well, what about this fellow who comes busting out of the middle of nowhere and he all of a sudden develops this whole fantastic panorama of new material?" No, you were looking at a pro. You didn't look at anybody who suddenly busted out of nowhere uninformed and so forth. But his education might easily – because it wasn't being taught anyplace – the significance was backed up by a great deal of additional hard study, see? You still had the study there, see? He studied like mad.

Let's take somebody like the fellow who projected the first color pictures. I bet you he could have given you the number and book of practically every photograph that had been taken in the history of photography, which went back of him only about 20-30 years. He must have known them, see? He must have known them all. Then you go back into it a little bit further, you'll probably find out he was a chemist by training, see?
Professionalism, then, doesn't leap full-armed from the breath of somebody's hope. Professionalism is sweated for. And also, professionals are distinguished by the fact that they work hard.

Dilettantism is supposed to mean "good at many things," but actually I would rather extend its meaning a little bit to saying that "unprofessional at everything," because part of professionalism is hard work. You, really – to pick up all the significance of a subject and to put that into a doingness action and so forth, rough, rough, rough.

Now, that all sounds very interesting but there is another factor involved in it: Is, you don't have to have done everything that was done in order to be a pro and that is a very hopeful thing. And I learned that the hard way. You don't have to have made a piece of photographic film in order to become grounded in making photographic film, see? That's lucky for you, you don't have to make a human mind in order to fix one up. That's carrying the point a little broad but you actually don't have to have run Standard Operating Procedure of July of 1950, in order to call yourself a professional auditor. If you did that, why great – great, see? Fine. But you take someone who's being trained in 1964, to ask him to do that would be silly.

Right now, to – this stage of study, for me to go and get some chemicals of some kind or another and some old horses' hooves and boil them up, and – so as to have some gelatin and put these things all together so as to make one of the original forms of wet plate, and expose it wet in one of my cameras – which was the way they did it, you see and so forth, well, it'd just come out at the other end. I – what would I say out of this? "Well, I've done it." So what? I'm not going to do it. Not again. That would wreck the camera, of course. Do you see what I mean? That can be overstressed. Now, we get to the overstresses.

The doingness can be terribly overstressed. I've already showed you significance can be terribly overstressed. "Pliny did write on the – ye old wax tablet, which he wrote on with a stylus, which that day had a dull point, because his slave had a headache, that sturgeons…" See, you can go crazy on this subject, see, of significance. You can go nuts. You can wildly overestimate what a student has to know. You can also underestimate it.

But the wildest shot, when they get to formal schooling, is to shoot the moon with this thing. Just go overboard with it, just go crazy with it – make – drive everybody around the bend with it, see? It's sort of a method of forbidding somebody the subject, see? See? "If you can't tell us all the papers of Sigmund Freud, you can never be a diplomate in psychiatry." It's a fact, the total examination for the highest rank of psychiatry is simply the title, the date written and the place of publication of each one of Freud's papers. I know I exaggerate and a psychiatrist, if he were here right now, would say, "Oh, how you – rowr-rowr-rowr-rowr-rowr-rowr-rowr-rowr-rowr," you know? He'd sound like Vixie out here when you kick her. [laughter] But he'd be lying in his teeth, because that's his diplomate examination. I know – I knew a psychiatrist, nursed him through a psychotic break, because he was taking it. [laughter]

And I don't think you can get much closer to the examination without, in actual fact, taking it yourself. And that was what was driving him around the bend. He was preparing for that exam that way and he took the exam that way and that was it. It was very funny watching him prepare for the exam, he'd keep rolling up on a ball, sucking his thumb; rolling up in a ball, you know, in the fetal position on the couch so he could study this. It was very funny.
never did tell him, "You know, brother, I think you're keyed in." [laughter] But overweighted significance is a way of defeating a student, way overweighted.

Now, you can err to the degree that you're giving him a subject which he's never going to do. Now, let's take it over into Scientology. You're giving him all the data, necessary to run Standard Operating Procedure of July, Elizabeth, New Jersey and so forth. And the mistake is to give him all of it. He's never going to use it.

All you want to know, you – all you want to give him is enough so he can identify it. If he collides with this thing again, he said, "Hey, that's Standard Operating Procedure of July," you know, "back there, Elizabeth." "Early days, Elizabeth," is about all you want to get through there. "Yeah, that sort of thing. Finger snap, yeah." Something like that. "Oh, yes. They did that, early days." Have some dim idea where this thing fits, you see? That's about all you want to get across to him. He's not going to do it, see? So therefore, if he's not going to do it, you've got to strip the significance off of it. You got the idea? That's the way these are kept in balance. If the guy isn't going to do it, take the significance off of it. See, you've got to keep these things in balance. If he's going to do it, pour it to him, man!

Let's take an esoteric process like bromoil. Well, they didn't use to have panchromatic film, so it drove them mad. They didn't use to have a film that responded to color, so it drove them absolutely stark, staring mad trying to get a tree light enough so that it looked like a tree, you know? When they made a picture of a tree, they had an awful time with this sort of thing. So they did this fantastic process, like photolithography. I won't burden you with any of the details, because – ohh – horrible! It makes me shudder to remember it. Nobody's ever going to do a bromoil, unless he's a doodle-daddle type of darkroom bug, you know? See, he's got to be a real darkroom bug, because there's much simpler methods of producing the same result, do you see?

Well, some old-time photographer that is a real purist and so forth, in New York, would listen to that statement and he'd say, "I don't know that you'll never do a bromoil. You can't be sure, you know. I myself have done bromoils and so forth. Only took me thirty days one time to do one bromoil print." That's about the length of time, see? Oh! Cruel! And right when I was coming down the home stretch with my course I had a half a textbook on how you did bromoil prints. A half a textbook! It is there in its most painful excruciating detail, but not, incidentally, in such a way that you could really do one by referring to the text. It goes like this, the order of action, which is another point down here which I'll get to – the order of action is all wrong in it. That is to say, "Now make sure that you lay this wet picture," you see, "this wet print out on the back of the tray that will fit it, or glass, and make sure that you lay it out and pin it all down carefully. Now, before you do that, make sure that you have the other print ready, because you're going to need it in a second." Oh, no, see? You're on what I know as order of. You've got down to this line, and you're slavishly going down the line mentally doing the action, you see, and then you find out you've made a mistake, see? He tells you now that there was another action you should have done before the action he tells you to do, see? Zzzrrrrrrr! And you have a feeling like you've made a terrible mistake.

But bromoil is there in its most excruciating detail and has not been done seriously for a number of years. You could probably win a salon exhibit with a bromoil print. You probably could today. Judges would stand there and they'd look at it and they'd say, "What's this?"
They're quite beautiful. "Uhh, what's this? My God! A bromoil, you know? Gee, you know? Give him first technical prize." That's about all you'd get for it, see? "Somebody has actually done a bromoil print – wow!" See? And they'd say, "Gee," you know? They themselves would know what this involved – being trained people, see? Public would go by, look on down at the rest of the pictures; wouldn't stop any eyes.

But it would have meant about thirty days, or something like that, of pure, dripping sweat. But to be taught how to do it, down to the last comma, down to the last bit of temperature, down to every mistake that you could make in doing this thing which you're never going to do, absolutely takes the cake right off the top of the oven. Wow! See? There is all this doingness which is never going to be matched with a doingness, you see? So all this significance is then built up with an undone never-will-be-done doingness, so it all becomes significance.

So, the doingness all but moves over here into the significance department, don't you see? And it doesn't just unbalance it; it winds you up with some ghastly headaches, I know. I say, "Well, I've got to get through this to get to the end of this course or I don't get any diploma. Got to make it. 'So you take a stipple brush.' Now, let me read that again. 'You…'" Ghastly, you know? You're never going to take a stipple brush. You couldn't care less.

So they couldn't make prints in 1890! All right. Great! We don't happen to be having that trouble today. Like asking you to study the aspects – you are studying to some slight degree, but they are very useful – but studying some of the aspect of a "pc lists that were made in 1950" – they weren't published – but what could – you know, no meters, see – so what could the auditor detect without any meter? What would the pc do that would indicate this, see? And then giving it to you in total, painful detail. All you're going to do is read your tone arm, see? But giving you this other in total painful detail, "You sit there and you audit with your fingers on their pulse," you see, and now give you the whole rundown of the Japanese or Chinese system of pulse counting by pressure because that's the more complex system.

That was actually what I used, the Chinese system of pulse counting, trying to get up on it – how... oh, you'd be surprised, man – you sit there today – you were absolutely at the beginning of road nowhere in the – just about 14-15 years ago, there was no way to tell what the reaction of the pc was; there was no way to tell what a hot subject was; there was no way to look into anybody's mind; there was no way to record it, if you did. Just a nowhere view, see? Grim.

But now, for you to be taught, who are never going to do it, how you detect a tone arm response without any meter because of the various physiological manifestations of the pc, the motion of the chest – very important, see, the change of breath, coloration; eye coloration. There is a whole subject of how do you know if a process is flat by the eye coloration. Very interesting subject! How would you like to learn the several thousand words that were written on this subject?

All you have to know, if you were taught this, is that there was such a subject. You see? You could very easily learn there was such a subject and there is the subject, which is what makes the E-Meter important, see? This other subject is so complex that the E-Meter solves this other subject, which is "How do you tell what's going on in the pc?" And that subject had many ramifications, see? And if a process is really getting to a pc, his eye color will
change, you see? Or his pulse will smooth out, you know? That's about all you have to know. The rest of this is bric-a-brac.

All right, somebody can spend his whole life, whole life working in the field and realm of bric-a-brac and have a good time. There are fellows who study the history of bromoil – not do it – study the history of it – as almost a full-time hobby or profession or something, see? So, you can get these incredible significances built up in a subject which actually don't amplify the doingness or the expected action of the student. Then this is giving him doingness which becomes a significance.

So we get to the next point of the line which is the conversion of doingnesses to only significances. And if a subject does very much of this, you've just about had it. If you convert all the doingnesses of a subject over into significance – that's how you do it, is you take some subject which is not going to be performed and you describe it far beyond any necessity. Then you've got a conversion, see? Now, if you can go the reverse, you can say the significance is convertible over to the doingness. And you have just had an example of that – the fellow is never going to make a bromoil, so you make him make a bromoil. See, it's properly merely a significance today; it's just properly a significance. There was a thing called a bromoil print. Fine, it existed, see? What it was, was it depended on the same principle now used in photolithography. Gelatin holds water and water repels oil, see? Uses these various principles. Interesting to know, see? You can cover it in a paragraph or two, see?

Now, if we go too far on this particular line, by making some person do some ancient, old act, which he is never again going to do, we've taken something that should have just remained there as a significance and we have pushed it over into a doingness action. And it again upsets the student most ghastly. I'm sure he would have – I'm sure it'd be cute to grind some wheat with a millstone, you see? It could be a hobby, don't you see? It could be very nice, but there would have to be some good reason why you were doing it. Do you see? A good reason why you were doing it, see? And if it's just that you want to see how they did it primitively, well, maybe that's a good enough reason, see? But that's if you want to do it. Did you notice the choice of words? To make a student do it is a fantastic error. Silly! And his reaction to your effort to teach him is an ARC break. He can't figure out why the devil he's doing this in the first place.

So we come to the conclusion that the doingness and the mass of a subject are the current, applicable and useful doingnesses and masses of the subject and those are what should be taught – hard. They're applicable – the applicable doingnesses and masses. In other words, the student should be taught what the student is going to be doing. And the significances that should be taught to the student are – don't compare to what I just told you. The significances are enough background so as not to get – and this is something they've all missed, and this is how an engineer gets to be forty years old and goes old hat – is enough significance so that he doesn't get stuck in the mechanical doingness he's been taught – and you've got to give him enough significance. In other words, that's a little bit more significance than you would expect to give him. And that's why you give him the history of it, to show that it was developed and give him some sketch of its development. And that's why you show him how the thing evolved and what the doingnesses of it were.
So you see, it becomes asinine to make him do these old things. You're just trying to show him that there were some other doingnesses, don't you see? And you're making him conversant with the principles with which he's operating and if he's sufficiently conversant with those, then the doingness and the other action which he is being taught don't become obsolete because he can think, see? And that's the difference between a pro – that's the difference between a "pro" and a "practical man." It shows up quite additionally, is a pro always does it by the textbook, with a difference; always does it by the textbook, a bit better. And when the thing shifts, it doesn't look like a shift to him, it looks like simply the same thing with its face slightly shifted. Do you see? It doesn't look all that brassy new.

Now, you'll hear people around – you've just shifted how you do a repetitive command – and you will have people around that tell you, "We've changed all of Scientology." Well, they had learned the practical action – they'd learned the doingness of giving a practice... a repetitive command, but they had no theory over here of why they were doing this, or what was – what one was trying to accomplish with this, such as flatten the mental comm lag, do you see, that the guy's going through, or anything like that, flatten the process. They just knew this thing of a steady grind, so the second you changed one comma in it, they thought you'd changed all of Scientology, don't you see? But the guy who has grounding on the subject and who knows what processes are and what they're supposed to do, he would say, "Yeah, well, that – that..." He'd give it the proper significance, you see? He'd say, "Well, ah – that's an out... slightly out of ARC, so it should be shifted slightly, see? That knocks the pc a little bit out of ARC. But this other wording, that's very clever. That doesn't knock the pc. See, that doesn't give him a 'no ARC,' you see?" Yeah, nothing changed, see, to him. Everything looked calm, normal, so forth.

Now, a professional then is able to advance and a practical man quite commonly cannot advance. A theoretician, then, would be well taught, but seldom educated. Somebody who is just dealing in theory and nothing but theory, and so forth, could be absolutely beautifully taught, he could be wonderfully schooled, but he would not be educated in that subject because he would have had the doingness missing in that subject. His doingness would have been gone. He's just an expert on the painters of the nineteenth century, that's all. He knows the theory of all of their paintings – just the theory. It's not being done anymore, nobody ever expects to do it again.

But you'll find odd bits of the society and culture get parked like this and he can become important, just because millionaires these days are trying madly to save their cash with art. Art and land increase in value. So, there's guys walking into salons today who know nothing about art, but have just got that 100,000 bucks that they want to get deposited fast before inflation eats it up and they feel if they bought a big, nice, good, solid piece of art, that would be known into the future, then of course, it's worth a 100,000 now, but when money inflates, it'll be worth 200,000. Like land, it would have increased its value with the inflation, so therefore it's like gold, you see?

So he walks into the gallery and he looks at this painting, "Huh! It's a girl holding a what?" That's the total knowledge he has of any of this, so he's got experts and the expert can't paint, but he can tell him the real from the false, something like that. But if that guy himself had no doingness of detection or doingness of anything else, his opinion wouldn't be worth
anything either. He wouldn't be able to see and he'd be able to palm off everything. But you've got quite a culture – winds up in some very odd spots and you occasionally look into some of these spots and you'll think you have a total theoretician or something like that, that you've got a totality and you may very well have.

But there's nothing sadder than an expert on steam-driven road equipment. I imagine there is one in England today. He's an expert, the last practical expert on the subject of steam-driven road repair equipment. Did you ever see any of these things in textbooks? They're steam engines that have rollers, and they go up and down the roads and – in the days before the internal combustion engine. He's the last – he was the world's – he was a good practical man. He never had any theory of any kind on the subject of steam, or propulsion or anything else, but he's awful practical on the subject of these things, you see? He was all doingness and no thought. Well, he antiquated. He became antique. He became unemployable, actually.

So, when you break up this balance in an education, then you haven't educated the bloke and you haven't safeguarded his future. A fellow is betrayed, then, to the degree that he is not educated and only schooled; and that is most of the protest of the young: that they are being schooled, not educated. They're not being fitted for life.

I'll give you an idea how far adrift it can go. I asked my kids the other day to write something, write their names, sign their names. And boy! Of all the tongue-between-the-teeth actions, you know! Oh, that was grim! They had no signatures. I came down on their teacher like a ton of bricks, you see? They've done – do lots of – lots of exercises in the field of writing, they couldn't sign their own name. Marvelous example, don't you see? Yet I'm sure that they've been very busy making circles and very busy making slant exercises and very busy doing other things and very busy doing everything but write. And somewhere or other, if you wanted to know what was wrong with that and why that occurred, somewhere or other the doingness moved into the field of theory or significance, see? The doingness moved, became just a significance. But it isn't a doingness, don't you see? I mean, writing words has very little to do with traveling ovals, as they call them and so forth, see? So, you can just go just so far with traveling ovals and you get no – there's no doingness there.

So the guy is actually in motion, but it isn't an educational doingness. And that's where an Instructor could make his mistake, you see? Because people are busy or active or acting, then he thinks they are doing. It all depends on what they are doing. If they're not doing something that is immediately going to add up to an action applicable by them in life to the accomplishment of a result, they're in the field of significance. And they react like they are in the field of significance. They become very stultified and bored and protesting and annoyed. See, they themselves have recognized that they've exceeded the doingness, that this doingness has nothing whatsoever to do with what they'll be doing. So they fall back then, and they just treat it as a significance because it's purposeless. It doesn't go anywhere, you see? Nothing's happening so it might as well just be a significance and therefore all the motion is no motion at all. So, all the motion being no motion, really, they get this funny, bored, you know, feeling, like, you know, they're not moving. Here they see all the motion, but they're not moving. And actually it's a significance, which has some motion in it and it doesn't have anything to do with going anywhere. And they get this funny sensation – it actually develops a physiological
sensation. It's being up against something, but not being able to move through it. Funny, funny sensation. It's identifiable.

Well, those fundamentally are the basic balances of proper education. Whatever else you want to say about it, those are the basic balances. There are a lot of very specific things, there are a lot of odd and very sharp and very true and very positive and very practical aspects of all this. But education is the – should be the activity of relaying an idea or an action from one being to another, in such a way as not to stultify or inhibit the use thereof. And that's about all it is. You could add to it that it permits, then, the other fellow to think on this subject and develop. He should be able to think on the subject and develop on the subject.

In other words, he takes this idea that you've given him, and it applies only to murals. You've given him enough background and so forth, and you've told him this applied to murals. And one day he's looking at a miniature and he says, "For heaven's sakes, that also applies – for this particular job that I'm doing – that other principle applies to the miniature."

I'll give you one, I can think of one right offhand. A photomural should never be painted until it is actually assembled on a wall, if you're going to paint a photomural, see? Well, I can think of an association that a guy would get in his skull, if he was having any trouble doing miniatures. Supposing for some wild reason or another somebody came up and wanted him to do a miniature on ivory. Well, this is feasible, you can do it. So, if he knew photomurals, and he knew a lot of other work, and he knew lantern slides and so forth and then also he knows how to go back and find how to make an emulsion (you know, one of the basic emulsions that – make it out of egg white or something) he knows what textbook to find it in. He'd probably whop all this together and then he would also know that you certainly better not paint it until you'd totally finished it, see, and in other words, the information is loose in the guy's head. It's flexible, he can use it, see? It isn't jammed into his head crosswise so that it just associates just with one thing, see?

Don't give it – don't – education shouldn't give people the technology in such a way that the technology is not useful to them. They've got to be able to think with it. You've got to remember that when you teach this engineer in a university all there is to know about nuclear physics, that in just about a dozen years, through the investment of national governments and other things – and particularly since it's very destructive, we know that national governments will invest, very heavily. And we know that this field is going to change. And we're going to teach him all there is to know on the subject. Well, we could make just a technician out of him for common, ordinary, garden-variety actions of reading meters; or we could teach him current technology or current theory as a biblical fact; or we could teach him in such a way that he could think in the subject. And of them, the only fair thing to do is teach him in such a way as he could think in the subject because it's an advancing subject, and he won't become an antique in a dozen years, see? If we did anything else, he would become antique because this thing – after all, governments are in there shoveling the money into atomic development and so forth, left, right and center. They've got guys on pure mathematics and they've got guys on this and guys on that.

And they're – I don't care how they say they're – but I always get suspicious. They say they're "abandoning the production units of Uranium 235," and then the following sentence is added onto this. We take it – yes, they're abandoning the manufacture of 235, we'll buy that.
Now, the "because" is what you – what you wince on. "Because there's already sufficient quantities of it to answer all possible needs for the next 500 years," see? There's that "because." The first sentence, all right. All right. So they're going to abandon this development. But their "because"? Maybe so, but we don't really think so. They've discovered something else, brother. They've discovered something that makes U-235, you know, look like last season's high-button shoes. And of course they're not about to let it out.

Every time somebody discovers one of these secrets, or the secretary of state, or somebody like that, of the United States gets on a plane hurriedly in order to tell the last atomic secrets to Khrushchev. I don't think that's his job, but that's what he's been doing lately – this bird, he goes ramming across and around and about and screaming about this and screaming about that. No. There isn't any of these secrets that have been stolen such as the Fuchs and that sort of thing, as damaging as they were, that didn't excite the government into a fantastic internal convulsion on the subject of "Develop something new, something better, something that hasn't been stolen yet." And their best prevention of espionage is not political because that they're sour at. Their best prevention of espionage is just being newer.

So, I imagine the poor kid being educated right up now in Birmingham on the subject of atomic physics is probably already 10, 15 years behind the mark. He'll probably get out and he will look very bright and he will say, "All right, now we take the riga-bongs," and so forth.

And the fellows on the place say, "The what? Oh yes, yes. We remember that. We – it's – we... that's historical."

That was his last course, see, was in riga-bongs, you know? Oooh! "Well, what are you fellows doing?"

"Oh well, we haven't time now, but there's a pile of textbooks over in the corner. Those are our more recent notes."

Well, education, then, to fit this fellow for life would have to fit him for this operating atmosphere. It would have to fit him to think. At the same time they'd have to teach him that disciplines are disciplines and actions are actions but at the same time they'd have to teach him to think with these actions and advance these actions and carry them out to a finite and final conclusion. They'd have to do these things. Well, that's quite a trick, to teach somebody, on the one hand, that this is an exacting discipline, and on the other hand that you should have a loose and flexible attitude toward it. Quite a trick, isn't it?

Well, you recognize what the strain is. You're trying to make a practical person who applies it to a result, who can give it that extra fillip, you know, that extra little zing that pushes it on through. He can think on his feet, in other words, and – so that he won't antiquate. Give him all this so he won't antiquate. Well, that's quite a trick.

Actually, that is being demanded of Scientology as in nowhere else. And anybody studying in Scientology is under considerable stress and strain because of these various factors. You have a madly advancing subject, which is advancing beyond the expectancy that it was – its expectancy keeps rising, don't you see? And which is already taking off from the – from the basis of having exceeded all former expectancies. See, and now it is still advancing and its expectancy level is rising, see, consistently. I mean, more and more and more is developed that broadens the view more and more, see?
And so therefore education in Scientology becomes a much touchier proposition than in any other analogous subject and it's very rough. It's very rough. That is why I undertook to find out what are these various balances and what do you do and so forth. And how do you bring somebody up to a point where he can study this thing without too much casualty and upset.

And what are the touchy points, then, of education? And of course, education is a subject that has not been worked out. By definition – there isn't even a definition, you see, such as I just gave you a moment ago. They don't operate in a school with a definition. Well, that's wonderful because what trouble do you get into if you read a paragraph beyond something that you haven't got the definition of? You get into trouble, promptly, instantly and immediately, catastrophic trouble. Well, education's been in trouble ever since it started to do something which it never defined. That's the basic thing wrong with education, see?

Let's call somebody who is being educated different than somebody who is being taught. Let's make that shading of difference here. And then let's get the technology of schooling and understand that the technology of schooling somebody does exist and that man has had that for quite a while, but it doesn't necessarily have too much to do with the technology of educating him, which has been relatively undeveloped. So just because one is going to school is no reason one is getting educated, see?

But there's terrific technology wrapped up around school. And that the success of any taught subject is to the degree that it keeps its significance sensibly balanced with its action and the masses associated with it. And that's a sensibly balanced subject. And the odd whip-around can occur here that actually a person can think he's engaged in a doingness when actually he's engaged in a significance because the doingness is never going to be applied, see? And he can actually be engaged in a significance which is really a doingness, on the other side of the fence, naturally. If it balances one way, it'll for sure balance the other way. He can be engaged in a – in a significance of the action of contemplation. And it's as silly as that, don't you see? It's too silly to require very much stress.

What is the significance of an action? Well, if an individual was terribly significant about everything under the sun, moon and stars, you could, of course, work up significance into some kind of an educational subject. Don't you see? So the significance itself would lean over and become a doingness. Sounds silly, but it's true.

I'm now talking about the "expert on art of the nineteenth century," see? And there are fellows who make a terribly good living, which is the achievement of a final result of education. After all, I don't care how much communism we've got amongst us, you know? The guy is making a living by simply being a walking dictionary, see. Memory expert on something or other – he's somebody or other. He knows all the formulas there are to be known on the subject of paint. He never mixed any paint, he wouldn't know what to do if you showed him a paint can, he actually abhors the smell of it – it makes him quite sick. But he can sit there in a little cubicle and be an expert on the subject of paint. So his, of course, has become – his significance has become his doingness. Perfectly allowable. The society has that.
So, somebody writes him a letter and they say, "Dear Expert Jones: We are working with the formula of rosin and – uh – su... and – uh – amber, and we are trying very hard to develop the – so on. Could you please give us the background music to this here paint?"

And he says, "Well, that paint was originally used on the Tyrrhenian Sea and uh – so forth and their amber was different than anybody else's amber," and he goes on and on and on.

At the other end of – the guy, the practical bird, takes a look. "Hey, no wonder it won't paint! Their amber was different. There's a different type of amber – that's Russian amber and Russian amber, it has an awful lot of beeswax in it," or something, you know, whatever it is. "Ha! This paint requires wax." So we dump some wax in. All right, now it paints things. See?

But this bird didn't have any idea of applying this to anything. If he said enough on the subject then somebody who was doing the subject, you know, could make some sense out of it. So there are experts.

There's guys like Einstein. He sat around and did a wonderful... he had a total doing-ness that was of significance. He figured and figured and figured and figured and he figured everybody into a hole. But he sure stimulated guys. More mathematicians were made trying to understand Einstein than any other single man that ever worked. The joke of it is, there might be nothing in his work at all. It's sort of idiotic to say that – somebody comes along and tells you that the speed of light is c, and it's never any different. What's he talking about? What light? Well, now, I don't even think he says it's the light between 3,600 angstroms and 5,600 angstroms. I don't think he got that definite. He just said, "The speed of light." Well, that's great. Does he mean light as we normally see light? Well, light, in actual fact is simply the light vibration that you see, don't you see? By definition, that's light. Well, then he must have meant that light, visible light. Well, great. I'm glad he did because when it goes through a prism, it no longer travels at c.

Well, what do you say? It could no longer travel at c for this excellent reason: It emerges from the prism at different speeds. Otherwise you would never have a spectrum.

Oh yes. But now, you're only talking about wavelength and you're only talking about the amplitude of the wavelength and that sort of thing and that's why it turns the corner. No, I'm afraid that that can't be true either. It must be at a different speed because if you've ever watched soldiers in an evolution, the fellow on the outside is going faster than the fellow on the inside. Have you ever noticed that? Well, light, to bend and fan into a dispersal when it goes through a prism, must be handling something that has to do with speed.

But because everybody has gone stone-blind on this because Einstein has said quite the contrary, don't you see, now they've got to have some weird idea, and actually it might interest you to know that they have finally abolished light. I thought that was mighty nice of them. They've now got it worked out that color is only something that is manufactured by the eye to relay to the brain and doesn't exist in actual fact anywhere. That's actually told to you – that's being taught me right now. I think it's a wonderful idea. But if the guy hadn't read a psychology textbook before he wrote that textbook, I would be happier about it. There's something wrong with all of this, for this excellent reason, is, a vibration is a vibration. I don't know why you have to get psychology into it. That's the influence of Locke and Hume, you see? These old birds.
"If there was a sound..." Descartes, yeah? "If there – is there sound in the forest if there is nobody there to hear it?" [laughter] Well, what do they want to chase themselves up those blind alleys for, man? Because they're very easily answered. They are confusing the role of a thetan because they haven't got him. And of course, he's the wild, missing variable in all of their equations.

So, all right. So the thetan builds the universe. Now of course, he can experience it. You can experience what you can build, so therefore there would be such a thing as light. It all depends on how you're looking at it, and from what mental science you are looking at it, as to whether or not you make pronunciamentos concerning it one way or the other. But you might get an idiocy that would go something like this: "Now, light doesn't exist because you aren't. Now, if you were, then light couldn't. Because, you see, if light really does come through the pupil of the eye and excite the brain into various sensations known as color and so forth – but if these things do not exist in actual fact, then of course nothing is behaving outside of your skull at all. Nothing is happening outside of your skull." You are saying such things as, "A cook can never eat the cake he bakes." See, this is the plea for total introversion. You follow me, don't you?

Therefore, if we've got to have an argument about "If the tree falls, is there a sound if nobody's there?" If we're going to have an argument of that character, then let's have some real arguments like "Can a cook bake a cake and eat it?" See?

But you'd have to go upstairs into the role of a being in this universe, or a thetan. You'd have to come off the kick of the "Big Thetan" idea, see? You follow me? "The Big Thetan built light, and you can only experience light and you don't have anything else to do with light except experiencing light, therefore you're a total effect, brother. Lie down." See? You get how these tricks are worked?

Well, in education and so forth, you'll find out that it's very safe to advance from a basic premise or a basic assumption, and to make it very clear what basic assumption you are advancing from, and then not try to spread this assumption over into a thousand different things.

They have assumed, in physics, the conservation of energy. Well, let them talk about that loud and clear and then let them not talk about the organization of mass. Because they've merely started from the conservation of energy. They haven't said anything about mass. But now they try to drag in mass by saying mass is merely a bunch of energy. Why did they do that? Because their basic assumption is the conservation of energy. "Energy can neither be made nor destroyed, by anybody, particularly you." See, that's the basic assumption of physics. So this naturally is energy, see?

Now, it's not the conservation of space, it's not the conservation of time and it's not the conservation of mass. So now everything, then, has to become energy because they've started out with their basic assumption. Therefore they themselves become blind to where their subject took off, and therefore where it'll err. It's going to depart, see? The second something comes up which is not energy, it's going to exceed the basics of finite physics and that's all that's wrong with that because they didn't start with anything but energy, don't you see? So, they're not going to go anyplace but energy.
We're in a very safe relationship to this. We start with the being: you, a thetan. We can prove that you, a being as a thetan, exists. We can prove that, and we can back you out of your skull and you can stand without a body. So you're not a body. That's very simple. We don't do this very often and don't require you to do it as one of your class exercises because it makes people sick and unhappy. But it does happen and it does work. All right, so we start out with the basic building block of the universe: a thetan. Now, we're on fairly solid ground there, but of course having done that we are now exceeding all former basic assumptions which start subjects.

Now, in trying to communicate this idea, then, we collide with all preconceptions. We collide with everything in the background of people, we collide with all of their upsets in the past, with practically everything under the sun. We can only go, then, in the direction of processing. We can't go in the direction much of the theory and philosophy of the universe because the only way we will really win is in the direction of processing, handling and doing something with the unit because the unit is not educatable at a degraded state. See, that's elementary. So, unfortunately then, we have to know about all there is to know and know it better than anybody has ever had to know anything before, particularly about education because we can't teach anybody to do it.

You're tackling a very tough subject. It's a very easy subject. You're tackling essentially a very tough subject, in Scientology, which has been made as easy as possible. And my efforts have been devoted to, in the last few months, in studying study, to make it even easier.

Now, I haven't told you very much in this lecture that you can use, but I've told you something that you might have some inspective relationships with, you know?

Well let's say, a whole school system of a country miseducated all the youth of this country with malice aforethought. They would get to a point where they couldn't receive a datum. So, they're in a war, and, the enemy – the enemy sends them a despatch and says, "We are going to attack tomorrow morning," but they can't receive a datum. They've got it that plain and clear, see, and they are all in bed, and they all get shot down in flames and that's the end of the country, see? It gets down to the reductio ad absurdum of not being able to observe anything, not be able to perceive anything, not be able to understand anything and have no ARC with anything, which looks to me like a sort of a "thetan death" situation.

So, it looks to me like there is a great deal of comparison between miseducation and aberration. And it also looks to me that a great deal of work could be put in on this field from a standpoint of deaberrating people at the lower levels. I'll give you an example, just offhand: "Tell me –" this would not be a repetitive process – but, "Tell me a word that you have not understood in this life." And then you make the guy go ahead and clarify it. I think you'd get some of the most interesting resurgences. I think some of the many personal problems of the individual would blow up in smoke.

But here, just on this other subject of study – of studying the subject of study – one walks forth with a brand-new avenue of lower-level disentanglement and lower-level therapy lines which look quite promising; they look quite promising. But what I'm mainly interested in is you, a Scientology pro training people, have to know something about this subject. I'm
interested in your education right now as you exist. And I'm trying to make it as easy as possible on you and teach you something about it.

Thank you very much.
STUDY: GRADIENTS AND NOMENCLATURE

A lecture given on 6 August 1964

Well, what's the date?

Audience: Sixth of August AD 14.

What?

Audience: Sixth of August.

It is the 6th of March.

Audience: Sixth of August.

Somebody back there says it's the 6th of March. It's the 6th of August AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And we have another lecture today on study.

Now probably, just to get off in high gear here, so the taxi cabs won't run up too big a bill out there this evening – just to get off into high gear, let me tell you at first that, of course, no field of study including Scientology texts of earlier times includes these principles.

So this is a very adventurous thing I'm doing because it can rebound on a critical, you see, at Scientology texts because they are not written this way. They are written in an effort to make people understand what you're talking about but they do not go according to these principles and future Scientology texts, on the other hand, will go according to these principles. And you will see this suddenly entering and coming over the horizon. However, you have at this time only a bulletin or two which represent this. You probably have noticed of recent times that the more recent bulletins are much easier to study and that is a direct result of this study of study. Leave it to me to study study.

But it's very interesting that your grades on examination, since I have been talking to you about studying, have increased from five percent in the nineties – five percent of the class in the nineties – to sixty percent of the class in the nineties. That's one of these astonishing leaps, you see? It is too astonishing to – well, it would be totally unlooked for. Now, you are already being trained above the level of modern education, that is to say modern education as she is taught. One shouldn't be grammatical about low-grade things, you see? I've been amusing myself lately by making grammar agree with the disrespectfulness with which something should be regarded. That's very interesting – the mood with which you use grammar, you see? And you do that, too, you say, "She ain't a-gonna come." Meaning, of course, that you had a highly disrespectful attitude towards what she said about it, don't you see? A lot of unex-
explored nuances in language and that sort of thing which are quite amusing. But of course, that's just amusing.

In the field of study to improve the ability of a student to learn by altering the character and methodology of teaching is the exact aim here. Now, this is quite an interesting aim: that is, just to alter the ability of the student to study and to learn and improve it by simply altering the teaching methodology. Now, you see now, that in itself is rather adventurous, because you say, "Well, I could make the subject easier to read," or something like that, but how about changing the subjective reaction of the student to the subject by the method of teaching which is employed? So, you see how far we have reached here. We are now handling in this subject the subjective reaction of the student to the subject by the method we use in teaching it. So, if you want to see some pan-determinism at work, that's it, don't you see?

Now, study normally would simply be, you told somebody something and he was supposed to study it, you see; and if he didn't like it, why, you reported him to the headmaster, you see? That was how we achieved subjective reality on the student. In universities it's done by mechanisms of expulsion, a grade system whereby if somebody doesn't make a grade he is expelled.

This lightly goes on – he's not permitted to go into the next grade. You see that very commonly, but this goes up to a point where somebody is expelled. Now, that was how they tried to give the student subjective reality on the subject he was studying by, of course, punishment. How else would you expect, don't you see, the thing to conduct itself in the physical universe?

So actually, beyond an effort to present the facts and say a subject was there and then provide a school technology which made the individual guilty if he didn't know it, the whole subject of study and training had not really much advanced beyond that point. That was about the high tide of study.

Now, quite accidentally someone with intuition or insight – some professor, some teacher someplace, in some school – would depart from this rationale. He would depart from this method of teaching and he would try to invite the understanding and the interest and the participation of the student; and such people were very rare and people really tried, students really fought to get into their classes. And that was about as far as it had advanced.

Now, when we recognize that education is not very successful we have made an enormous stride forward. Now, the educational authorities who are responsible for the education of children and adults refuse to recognize this fact and so they really don't really try to improve it.

But when you are down against a practical subject such as Scientology where you have trained this auditor as best you could and then you see him sit down – you have an element there which is missing in most educational technologies. They teach the engineer to build a bridge but then nobody in that university is forced to sit down and watch him build a bridge, much less go across the bridge he has built. So you see, they do not in actual fact get a very good look at whether their educational methods are successful or not. We teach somebody ancient Greek. There is nothing wrong with learning ancient Greek but the teacher then
never really is a witness of the student speaking to the ancient Greeks, see? He doesn't pay too much attention to this.

So therefore, in studying study, I avoided all those fields where observation of the student was not easily attained, the actual doings of the student was not easily viewed. That ruled out a field for the study of study, you see? So immediately engineering technology, we could learn nothing from that because, of course, nobody ever sits around and watches whether or not the engineer builds the bridge, you see? So it had to be something as intimate as Scientology, which is, the instructor teaches the student how to audit a case and then, oddly enough, is able at that very minute to have him turn around and audit the case, see? So this, of course, has a tendency to force progress and advance upon us and we are able then to make a further advance because we have an instantaneous inspection of the results of our study.

So, perhaps one of the reasons why the civilization has not made considerable progress in this line is because very few subjects are in this category, whereby the subject instructed is not instantly practiced before the professor. Do you see that? So that therefore gives us – gives us you might say the driver's seat in this subject where – of study – because we can see instantly with no comm lag at all. We don't find out whether or not this fellow turned out to be a great and famous barrister, don't you see, twenty years hence. We don't find that out, but we find out whether this person became an auditor before the day is out. Can the person use this principle? Well, we walk right over into the auditing section and there is the same auditor that we've just had in practical and we've just taught him something in practical and there he sits, you see? There he sits with his bare face showing. Right there! And when the Practical Supervisor also does auditing supervision, he continues to work very, very hard to put his practical across to a point where he sees it all of a sudden in a session. You see? So, we probably have a closer look than anyone else.

Now, there's a great zone of tolerance in most studies. They expect the student to be very amateurish. Let's say we're teaching a craft like silversmithing; now, we don't expect he is going to heat up any silver without burning his fingers, see? So we get a big gradient win: He heated up some silver without burning his fingers, see? Well, that's all very well and that's fine but we don't expect him to make a tea service that is going to please the general manager of the British Silver Trust in his first few weeks of silversmithing. We sort of would expect that fellow to go out and hang around silversmithing and improve his design and work with a master and gradually get there and when he is about fifty, why, turn out some cracking marvel of a piece, you see, that the general manager of British Tea Services, Limited, or something of the sort, would approve of and buy and use as a standard design, you see? There's always this comm lag.

But there was a field, not to stretch it too far, there was a field where instant inspection was feasible and so that field lent itself peculiarly to study on the subject of study which would be analogous to Scientology and that was the field of photography. Now, when you tell a student to take a picture of a tree and he goes out and takes a picture of a tree, you in very short order are going to see a picture of a tree. And if it is upside down and if he has cut it in half and if he didn't hold his camera level and if he had camera shake, all of these things are immediately and distinctly visible. Furthermore, we have a direct and exact result of a combi-
nation of actions which, of course, is important. Can he put a sandwich on a tray? Well, all right, he can put a sandwich on a tray, but that's not a very complex action. Can he make a sandwich and put it on a tray? See? All right, well can he make the bread, you see, and make the filler and make the sandwich and make the tray and put it on the tray? You see how this field – you could suddenly start broadening, see, out a subject.

Well, I'm afraid that we're in – very close in – to that kind of a subject in Scientology. It's a subject of complex actions. It's not a subject of simple actions. No matter how hopefully a person in a co-audit when he first comes in – I'm talking about a HAS co-audit – believes, no matter how touchingly he believes that all it is, is he has to sit there and nod, he very, very soon becomes aware that he is engaged in a complex action. He is expected to say something and this probably strikes him with the greatest of shock when he finally realizes he is expected to say something and that it is up to him to get the person he's auditing to say something.

Now, we've got a double complexity: he not only himself has to say something but the person he is auditing has to have something said to him which will cause the person he is auditing to say something. Do you follow this through? Then he's got to hear this and then he has got to acknowledge it. Well, he probably finally masters this, off a canned piece of paper or something of the sort, and he finally masters this and he feels very triumphant, only to discover that the person who sits opposite him in the co-audit, as it changes around, is not the same case. He gets different pcs and these pcs have different cases and this is pretty grim, because we knew all we had to say to somebody was, "Well, how is your mother-in-law getting along," and we had a good session going. But this next fellow hasn't got a mother-in-law, [laughter] so that is a total stumbling block and you would be amazed how big a stumbling block that might look. Now he has to enter the technology, if he's told that he has to do something, he has to enter the technology of problems. What the devil is a problem? In order to talk to somebody about problems, or dream up things about problems for the fellow to talk about, we have to know something about problems. Now, he's away into the significance of the mind, added to the actions which he is performing.

Now, the normal way we go about this is to get him to perform the simple actions and then add the complexities to them one after the other, on the basis that the person would become confused if given too much too fast.

So, we have a new discovery which we have made, long since, called gradient scales which applies in the field of study and that you teach somebody on a gradient. Well, what is meant by "teaching somebody on a gradient"? Well, a gradient of course refers to a grade which is sort of an uphill looking sort of picture, don't you see? It's a little bit more so each successive step. What we mean by a gradient: It gets steeper or it gets more complex or it takes in more the further you go.

Well, that's a gradient and as long as we attack a gradient – as long as we attack the subject on a gradient of complexity, we give him this cycle. We move along into more and more numerous actions, but we try to teach him each action that we're going to add to – we're going to add to this action – so we're going to teach him that action so well that it doesn't worry him. And then our next action that we teach him – this has its own complexity, but it's
done in combination with this first action. But if the first action is still worrying him and he hasn't got that down, then our next action is going to throw him.

When you see somebody getting confused, then he hasn't gotten down the more fundamental action he should have gotten down before he advanced into more complex action. It isn't that he doesn't understand the more complex action – he's not even confronting that action; he's still confronting this more basic action. See, he hasn't learned that basic action.

Well now, the only place you can err in this area is trying to start in too high on the gradient and you can make that mistake and you can make that mistake with the greatest of ease. It's the easiest mistake to make because nothing else is done in the modern university except make this mistake. They don't educate – they make that mistake.

Modern education is really the art and science of making the mistake of too steep, too quick, before anybody has learned anything about it.

For instance, I've seen German taught with ferocity and velocity and the next thing you know, we were learning all about Schiller, whoever the hell he was. "What's Schiller, where are we? How come?"

"Well, that's just in the lesson text. See, that's the fourth week's lesson text."

"Yeah, wait a minute. What happened to the alphabet?" Nobody can read a German alphabet in the – that's used only to English Alphabets. You can't read one of those Gothic Alphabets. It's just gobbledygook! Looks like bird tracks! [laughter] Well, all right, you're going to teach somebody about the nuances of Schiller, are you? When it doesn't even look like words on a page! He's not yet convinced there are words on the page, you see? He thinks the printer spilled some ink. He thinks his book has been damaged. Nobody bothers to teach him the German alphabet. Where was he supposed to learn it? We look in vain for where he was supposed to learn the German alphabet, because it's not any part of the syllabus of that course. Ah, but it's German 1; where the hell is German 0? Well, they must assume that that must have been in your last life.

So, you can make with the greatest of ease the mistake of entering a gradient too high.

A multimillion pound activity was carried on in Africa teaching a number of tribes down there "Soil Erosion: The Techniques of Preserving Soil and Preventing Erosion." Parliament up here was just appropriating money, along with peanuts, and so forth. It was back in the days when we were all comrades. And they were appropriating money for these groundnuts – peanuts to you Americans – which never grew and nobody could do anything with them after they'd grown them because there was other things they did it with, see? Same time they were pouring this flood of money, as a support program to groundnuts – they got into soil preservation and preventing soil erosion. And they poured the money into this and they poured people down there and they had people in an airlift going down to Central Africa to solve these staggering and fantastic problems they were having in trying to teach these natives how to not erode soil. And the native was taking this in just about the way oil takes in water. I'm sure he was being polite and gentlemanly about listening but brother, he was really paying no attention.
And it took a Scientologist in the middle of the program to straighten it out. He did it with gradients which we already knew about. He just decided that the government had cut in too late. The native didn't have any reason to not erode soil. Well, there was all of Africa full of soil – how come we were preserving it? It seemed to be the most bountiful substance he ever had anything to do with. And this dropped back to the fact that he had no idea of future. So this Scientologist sat down patiently and ran around and wrote them up something that they used in the program and one has never heard about it since, so it must have been very successful. No more billions are being promoted in that direction anyway.

Just this: That you had to teach the native that there was such a thing as the future and that his future welfare of his children and tribe depended to a large degree on his still having pastures to graze and areas to grow things in. And they taught them this very carefully and considerable enthusiasm greeted soil erosion.

Now, you very often make a mistake in a Comm Course when you find a new student comes into that Comm Course and you are teaching him this and you're teaching him that and you're teaching him this drill and you're teaching him that drill and he doesn't know how to sit in a chair, man. Now, you could go more fundamentally than this – you could go more fundamental – maybe he didn't know why he was there. Maybe he came in by mistake. Maybe he still has some weird idea about how come he's there. Now you're teaching him a Comm Course.

Well, you're not teaching a Comm Course to anybody that's there, so our basic gradient on education is to get somebody there. That sounds too simple but almost every elementary teacher in the world is making that mistake today. They are teaching children who aren't there. And you'll find the most marvelous increases in IQ and learning rate take place under that very, very funny simplicity and most of their big educational strides made with Scientology are simply based on that one little tiny factor of getting the student there.

Well now, they don't know what they're doing, some of these teachers. They think they're doing something esoteric or wonderful when they tell the student class – when they tell the class each morning to "Look at the front wall, look at the back wall and look at the ceiling and look at the floor." Maybe they're doing it "because Ron said so," but it seems to work and this seems to have a great deal of workability and the children all appear to have an enormous increase in intelligence even though this is only used for five or ten minutes each morning.

Well, that's quite marvelous if it's only used for five or ten minutes each morning because the process obviously isn't run long enough to even get into the zone of having to be flattened. Nothing is going to happen here to a case to amount to anything. What they haven't noticed before is that the children weren't there to be taught and of course they look more intelligent if they are there. Try and run an IQ test on somebody who is not sitting at the desk taking one.

So, actually this is completely aside from the ramifications of havingness and other factors that would be involved in this – that first step is just to get somebody there. That's the first step. Now, maybe in a Central Organization somebody up in the Academy may be saying to himself, "Well, the Letter Registrar already got the person here. Getting the person here is
the duty of the Letter Registrar. The person came in to take the course, didn't he? Well, the Letter Registrar was supposed to have written him letters, so obviously, then, the person is there." I've already had this explained to me. Do you see the rationale? No, they've got a body in class. They've got a body in class. Now, why the person is actually there? They don't know that.

Well, the fads hit this course. Yeah, once in a blue moon we'll have a new fad – not once in a blue moon either – everybody will get on a fad thing. For a while, a year or two ago, I've forgotten exactly when it was, "the problem they solved by coming to Saint Hill" was in vogue and for a while, why, everybody was just making marvelous TA and gorgeous case gains and so forth – "the problem they solved by coming to Saint Hill." "What did coming to Saint Hill solve as a problem for you?" See? And then they would run this out and they'd square it up and it's marvelous, and so forth. And I don't believe I ever thought about it very much, but my laughter on this situation would be based on this very elementary fact: That they weren't really running a Problems Process at all, see? They were simply making the person aware of the fact that they had arrived at Saint Hill.

So, we don't do that anymore because we've got a little checksheet which goes in and out and is sometimes skipped and sometimes put back in again, which has to do with getting the person to go around and spot the locations of everything around here, see? We take care of it with a little checksheet. They're supposed to get this and supposed to get that and they're supposed to look over this and supposed to that, don't you see? So, there is a Touch Assist familiarity, so that – that wipes out two things: the vast mystery of where they have arrived at and the fact that they have arrived.

So, your first gradient in education is to get somebody there. It doesn't much matter how you solve it. I have shown you here – get the little kids in school to spot the ceiling and spot the teacher and spot the floor and so forth. You've got them there now and they respond by appearing to be far more intelligent than they were before, so you say, "Well, look at the tremendous IQ gain this gives." No, nobody is smart where he is not.

All right, so there – there is the idea of education by gradient and the – repeat – the mistake you can make in education by gradient is a big mistake and that is: failure to undercut the gradient, failure to get simple enough, failure to get the primary action. You must get the starting action that the person can be made sure of so that he can then go on to another action and become sure of that and go on to another action that he becomes sure of, you see?

Well, now if you haven't ever gotten a low enough or simple enough first action for the person to become sure of, then the person advancing into the next zone finds that very, very complex and starts to feel sort of spinnying and then the instructor starts going mad trying to explain to this student what this is all about – this step two, see? Well, he has never gotten to step one and from there on his education is a complete mish-mash. And if you want to unscramble anybody's difficulties with training, and so forth, then you will just have to find the gradient that they overlooked or skipped or missed, after which they entered into a confusion.

And this would be very easy to find on an E-Meter, extremely easy on an E-Meter and that is simply: the E-Meter would register an early moment of confusion about study or training and it would register it repeatedly, that is two or three times if it's never been resolved. It
would only go *flick*, or something like that if it had existed and then been resolved, you see? There would just be the residual charge left on the time track. But if it's repetitively reading, if it reads several times and seems to read very strongly as he discusses it – gives you in other words tone arm action – why, then you know that it has never been resolved to this day.

Now, the difficulties that men have with their minds are those which have ridden forward with them into the present. Those are the difficulties that have to be treated and handled – the difficulties which they have had in the past which have ridden forward to them into the present. You can always get a registry on a difficulty somebody has had in the past simply because it is pictured on the time track as having had a difficulty. But if it is not riding forward with him into the present, you are simply using auditing to contact it again and it will blow. It won't restimulate particularly, it usually just blows.

For instance, if you have had somebody get a deep, a very heavy surge, let me put it this way – if you get somebody got a – get a heavy surge on a meter in a session, you can actually put them back into that moment of the session when they got the surge and you will get some ghost of that surge. That's not riding forward with them in the present time. You actually took them back into the past to find the surge. But you can get that surge back again because what you did was get the impression it made on the session. You didn't get the original reading – that blew. But then the fact that it did do this in the session is still a matter of record which can be picked up.

So therefore, accordingly, you could go back into the time track of an individual and you could get an emotional reaction for everything a person had ever been emotional about. Or you could get heavy reactions – it isn't that the reactions are necessarily heavy or soft – but you could get reactions about what a person has been emotional about that he is still emotional about.

Now, get the slight difference here. One is simply the impression on the time track of having been emotional. Well, you'll get a – you'll get a needle read on that. And the other one is a moment on the time track when he has been emotional that he is still emotional about. The thing has never been cleared up, in other words. And the difference between those two reactions is one will fade instantly, the first one – he has simply been emotional about something; he is not still emotional about that thing, that's long since gone, you will simply get the *whooh* on the needle – that needle's going to move, just contacting the earliest point or the point when it occurred, see, you are going to get a needle reaction.

But the other thing that you're going to run into, if it is still current, it will repeat. It doesn't blow through just being contacted – it now repeats and you can get more repeat. Well, that means it has ridden forward in time and has never been resolved.

I just make this point to you. As an auditor you are only interested in those things which the individual has never resolved. You're not interested in just those things which he didn't resolve. You get the shadow of a difference between? He didn't resolve it, so what? He never did find out how to get along with his commanding officer, but – he never did – but it's not riding forward in time with him. It isn't even capable of being restimulated, therefore it will read once and go *bvop* and it flattens; see, it's right now, it's out. Now, you could revivify him or regress him to that moment in time and start running him through incidents which are
not in restimulation and oddly enough you could get some built up that would go into re-
stimulation.

As an auditor you have considerable power over the mind, you see, you can do some
interesting things with it. So, there's two reactions here that you are interested in: There's the
reaction that simply was there and isn't bothering the fellow – it hasn't ridden forward in time
with him, but you can get him back to it and it reacts on the meter; and the other action is one
that has not only been active at the time but is active now without any difficulty whatsoever.
You don't have to go back in time to find this thing. It's going to react right away and the only
meter difference that you will see between those two reactions is that one, the one which is
still with him and is riding forward in time with him, and so forth, that one is repetitively
reading. It will read and it will read again and it will read and it will read again, you see?

When you are checking out things you have to make sure that you've got something
that will repeat. One of the main faults that you make in R6 is that you do not ever ask for the
repeat read. Well, I wouldn't give you two nickels and a collar button, anytime, ever, for a
one-read checkout – achtio! Now, do you see why? Is maybe you checked it earlier and it
read. Well, when you check it again, you might get the earlier read, you might get the moment
in the session when it read before. Do you understand?

So you are only interested in a read that will repeat itself. Reads that don't repeat
themselves have either blown, or they haven't ridden forward in time, anyhow, so the devil
with them.

If you can't get something to read twice, skip it. If you can make it read twice, realize
that it's riding forward with the pc and is therefore worrying him. Still worrying him to this
day.

Now, all of this is necessary technology, as elementary as that may be, that's necessary
technology to an understanding of how you would locate somebody's early confusions with
regard to an educational subject. Because of course he was confused; he was confused every
time he attacked a new point on the gradient, but he unconfused afterwards. The meter will
still register those moments of first confusion, but they will register as only ones,

This, then, I have to tell you so that you can see and evaluate the observation. And
then you get used to this and then you get some subjective reality on it, you realize what I am
telling you is true. "Yes! Oh, he was very confused the first time he looked at the letter 'A.' He
didn't know what that was – that was – yeah." Well, you get a read – one shot, see? You get a
small read there on the needle, the needle moved.

"What about the confusion about the alphabet?"

"Yeah, the letter 'A'."

Whoom! – the needle moves and you say, "All right, now about the letter 'A'," and
there is no motion. He isn't still confused about "A."

But let's take this bird now and we say, "What about the letter 'A'?" and it goes
whoompf! Now it's done it once. "What about 'A'!?" Whoompf! "Well, how about – how
about – can you tell me something more about being disturbed about this formation of the
letter 'A'? Whoompf! Now, you suddenly realize this bird can't write, see? You just – from your various observations of the pc, you've suddenly remembered having observed this, see? You didn't need the observation until that moment, but this guy can't write. Well, you want to clean up his writing. Well, let's find out what underlay that confusion.

Now, ARC must have preceded all misemotion and bad reactions. You don't have a bad reaction unless there has been ARC in the first place. There's got to have been ARC with something in order to make a bad action occur. You've heard me say that often enough. Well, all right, how about this – how about this confusion? Do you address the confusion in itself? No, it's just sort of an out-of-ARC subject. It's never the confusion that the person is supposed to be in, by himself and the Instructor and that's why education breaks down.

Now, let's go over that again. It's not the confusion that the student is trying to learn and the Instructor is trying to teach him. If they are having any difficulty with that at all, then that's a guarantee that it isn't the right confusion. You can just chalk that up with a great big red mark. Student can't learn it – you follow me? We're talking now about a heavy reaction here, not just a little old light brush-over – the student can't learn it, and the Instructor can't get it through the student's head.

Now, what are we looking at? We are looking at a lower point on the gradient which was skipped, getting back to what we were talking about in the first place. Here's this point on the gradient that he didn't master and then went on to the next point. With that next point he had enough confusion to cause him to be overwhelmed and he never did get that point. And when you look it over on the meter, that's the point you're going to get. You're not going to get the original point – you're going to get the next point on the gradient.

So, one of the sneakers that made this very difficult to solve was the fact that the thing the student is apparently having trouble with is never the thing the student is having trouble with. And you can save yourself a great many Instructor hours if you recognize that and get a good grasp on that, in actual fact. Now this, of course, follows the pattern of the mind, doesn't it? If the pc knows what is worrying him and if he is worrying then – if he's worrying – then that isn't what he's worried about. See, we know that. If you know all about what's wrong with you, that isn't what's wrong with you, brother, because of course, that would as-is and cease to be wrong with you. That's elementary, see?

So, this applied to education gives us this other weird look – that this same set of data applies in the field of training. And what the student is very confused about and unable to move forward into and what the Instructor can't seem to teach this student is not then the right point of address for instruction. That must then immediately, just by that adjudication, that must be the wrong point of address. And the Instructor just pulls off of that and takes a better, longer look at this situation. See, that's elementary, see?

Let me give you an example – this becomes – this is terribly elementary, very, very simple stuff. You can very easily overlook it: one, very easily not credit that this has got this much jolt in it. I know an Instructor in a slight state of shock at some of the results that he's suddenly getting applying some of this material, you see, on a student. "And did you know...?" You know, that sort of thing – didn't realize it was that strong. A Theory Instructor is checking out a student on a bulletin and gets to paragraph three and decides the student
can't pass it. But the student has been having such a dreadful time that the Theory Instructor decides that this student had better have a little bit of instruction. He's not going to give him a pass on this but he just – quite ordinary – he's just tired of having him foul up on this particular point. The student there can't ever seem to get beyond this point, see? So he says, "Now-now-now-look, look-look-look-now. Can you get the idea that bla-bla-bla-bla," and he takes up, you see, the third paragraph. And the student gets all foggy, and the Instructor says, "Now, just a minute. Let's see, how can I put this a little simpler? How can I put it a little easier?" See, the Instructor actually is reaching in the right direction, but he's still staying on what the student is supposed to be confused about, that's the mistake he's making. "But how can I get this a little simpler? Now, how can I get it a little lower on the gradient?" Now this student can't get it and the Instructor can't teach him.

Now, the first thing you should know at once is that we're one or more steps beyond what the student was really confused about. Now, it goes this elementary; you then go back and find what word in the second paragraph – which obviously has been handsomely passed – the student didn't understand. And it may not be a Scientology word at all. It may be some common English word, just like that. And all of a sudden, why, the student says, "Oh."

You see, this is not prior in time just because it's the earlier paragraph in the bulletin, it just happens that bulletins happen to be written more or less on a gradient. That's why you get the apparency of the earlier moment then.

But they've actually gotten to this point then and they didn't grasp the lower point of the gradient, so the upper point of the gradient is just hvuurr! And the moment they get into this upper point of the gradient it's, "God!" You know? And the walls are getting closer and there's little bright spots appearing in front of their eyes and they feel sort of headachy. It's physiological.

It's no wonder the French over there – of course in a harder time, during Napoleonic times we could have said, "Who cares how many Frenchmen get killed?" do you see – but today we shouldn't have that calloused attitude and we ought to do something about the French educational system because they drive more students to suicide than you could easily count. They're specialists, specialists at making students commit suicide. The American university leads in as a close second. They just disgrace the fellow and send him down to skid row, if he errs. If they've made the mistake of too fast a gradient, then they condemn the fellow. Crazy! You get how severe this is.

This gets into – here is another salient point, I should not just interject in here, but I should give you full blast, is: Study can produce a physiological reaction and it can produce some pleasant ones and it can produce some confoundedly unpleasant ones. You can have some of the wildest physical reactions just from the fact of study that you care to have anything to do with. And this isn't just studying Scientology, man, this is studying how to paint barns – and it's not for nothing some student will be sitting there at his drawing board or something like that and he'll be getting more and more – he'll be getting more and more and more and more spiny, and he feels sort of weird and he's making himself spots in front of the eyes. And he's making himself sick trying to study any further. And of course, if he's being pressured forward against time, for a final examination, he cannot sit back and go for a walk.
in the park, he can't do anything like that. He's got to sit there and wrap the towel around his head, don't you see, and swill up the coffee and of course he's just keying himself in like mad, he's tearing himself to pieces, and so forth. It's no wonder.

Well, what is the trouble with him at that moment when all this happens? Well, the trouble with him is not what he is studying, it's what he has failed to study, just before. This is always his hang-up. When you get a physiological reaction you've got a skip on the gradient, that you can be absolutely certain of. You've skipped the gradient. You are all of a sudden going into something or other, and you are studying how to lay sticks of wood across a path in order to subdivide the thing and measure it up to be concreted or the number of grains of potassium bichromate that you're supposed to pour in if it is a British manufacturer as opposed to American manufacturer and you say, "What's this?"

Now, it isn't just a missing datum. Don't get that idea, see? It isn't a missing datum. It's something on the subject of the mixture of chemicals or – see, it can be an analogous – it can be an allied subject where a more fundamental datum is or exists on… See, the gradient was skipped on an allied subject, see – or it was just the paragraph ahead of this in the text. See, it's not always the paragraph ahead of this in the text.

Sometimes the fellow all these years has wondered, "How do you really measure something when it's of irregular shape?" you see? And, "How-h-ow-ha-h-a-w?" And then all of a sudden he's got this thrown in his teeth, you see? "Well you measure out this concrete walk and you so forth and so forth and now the calculus which is superannuated on this subject, is so on..." and he's trying to understand the calculus – he's trying to understand the calculus – and trying to understand the cal – .

There's nothing wrong with the calculus. He doesn't know how to measure a walk – and he's been keyed in by some sentence that went right along with what he thinks he's worried about. It's right there next door – only it's a blank.

And you know, the whole subject goes blank? The whole surrounding area goes blank. It's like you shoot the top off one skyscraper and the whole town disappears. I mean it's that peculiar a phenomenon, see? You say, "Well, how could that whole page disappear?" You know, or "How could that whole textbook disappear?" If a student is having very heavy going he will have words vanish off the page.

I just had an experience a very, very short time ago; I was trying to look up a word in the dictionary that was included on a page which I was having a hard time coming to grips with, and you know, the word had disappeared out of the column and I said, "Come off it now, it couldn't possibly be missing out of this column. It must be in this dictionary!" And – specialized dictionary, and so forth, and I just sort of gritted my teeth and concentrated me eyeballs on it and, by George, it was right there. And, you know, it hadn't been in the column a moment before? [laughter]

In this particular instance, I however, know what I don't quite understand, I know what I have skipped doing and I've got to go ahead and do something about it, because it's just getting more and more and more into my road. I do not know so that I can bark them off, the complementary absorbing colors by rote. I can't tell you every color combination which ab-
sorbs every component of white light, except one, you see? That sounds very complex, doesn't it? It is! But it's this kind of an action.

But going on and studying beyond this point, which I went ahead and did, because I just didn't sit down and figure out a color wheel and get it all down within an inch of its life – it's lost back there. See? I crowded on past it. Now, somewhere in the vicinity of that is a non-comprehend. I have got that bit of noncomprehend pretty well spotted but that isn't what I'm studying now and that isn't what I'm having trouble with. I'm actually running into a point where things are disappearing off a page, much less headaches. But just going beyond this, beyond this – well, there's something back in that area. It is very easy and so on, but nobody has made one of these wheels; there isn't an illustration of one which gives it by complementary colors in this textbook. And there are no wheels that give you primary colors in terms of what absorbs "not them" from white light, see? What absorbs "not them." No list of what doesn't absorb them, so that would sort of have to be compiled and I'd have to sit down and draw this whole thing, I'd have to memorize all of these points of the thing and then I know I would have it straight.

And about that time when I started to do this, something would fly up and hit me in the teeth like, "What the hell is cyan?" see? "What's this cyan? What shade is cyan? I always thought cyan was blue, obviously it is not blue. I have all my life been told by medical examiners that when you fed somebody cyanide they turn blue and..." See, here is a big bunch of confusion going on here and there is probably some foolish word like that kicking around in that area someplace, so I'll just have to go back and look over this area, because I know when it began, you see? That is I know the point that occurred before it began.

See, you can get clever enough to spot where are you at. And all you have to ask yourself or all you have to ask a student, "Where weren't you having trouble? Now where are you having trouble? Good. It's at the end of where you weren't having trouble." See, that's very simple, isn't it? So the formula is that you find out where the student wasn't having trouble with the subject and that meant that he had gone that far on the gradient successfully. And then find out where he began having trouble and you pick it up right at the tag end of where he wasn't having trouble and it lies in that immediate area. You can actually circumscribe it within a few words. I mean, you can do it that precisely. You can pinpoint. You'll have the half a paragraph that it's in or you'll have – sometimes you can get it down to the half a sentence that it is in and then you start plowing it out. But don't expect the student to be able to tell you exactly what it is that he is having trouble with, because that's why he is having trouble with it.

So, instruction would consist of guiding a student along a gradient of known data. It wouldn't be inventing new solutions to the student's confusions. You start inventing new solutions to a student's confusion, you're just going to get in more and more trouble. Why? Because you are already giving him – he has already got something he doesn't comprehend, now you're going to give him an incomprehensible that solves it.

Good instruction is a system of backtracking. A student will go forward – you can almost leave that on automaticity. He will go forward like a shot bear. Zarroom! He'll go into a subject. And all of a sudden you'll hear these – you'll hear this loud screak and the paws are
smoking, you see? Then you hear a thud you know? And then you feel the atmosphere around
you shake. There's something happened.

Well, exactly what did happen? Well, he went right over the top of one point on the
gradient, thought he understood it, didn't understand it, went into the next point of the gradi-
et and ran into a brick wall. So the trouble with him is, it wasn't the next point on the gradi-
etent, the trouble with him was that last point on the gradient that he thought he understood, but
didn't. So therefore, it becomes very difficult with a student sometimes to spot this, because
he's so positive that he understood that last point. Yet the evidence that he didn't is sitting in
front of your eyes: He's having trouble with the next point.

See, this fellow says, "Oh, I learned how to sit in a chair, I learned how to sit in a
chair." You're teaching a Comm Course, see? "I learned how to sit in a chair. I know all about
that. It's sitting in a chair and looking at somebody in front of me that is absolutely impossi-
ble! That's terrible! I can't do it anymore!"

You say, "Well, let's see." Here – here's… In the absence of this technology, one's re-
action might have been, "Well, let's see, how can I fix up a drill here to get him to look at that
student?" Now, you see how that would lay an egg and extend his training? See? "Now, how
can I figure out something whereby he can confront this bird?" Nah-nah-nah-nah-nah – this is
not – you are at the wrong point of the gradient, see?

Here's just a practical application. You say, "Well now, it's about sitting in a chair, see,
that was – wasn't that the drill you had immediately before you had the drill of confronting the
pc? Wasn't that the drill, huh, wasn't that the drill?"

"Well, there was a little thing that came in between there," he suddenly remembers.

"What was that?"

"Well, that was sit in the chair comfortably and of course that's impossible."

"Oh, oh, there was something else in this thing."

"Yeah, well, anybody can sit in a chair, actually you can force yourself to sit in a chair
for hours."

"Well, how do you go about sitting in a chair?"

"Well, you sit in the chair and you bring your heels together, you understand? And if
you bring your heels together hard enough and press them in, you can press the calves of your
legs out against the outer sides of the chair and you can keep yourself awake and erect."

What the hell is all this?

See, knowing the principle of undercut on the gradient, you see, you would find that
out. But if you didn't know the principle you would just keep knocking your brains out, trying
to train this person how to confront another human being. And they haven't – they actually
wouldn't have any trouble confronting somebody else except they are trying to confront two
things at once. They are confronting keeping their heels together and they're… See, they ha-
ven't learned how to do that and now they're trying to confront something else at the same
time. Their attention is split and they are starting to get very headachy. And then you find out
there's something wild about it they haven't understood, like: "Well, why do you audit in a chair?"

"Why? How should you audit?"

"Well, couldn't you audit lying in a bed? I get very tired auditing." You see?

All kinds of wild little things come up. You don't pay very much attention to what they've got to do. You don't try to solve those things. But these considerations have got to get into the fresh air. Now, all of a sudden we've got this fellow – he suddenly looks this over: "Oh, you mean you just sit in a chair? Oh, you – oh, wait a minute, that takes some doing! Oh! What do you mean, just sit in a chair? Just sit in a chair! No, you can't just sit in a chair! Impossible!"

"All right. Now, just tell me what's impossible about it." You don't even have to be an auditor to instruct, see? I mean you don't have to do a lot of clever auditing: "What's so impossible about it? What's impossible about it?"

"Keeping your back two-and-a-half inches from the back of the chair, and so forth, is impossible because you have to keep – well, actually, you have to keep measuring if it's two-and-a-half inches, don't you?" [laughter]

It's pretty hard to believe until it has happened to you, but the whole next paragraph after the sentence which contained the word one didn't understand, can just disappear right out of this world. It can do the wildest piece of disappearing anybody ever saw. It just vanishes. Almost a white piece of blank page and try to check the student out on this and you can check him out on the whole bulletin, but, by George, there's no paragraph there; no subject matter there of any kind whatsoever. You run that back, you'll find out there's something just prior to that collision they didn't understand. And if they didn't understand that with great violence then you must realize that it's just before that; and you start running some student back, I don't know quite where you're going to wind up. Well, I wouldn't try to wind up outside this lifetime, but I don't know quite where you would wind up. Become interesting what would go on.

Now, there's the primary mechanism of study. A study is a con... a study – I almost used a five-dollar word – I will use a five-dollar word – is a concatenation of certainties. It's a string of certainties. And these are a string of confidences and competences. There are many, many ways to promote these feelings of competence and confidence, and so forth, but the best way to do it is just a head-on thing of just making sure – not that the student walks slowly, but to make sure that the student walks certainly. Don't hold somebody back because you're not sure he's walking certainly.

The other point is, is *always* let a student get into trouble before you help him out. Don't ever help out a student before he's in trouble. This guy is doing his Comm Course drills right straight through to the bitter end, he does them like a little wound up doll, everything is beautiful and smooth and so forth, well, what are you trying to do – find something to train? I mean, what are you going to do, rack this guy over until you can find something – till you create something that can be wrong? Or why would you – why would you do anything with
it? See, I'm just making the point: Why would you do anything with this? Your participation is not invited there by any difficulty. You see, why worry?

And that is one of the reasons why study uniformly spread across a group is a mistake. See? Students run into trouble that the Instructor doesn't detect and other students aren't running into trouble and they just try to make a medium average of trouble for the whole course, the whole class, you see? Well, the way to do is to let a student run into all the brick walls he wants to run into and the only thing you've got to be alert for is a student who has run into a brick wall. Now, when he has run into the brick wall, recognize that he has hit a gradient, hit a stage or a point beyond where he didn't understand something; elementary.

And the next must is: Don't ever take up with him what he doesn't understand. It's a waste of trouble – waste of time. He doesn't know what he doesn't understand. Always cut it back. "What were you studying immediately ahead of this?" Same formula I gave you before, "What moment there weren't you in trouble?"

"Oh, I wasn't in trouble over this and that, and so forth, that was all easy."

"All right, what moment did you get into trouble on it?"

"Oh well, it's – oh-oh-oh – terrible and terrible and terrible, oh-oh-oh-oh-oh..."

"All right."

Now, you've made a bracket there, haven't you, you've got parentheses; you've got the point of no trouble and you've got the point of trouble and now you must recognize that in the dead center, between, you will find the real trouble. Now, the clever Instructor, knowing this, could spot it right on out. Actually he doesn't have to be terribly clever, but it's a matter of "All right, you say you were doing fine with this bulletin right up to this," and we finally spot it.

I would even go so far, if I were having a lot of trouble, to slam the guy on the meter. Meters are made to be used. And I'd say, "Now, you're doing all right on this first paragraph, you're doing all right on the next paragraph and you say you ran into trouble here about paragraph five. Well, let me look at paragraph five; yeah, there is a typographical error there in paragraph five. That's perfectly correct, there is one. Now, let's see, you had number four – number four, you didn't have any trouble with number four, paragraph four here, which starts so-and-so and so-and-so; you say you didn't have any trouble with that?"

"No, no, I didn't have a bit of trouble with that."

"All right, now let's see, let's get down toward the end of paragraph four – paragraph four here; now, will you please listen to this sentence: 'So-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so...' clang! What is the meaning of the word 'disability'?"

"Oh, well, Christ! Nobody could define 'disability'!" [laughter]

You got the idea? It isn't even that any big mental quirk sits behind it. No vast amount of case has to be taken into it. He just doesn't dig this word, man! Why he doesn't dig it, we don't even care, but he doesn't.
Now, what's very interesting is this is one of the first points of research, 1947, is the influence of a mislearned word on a life and that was the point of research. I'd picked up some of this from Commander Thompson on association of words and there are numerous other things about this, but I had jumped to an unreasonable assumption about this. As far as I was concerned it was relatively provable or unprovable, but it was relatively nowhere. They talked about association, they talked about this, they talked about that. Then I assumed, "Then it must be that a word will make somebody sick." Well, what could be wrong with a word?

So I started tracing backwards and getting people to redefine words and that sort of thing. I won't say I had any remarkable luck because there was no auditing technology that went along with it, but believe me people were sure interested. I wasn't using any method of testing at that particular moment that would have given me what the result was if it was.

I lost a lot of people I was working with. I know that's a direct result. That is to say, they walked out and went back to work, and so forth, and didn't turn up in my office anymore. But that still didn't demonstrate very much for that period, because it wasn't well followed up. I didn't have somebody on a telephone to call them all up and say, "Well, why didn't you come back the next week?" You know? But those that I did contact on the thing, "Oh, I feel fine now," or "You know, it's really something else that's worrying me these days, it's the fact that I haven't got a job in Mexico," or something, you know? Certainly what was worrying them ceased to worry them, that was about the only thing I established out of it.

Now, we find GPMs and the tremendous mass and significance mixed up with those and we must assume then, that all significances expressed as symbols – words, that is all significances expressed as words, which of course are a symbol of a significance – are locks on the GPMs. We know what's at the middle of this hurricane now. Now, we walk back and we take a look at this thing and we are going to find out that any word that you handle which is not in the GPMs is in actual fact to some degree a lock on the GPMs.

And if not on actual GPMs, certainly on implants. They got the best of all words covered. Very heavy locks, capable of producing a considerable amount of commotion in somebody's skull piece. Your skull bone could throb for quite a time. See? So when you got a – when you get yourself a – when you get yourself a good look at this, you recognize then that this is a symbological effort and one of the first reactions is simply become afraid of all words; then the next immediate action after that is to – well, to say, "To hell with it," and become very stupidly adventurous about it; then eventually fall back into something sensible, like don't stand around and chant a known end word at somebody's face for half an hour. Not that you will do much to them, they might be stuck elsewhere on the track, but you certainly louse yourself up. [laughs]

So, when we – when we examine this broad subject of teaching somebody something, we are examining the subject of relaying data to a person, which he can receive and understand in such a way that he will be able to use the data – the definition I gave you the other day just stated to fit in with this exact rationale that we are discussing now – and of course all of those are being done with words – words, motions, actions or examples. But there's some words mixed up in this.
So, when you get words on a bulletin, when you get words on an Instructor's comm
line, when your words are going over to one of your students, well, don't be so sensitive about
the Scientology vocabulary because, listen, you can make as much catastrophe in not naming
a distinctly different part as you can in naming one too complexly.

I ran into an example of this in this parallel course of study: "Basic lighting" and "ba-
sic profile lighting" and I got toward the end of the book on portrait lighting with which I'd
had terrible trouble. All the way through I was just running into trouble on this thing, trouble –
trouble and somehow or another getting through and getting it crosswise and getting it
straightened out, and so forth. And I found out the sin there was that they had called two dis-
tinctly different things with the same word, "basic." And I was called upon, I said, "Now wait
a minute" I said to myself, "before I take this exam, I better review what I've got here. The –
let's see, there's three types of lighting, and one of them is Rembrandt and one of them is but-
terfly and one of them is… I can't think of it! Now let's see, let's go over this again," and then
I remembered that all the way through I had sort of dimly been… this is just different patterns,
positions in which you put lights, not to hang you up on those things. Fancy names, aren't
they? Rembrandt and butterfly: makes a butterfly because when the nose comes down it
leaves a little shadow underneath the nose and you could imagine it to be a butterfly, see?
[laughter] And when the photographic lighting makes a little shadow underneath the nose, why
the pro calls it butterfly lighting. And Rembrandt is the face plane nearest the camera is
less lighted than the face planes further from the camera but not line lighting – but this one is
less lighted. It's very pretty – very pretty lighting, but those are – there are not very many –
there are not very many ways you can put lights together. Here's these two; and what's the
other one? What's the other one? I can't think of it, what's the other one, you know? Oh, well,
I'll go back and study it over again, so I study it very, very carefully, study it all the way
through, study it, study it, look it over, now I've got it all, I've gone back, good. "Now, there's
three kinds of lighting there. Wait – Rembrandt and butterfly and... where did it go?" I look
down into me head, have I got a 'ole in me skull these days? 1 And finally I said, "There's
something very funny going on here," because I didn't quite know anything like at that mo-
ment, because I was studying study, I didn't know the power that a messed-up definition could
have, you know? And I went back and I looked and I looked and I looked and I looked and I
looked and I finally found what it was.

It's – there's a whole school of lighting, a whole system of lighting, known as basic
lighting. It's just elementary lighting. You've got two lights and you shine one on the front of
the being and you shine the other one on the side. That's all! And the ways you do that and
the way his head is turned or shoulders are turned, while you're doing that, gives you this
whole school of lighting. There's nothing fancy about it. The other two are the fancy lightings,
but this one, which you simply – almost says, "Turn light on the subject," I couldn't get and
that was because under butterfly lighting there is a type of lighting, called "basic profile light-
ing," which everybody realizes is a butterfly lighting, but all professional photographers call
"basic profile." So, under butterfly lighting we have a kind of lighting called basic profile, but
over here, under this other, this whole class of lighting is called basic lighting. And because

---

1 NoT: said in a Cockney-accent. Correct Engl.: I look down into my head, have I got a hole in my skull these
days?
they hadn't sufficiently had a differentiation in their nomenclature, they didn't have enough terms in other words – louse up, total confusion, see?

Well, that was the Instructors' confusion that was the people who were teaching your confusion, because you obviously were going to fall into that trap. They just dug a pit, put a stake at the bottom of it and covered it up with leaves, man.

And you've got one right now. Now, prepare for a little line charge. You've got an insufficiency of nomenclature. I know you'd never dream you had, but if you figure how many things there are in the mind that you—that you already have, you realize there's not much nomenclature for it. When you realize the few little things in the mind that the medicos had and the vast array of nomenclature; we've got a tremendous number of parts and things in the mind and not much nomenclature. And actually we don't have enough nomenclature and that would be the last sin in the world you'd think you would accuse Dianetics and Scientology of, but it's true. And you will agree with me in just about a split instant.

There is a thing called an ARC break assessment and there's a bypassed charge assessment and hardly one of you monkeys have ever been able to tell the two apart or do either one of them. And I've lately watched you falling and falling in more pits and walk into more bear traps on this one subject than you can shake a stick at. Because a bypassed charge assessment is not an assessment. It's an auditing by list and the name of it should be "Auditing by Bypassed Charge Lists" or "Auditing by List for Bypassed Charge." It's not an assessment.

Now, you've begun to believe, you see, that an assessment is something that doesn't have anything to do with auditing and that's true. An ARC break assessment has nothing to do with auditing. You simply sit there and you reel it off, with your pc usually gritting his teeth to powder. And you finally see your meter react and you indicate the bypassed charge and you don't answer and you don't acknowledge and you jolly well had better not. If you value his sanity or yours on R6 material, you just sit there, man, and you reel this thing off and you find the bypassed charge and you indicate it right now. It's usually done in the middle of an ARC break.

If you audit a person in an ARC break you will put him into a sad effect. So of course it can't be auditing! But unfortunately we have instantly, immediately afterwards, called a thing a bypassed charge assessment by which you take the same list but treat it differently and the person is not ARC broke when you have done it, so that is auditing.

And this has been a source of enormous confusion to one and all, apparently. Why? Because both terms have the word "assessment" in them. So it's an inadequacy of nomenclature. There's a missing word, you follow?

All right, so that's all the trouble you are having with regard to it. There isn't— the trouble isn't any worse than that, see? You can see that you could audit— auditing by list has to do with cleaning up each question, after all that's the Joburg and that's these things and you just read the question until it's clean. Read it and get it answered till it's clean and you go to the next one and you read it and answer until it's clean. Auditing by list. You can take the R6 list and you can do this with it.
So, we had the same list, which gave a confusion and we had the same word attached to a process which gave a confusion, and so forth. So it's very, very hard, oddly enough now, to get auditors to do this. Well, that's funny, that it gets hard to get auditors to do this. Therefore, it must have a subtractive or a detractive action in excess of merely being misdefined. They couldn't do it; Auditing Supervisors were walking around in circles, "Now, look! Please do an ARC break assessment on this pc, because he is blowing," and so forth. Come back, here is the fellow busy auditing by list, you know, doing a bypassed charge assessment, you know, cleaning up everything, listening to the pc, you know and so forth, all this sort of thing, you know? "No, no, no!" You know? "Read the thing down the list and when you find the charge, and so forth, why, indicate it to the pc and that's all there is to this."

"Oh-oh, I see."

So, in other words, a term can be confused by being used for two different distinct purposes. You could enter confusion then with not enough nomenclature. As a matter of fact it's probably, in the field of the mind, has been a more serious sin than too much nomenclature.

Because the things were named in identification with one another. Do you follow me now? You've got this type of response? So of course, that will very shortly, as soon as I get around to pushing out a bulletin, that will very shortly become, of course: ARC break assessment is done so-and-so and so-and-so and not auditing; and then there's Auditing by List for Bypassed Charge and that becomes a completely different action. Now, you'll find out that's teachable.

So, we've covered now two things here and these two things are: If you take a person up the gradient too steeply he will get lost at some step always because he is confused about the prior step and he will blame the step he is lost in, while being stuck, in actual fact, in the step he really didn't get out of – , and that's what makes it a masked area and which makes it upset; and that the responsibility for the subjective reaction of the student in a very large measure lies with the Instructor. Boy, that is a new departure, see? The student's attitude, and so forth, is really today with Scientology and what I am teaching you here, right in the hands of the Instructor.

If you want to, you can almost produce the mental reaction you want to at will. You could blow a student off a course. It would work both ways – I'm not saying you'd do this, but this fellow is on course and you blow him off the course. You just with malice aforethought say, "Well, all right, we're going to blow him off the course."

One of the ways to do it is say, "All right, now two people sitting in the chair there; they are actually both preclears and they are actually both at the same time auditors and there is no particular difference between the word 'auditor' and the word 'pc,' and so forth, and they really don't mean anything different at all. All right, very good. You got that straight now? Good." You won't have him there in about 24 hours, if he's green grass off the street. See what I mean? You could overtly produce that reaction.

All right, now some guy is blowing and just as he leaves and you say, "What word was it that I didn't get there?" You will find out he'll stop moving, because you've already got part
of the charge, see, just by indicating it's wrong with the words. All right, he'll stop exiting, in other words. "Now let's trace it back. At what moment did you get confused?"

"Well, it was in the last half-hour."

"Good, what happened in the first half-hour?" see?

"Oh, well, it was that word."

"Very good. All right, thank you very much."

"Oh, is that what that means?"

"Yes."

In other words, there's handling of the guy stays or the guy goes. There's the Instructor creating that effect or result with just the method of teaching he is using. Pretty sneaky, huh? You can get further along this line – there's more to learn on this particular subject but that is – but those things stand out like a beacon. The earlier gradient – the earlier part of the gradient – is the one he's fallen down on.

Now, we get to the other section of it is – it is really always a word or phrase. Now, of course a word or phrase can be inadequate. I've got one going right now. I – nobody has bothered to tell me why they use a yellow filter in a certain combination and in all the illustrations here sits this yellow filter. What is it doing there? What does it have to do with something? I don't know. I haven't been told. I've not been demanded – it's not been demanded of me: Why is a yellow filter there? But yet, that is serving as just a little bit break there. I know there is something about this I don't know.

So, you see the sentence could be inexplicit or it could omit the data or accidentally deprive somebody of the information. A typographical error will do this. The word "cat" is missing in the sentence: "The dog chased a." All right, now we say to the student, "Now, all right, let's tell us what that action is." Well, he's confused. Well, you certainly don't have to go very far afield to find out what he's confused about.

So, the fault actually could be with the text, as well as with the student, if the text is not explicit by reason of typographical error or by some other reason, and so forth, the information is not relayed to him in an explicit form, so then he gets confused. So, it isn't always his fault that he is confused, don't you see?

You can sometimes take a hold of the text he's been studying and just take one glance at it and all of a sudden see that two paragraphs have been omitted out of it. They are the paragraphs that define somebody. You see, somebody made a mimeograph copy and didn't copy two paragraphs, you know? This corny. You see that all words in an auditing session are defined, except "auditor" and "pc." This is liable to bring about a certain amount of confusion.

So, the upshot of the thing is that your confusion is not necessarily the fault of the text, it's not necessarily the fault of the student. We're not trying to fix blame in this particular line. We're just showing you that there was something not understood. It might also have been the fault of his first grade teacher, see? She never told him what some little word like "reciprocity" meant, or something like this. And we've got – we've got ourselves, then, a good look at this. It's treated on the basis of "these are the factors which you must observe as an Instruc-
“Now, you can put those things together. You can see why he didn't attain the gradient or you can ask him why he didn't. You can locate the point where he didn't move from one point of the gradient to the next point, you can isolate why he did this.

We can see that nomenclature and other things could be responsible for this. Lack of definition could be responsible for this. We can see lack can be responsible for it as well as an existing thing can be responsible for it. And we see also that the individual would not have really a clue about what he was confused about or he wouldn't be confused and we see that the Instructor who is doing the best job of instruction is actually never trying to solve the problem of what the student is confused about. We see the good Instructor would never do that. Why? He's already one gradient late, so he just gets more confused than the student, because he can't understand why the student can't understand, see?

It says, "Cats are sometimes white."

"Yes, but I don't know why they are white, and so forth. Actually didn't – didn't Ben Franklin say something like that? I'm not sure whether Ben – I – uh – where – what is this – where-where-su-su-su-dah…"

"Well you see, cats – well, did you ever see a cat? Did you ever have a cat? Uh-uh-uh-do-do-do you – do you know anything about cats?

"Uh – let's-uh – let's go get a dictionary and look up a picture of cats." It's all a waste of time because it happens to be in the earlier paragraph where it said "feline." See, he doesn't know what that is, see? He didn't know that applied to cats, but he hung up on this earlier one.

So the appearance of his confusion is almost never the confusion he is actually in. An Instructor knowing this won't have any real difficulty answering the foolish questions he is asked, and so forth, because he just never bothers with them.

He wants to know what's going over the top. But somebody asks the Instructor the definition of something: "Yes, yes," he says, "a caterwump is a – ba – and that's all."

Okay?

Audience: Okay.

Good enough, thank you.
CONFRONTING

The first requisite of any subject is the ability to confront the various components (things) (parts) (divisions) of the subject itself.

All misunderstandings, confusions, omissions, alterations of a subject *begin* with failures or unwillingness to confront.

The difference between a good pilot and a bad pilot depends of course on consistent study and practice, but underlying this, determining whether the person *will* study and practice, is the ability to confront the components of study and airplanes.

A "quick study", by which is meant a student who learns rapidly or a person who grasps a subject quickly, has a high ability to confront that subject.

In a dramatic profession, the wild animal trainer who could confront wild animals remained alive. The one who couldn't confront was too slow of perception to live long.

In a more common line of work, the *fast* typist could confront study and typing in the first place and the slow typist couldn't and can't.

The confusions about "talent" and "native ability" and such are resolved to no small extent when one recognizes the role played by the ability to confront.

Basically, if one can just be there with it, he can *then* achieve the skill of communicating with whatever "it" is and handling it.

Thus, before communicating with the components of a subject can properly begin, one must be able to be there comfortably *with* the components of the subject.

All power depends upon the ability to hold a location. To communicate one must be able to hold to a location.

This is even true in the physical universe. You can't move a chair unless you can hold a position yourself near the chair. If you don't believe it, try it.
Thus the ability to communicate with precedes the ability to handle. But before one can communicate with something one must be able to be in a location near it.

The age-old puzzle of how some scholars can get "A" on a subject they have studied and then not be able to apply even a scrap of the data is resolved by this fact of confronting. They can confront the book, the class and the thought. But they haven't attained the ability to confront the physical objects of the subject.

At least such "glib" students can confront the book, the paper, the thought. They are partway there.

Now all they need to do is confront as well the physical things to which the subject is applied and they would be able to apply what they know.

Some people are not so lucky as to be "glib" students. They have to work up to "being there" with the book, paper, classroom and teacher.

Thus "confronting" is actually the ability to be there comfortably and perceive.

Amazing reactions occur when conscious effort is made to do this. Dullness, perception trouble, fogginess, sleep and even pains, emotions and convulsions can occur when one knowingly sets out to be there and comfortably perceive with the various parts of a subject.

These reactions discharge and vanish as one perseveres (continues) and at last, sometimes soon, sometimes after a long while, one can be there and perceive the component.

As one is able to confront one part he then finds it easier to confront other components.

People have mental tricks they use to get around actual confronting—to be disinterested, to realize it's not important, to be sort of half dead, etc—but these discharge (run out) as well eventually and at last they can just be there and comfortably perceive.

Eye blinks, swallows, twitches, aches, pains, are all systems of interrupting confronting and are the symptoms of discomfort. There are many of these. If they are present then one is not just being there and perceiving.

Confronting on a via (using a relay point) is another method of ducking out of it.

The worst off cannot even tolerate the idea of being there and perceiving anything. They run away, even go into emotional fits rather than be there and perceive. Such people's lives are a system of interruptions and vias, all substitutes for confronting. They are not very successful. For success in life depends not on running away from it but by being there and perceiving it and then being able to communicate with it and handle it.

**TERMS**

"A gradient scale" means a gradual increasing condition of, or a little more of, little by little.
A "skipped gradient" means taking on a higher degree or amount before a lesser degree of it has been handled. One has to go back and handle the missed degree or thing or else one will have just losses on a subject thereafter.

"Flattening" something means to do it until it no longer produces a reaction.

"Overrunning" something means accumulating protests and upsets about it until it is just a mass of stops. Anyone can do anything forever unless he begins to stop it.

"Invalidation" means a refuting or degrading or discrediting or denying something someone else considers to be a fact.

GRADIENTS

Some of the things one would have to be able to be there and perceive in order to study, placed on a graduated scale of increasing difficulty are:

- Beginning at all.
- The classroom or work space.
- Paper.
- Books.
- Writing materials.
- Sounds.
- A Student.
- The Supervisor.
- The area of the study subject's physical components.
- The motionless equipment of the subject.
- The moving equipment of the subject.
- Masses connected with the subject.
- The subject as a whole.
The next stages would have to be confronting while moving. This requires a consecutive being there and perceiving even though one is occupying different locations.

The next stages would be confronting selectively while moving despite other things seeking to distract.

This Bulletin is not an effort to set out the numerous confronting drills. It is intended to set out the various axioms or laws necessary to an understanding of the subject of confronting itself.

From these brief notes all the axioms can be derived.

The fundamental and basic simplicities of confronting itself is the first thing that must be grasped. All complexity surrounding any subject or action is derived (comes from) a greater or lesser inability to confront.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH: sb.nt.rd
I'm sorry to keep you waiting today. We were testing out the walkie-talkies we will not use on London Airport. Imagine, using walkie-talkies on London Airport, you know, with the radio control tower. We have a rig up so that we can handle photographic flash lamps at a distance with a little walkie-talkie – very tricky. And we're getting very cunning. And the – I can just hear it now though: "Impact pictures coming in for a landing on the north runway. What is our aperture, please?" [laughter, laughs] Very funny.

The difference between professional and amateur photography is a chasm wide and you have to go at it in particular wild ways on the professional front. It requires permission of nobody less than the Ministry of Aviation and that sort of thing, in order to move, practically, in the vicinity of aircraft in England, and so on. Have to produce credentials, you know, like a deck of cards and all that sort of thing, so forth. The ministry has granted us permission to go up and shoot the incoming landing of a hypothetical student, you see, so that all of your views of the airport and what you saw of England, and so forth, that's what I'm going up and shoot, in two or three weeks, just for fun. So those snapshots you took that didn't come out, I can give you some copies. [laughter] That's snide, you know? I'm showing you the proper Scientology attitude toward a learning or beginning Scientologist, you see?

All right, what's the date?

_Audience: August 11th._

August the 11th, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Okay. And we're going to resume our lectures on the subject of study and the more I talk about study the better your grades get, and so this is very fine. This is one of the most successful lines of lectures I think I've ever engaged upon – most productive of cata... cataclysmic and colossal results – really fabulous. So that I have not sweat through – "You take the sodium bichloride and you put it into the bichromate and you get bisulfite, because it precipitates negatives," you know, and so on...

I remind you that about late spring I decided to study study and find out what study was all about and so on and go on along this particular line – and – now, talking about study, your grades keep going up the more I talk about study. Well, that's very interesting, because I'm not restimulating you; study doesn't happen to be an end word. There is an end word, however, called _knowledge_ and this will bang your head off occasionally. But it is not directly
connected with words and so forth, and isn't the basic reason why people have any difficulty at all with study.

All right. There is no particular reason then that knowledge should get in your road because the *casus belli* (as the hootch dancer said) is a very, very deep-seated thing called "words." Now, you may even think there is an end word called "words," or something of the sort. But of course, all GPMs are composed of words. They're actually not composed of English words; they're composed of significances which are connected to masses. These masses are very capable of pushing somebody's 'ead off. And where you have precise significances – and it's quite interesting how precise these significances are – where you have very precise significances, you don't get too much upset. In other words, don't look at it the other way to; don't look at it on the basis that if you avoid end words a hundred percent you will make it, see? That's actually the incorrect look; it's the locks which do you in. The offbeats, do you see?

Now, you really shouldn't be terribly concerned of – about this as a Scientologist. The electrician gets used to handling 10,000 volts, the circus performer thinks that it's quite nothing to pat lions on the nose – I call to your attention that the public at large look at an electrician handling some voltage lines, or something like that, and they're horrified, see? And you look at a lion trainer in a cage – they hate to be called lion tamers because those lions are never tame; a tame lion is the last thing you want around, you see? So they want good, savage lions. Patting those on the nose and so forth, the public looks and they say 'Aaghhh!' But as a matter of fact, they would feel rather uncomfortable if they didn't have some big cats around to snap whips at, you know? I mean the lion trainer would. This is the life he lives. And the public at large, not being initiated into this, of course, is horrified and properly stunned by the lion trainer's association with the big cats in the cage.

Clyde Beatty, for instance, used to fight forty lions and tigers simultaneously, mixed. And I should imagine that he lay off of that for a few days, why he would have felt very, very poor, you know, he would have felt bored and life would have seemed uninteresting to him.

Now, there are many other professions and many other activities, and so forth. You wonder how in the name of God a dentist can stand there pulling teeth day after day after day after day. Fantastic, but he can. You wonder how a surgeon can stand there cutting out guts and throwing the offal in the garbage can hour after hour, you see? Year after year. How come? What are all these things? Well, these things are what is known as professional familia-rities. And if you get familiar enough with a particular subject, it may look terribly dangerous and upsetting to somebody else, but is not really dangerous or upsetting to you. This is quite remarkable. In any particular field or activity one is apt to become quite superhuman.

That is what's being demanded of you in Scientology. I'm not talking about whether you get better or whether you become Clear or OT or anything else; I'm just talking on a very down-to-earth, rock-bottom sort of an approach. GPM words are the lions, the high voltage, the various other professional danger points with which you live in Scientology: the words, the words of the GPMs and that sort of thing.

Now, you take these words and you go out and throw them in the teeth of the public out here, see? You can actually watch somebody turn green if you stood and chanted at him a
root connection of some kind or another, just wove it into your conversation four or five places, and so forth, kept telling him that he is – he just wants to be wrong, you see? He wants to wrong things, and so forth. Just keep going at it, you know, you – "Wrong this and wrong that" and keep pounding it into him and all of a sudden he'll start "Yeah-ah-ah." Well, he goes – walks out someplace and falls on his head – true! And he's liable to get quite ill and that sort of thing.

All right, well, he's just not used to lions, do you see? He couldn't even trace it back to why he feels so ill; he knows nothing about this. Well, this is a rather happy area to be a professional in; because life is – consists of livingness, and livingness has a lot to do with the mind. In fact there wouldn't even be anything here to live in, or any living to do, unless a mind was around, you see?

So the business – the business of being in the business of the mind, and so forth, has liabilities. But it has, of course, a great many things that are very good. And when you start fooling around with GPMs, you know very well you can knock your head off – you know very well that this is not something to lightly fool with. You know very well what they can do to somebody. You see somebody around on crutches gimping around, he's got arthritis – arthritis exclamation point, you see, and so on. What's the matter with him? Well, he's just all wound up in a GPM someplace; that's really all that is wrong with him. If even – even if it's an engram, why, it's held in place with a GPM. That's the way he lives, that's what's going on with...

All right, why is this couple having an awful hard time maritally? Well, they've just got a couple of end words crossed up one way or the other; one is riding one hobby horse and one is riding the other one, you know, and that sort of thing. Well, if you tried to explain it to them that it was an end word that was doing this sort of thing – you could probably slip it off of them on a meter, if you didn't try to explain it to them. This – well, just let's take a couple of hypothetical end words: let's say that he was "conservative," you see, and she had an end word "wild." Now, these two end words won't mix and they are both in high-blown howl, you see, on this subject. So he's being conservative and she's being wild.

All right, never the twain shall meet. So the upshot is that they're going to lead a very unhappy life. Now, you could probably, without their ever finding anything out about it really, pick up that it was "conservative" on the meter; probably get his considerations about being conservative, have this end word blow. You could take ahold of her, you could probably pick up "wild" on the meter, particularly if you had the total prearranged list of end words, you could probably key it out, get her considerations on this, and so forth. They'd walk out of there perfectly happy with each other and a miracle would have been performed. They would never be able to trace it even back to a word. Their ability to recognize what has happened to them – even that is far below their familiarity level. They have no familiarity with this thing, you see?

You've heard people go around and say: "Well, it doesn't matter, sticks and stones may break my bones, but words can never..." Oh yeah? [laughter]

Now, the liability – the professional liability of the Scientologist – is the fact that he's dealing with significances and he's dealing with masses; and you connect the right or slightly
wrong mass with the right or slightly wrong significance and you get this mismatched one way or the other and you get catastrophe, and that's the way life – she is lived.

And you want to know about "What is human behavior? What are the basics – elements of existence? What makes matter stay here?" The con... physicist out there, he is busy studying conservation of matter – or conservation of energy rather – he's busy studying conservation of energy – conservation of energy. He is just going on with this, on with this, on with this. Oh, he's just riding an end word, man. And he's riding himself into the ground. Sooner or later – why he's going to strike "to kill all energy" or something of this sort and – as his interpretation of a GPM and build an atom bomb – something like this. He's got to do something, you see, in this particular line. He gets – he becomes obsessed along the line.

There are GPMs that have to do with pictures. I am very well aware of the fact that there's a whole series of GPMs that I haven't run, that have to do with pictures. And since I became aware of this, they don't have anything to do with me skull. You know, they don't knock my head off at all. Once in a while I find myself studying something and they have said "pictures" about five or six times too many in the paragraph and I find I have a tiny headache begin to grow on me, and I say "Oh." Look at the paragraph: "Oh!" you know, gone. The – this – this situation, then, that could have wrecked empires – one end word crosswise, you see, could have wrecked an empire – to you becomes a minor discomfort. You find you have a bellyache and you – something like this – and you've been processing somebody or doing something – you find that you have a bit of a stomachache and you wonder what – "What's the stomachache?" you know? Afterwards you notice you got a stomachache. You suddenly realize you've been invalidating an end word. That's the quickest way in the world to get yourself a stomachache.

You think, "Maybe there is an end word 'women'?" Well now, if you invalidate that you're probably all right because there isn't one; GPMs predate the idea of men and women, but there is one "bodies." And supposing you've got one "bodies," don't you see? And you invalidate the idea of bodies, well, you're going to have yourself a nice stomachache. You say there is no end word "bodies," when there is an end word "bodies," and of course, about that time – it sometimes takes minutes or even a half an hour or two, for this to begin to sneak up on you. "What was going on, what was going on?" you say to yourself. "Well, let's see, about a half an hour ago I was studying about bodies, I said they didn't exist. Tuh-huh! Well, I now know there is one end word anyway called 'bodies'." Total reaction.

Somebody else's reaction: "Oh my God! Call Doctor Cutwin! Ohhh! I've got to have an operation on me esophagus or me stomach, or something of the sort. I've got to have something drastic done to me, because look how drastic – in what drastic condition I am in!" Don't you see? And an incomprehensibility way down below any level of knowingness on this thing, they become the total effect of these things.

For instance, we just upset numerous Scientologists down in Australia because we had to fight back against the Laborite Party. The Laborite Party was the one who proposed the bill to outlaw Scientology in the state of Victoria. So I decided that they had lived too long and they don't come to the inquiry very much anymore. They as a matter of fact found out that Scientologists could cause them to come within an ace of losing all the seats they had. I wrote
out a little pamphlet and I've carefully put in it the exact proper end words. [laughter] This was circulated – this was circulated – they came within an ace of losing their lives in this election and that was it. But of course, some Scientologists down there who were afraid to shoot at somebody and who weren't in the know, and so forth, continued to write me on my Standing Order Number 1 line: "That was a terrible thing to do." They didn't know anything about the end word, that was – see, they are not trained up to this – not oriented in this area yet, "That was a terrible thing to do, because you really shouldn't put entheta, you see, on a theta line, like a nice Scientology magazine." And it's all – and they're sort of protesting, you know, that this pamphlet that came out and was generally issued in Australia against the Laborite Party – was issued at all.

They don't realize what they're protesting against. Some of those end words hit them; they aren't trained, they aren't in the know, and so, of course, it made them feel kind of queasy and they want to know who wrote it. Well, I haven't told them yet, I wrote it. But it produced the exact effect that it was supposed to produce, which, "to drive those dogs back in their kennels," and it did exactly that. They are much less enthusiastic these days. As a matter of fact, they are becoming sorrier and sorrier that they ever started this inquiry and that is the proper effect to produce on somebody who is attacking you is just make them very, very sorry that they attack you. That's the proper way to handle it in this universe, see?

United States government is getting into that frame of mind now on the E-Meter case, see? They are beginning to sit around and wonder why in the name of God they ever lost their wits to such a degree as to start this thing in the first place, because they can't prepare a case, because none of their facts are correct and their charges are all wrong and they're silly, but if they let this case go to court, they let themselves in for a recovery of damages that may run into the millions. They're now in trouble. Well, how do you make people in trouble? Well, you just make them sorry they done it, that's all.

Now, the psychiatrist and psychologist and so forth, are very busy in the world today on the field of motivational research, what they call motivational research; very interesting subject. I recommend to every Scientologist and particularly people who are engaged in promotion activities, something – in organizations, to read a book called Hidden Persuaders. Now, that is a very interesting book. Although it tries to make mock of the idea of "hidden persuaders," and so forth, down in between the lines it gives you a very thorough dissertation on the techniques now being used by modern advertising agencies and other people engaged in reaching the public. And they hire these days psychiatrists and so forth, to do motivational research and find out a bunch of goofy facts. Well, most of their facts are goofy because they don't know why people are. They don't know what make people tick and that sort of thing.

But if a Scientologist reads that, particularly a Saint Hiller and particularly somebody who is moving around in the vicinity of Class VI, see, he reads that – now just reinterpret that whole thing. They've laid a foundation, they've got a beautiful piece of music, they've got no words to the music, don't you see? They've got a marvelous idea that maybe they can influence and affect people one way or the other but they don't know what words to put to the tune. They're still groping around in their Freudian analysis and trying to motivate soap by getting a libido complex going on the age of three, see? They're trying to restimulate something one way or the other in order to sell their soap. And they haven't got the buttons, let me
put it this way, you see. They're playing a piano without any keys. They're still making noise on it. I don't know how they're managing it but one way or the other they're making noise on it.

Now actually, that is one of the highest paid activities in the world today – is the world of advertising and merchandising. That is the high – one of the highest paid activities in the world today. They are pouring out a terrific avalanche of money into the pockets of psychiatrists and so forth these days in order to find out what makes people tick. Of course, they're not on basic – really basic research. They're still flying around in kindergarten stuff, don't you see? But here these fellows are, trying to reach the public, trying to sell products and so forth and they have turned to the psychiatrist and psychologist in order to give them the answers. Well, they turned the wrong way and like any other boot soldier in an awkward squad, why, they'll probably get booted for it. They lose money on this every once in a while and they make mistakes.

But you start adding that up – if you really know the mind – and you wonder then that anybody would ever have any difficulty with dissemination.

Now, this material, of course, is a debased – I mean, this type of use is a debased use of this information. It would debase your knowledge of the field of the mind just to use it to sell somebody some preserved piglets or something, see? This is silly, see? This is something like using a Mercedes car to crack walnuts. This situation, then, is not – not recommended to you as an activity.

I'm simply pointing out some minor activity that's going on in the world today that is absorbing a great deal of money from the manufacturers – that has a bang – tremendous bang from each magazine. You turn on the TV set, you are looking at motivational research. You turn – open a magazine, you're looking at motivational research. You open up a newspaper and read its ads, you're looking at motivational research. You can look at an election, you realize those candidates in that election are running by motivational research. As a matter of fact, Eisenhower won the campaign in the United States when he was elected president because of the work of an advertising agency in the field of motivational research and they found that the country was starved for a father image, so they set him up for a father image and of course he got elected. Actually he was a pretty good father image, if fathers do nothing but read Western stories. But they set this boy up in that fashion.

Now, that's the way the world is moving. Now, if you want to know – if you want to know how to live calmly in the midst of a tremendous confusion all you really have to know is the answers – the basic answers; and if you know the basic answers, these things ninety percent of the time don't worry you and the other ten percent of the time you can do something about them. Do you follow me?

Knowledge is something that is achieved – end word or no end word – it is something achieved through study.

Now, the whole subject of words booby-traps a person's effort to find out what's going on, to find out what the world consists of. Words – it's a boobytrapped line: significance. What is this? How do you find out about anything? Well, you're going to find out something about something these days with words. Information is going to be relayed with words; you're
going to find out about things with words and those words are booby-trapped. They match up the GPMs – the woof and warp of the mind. They’ve got the mind pushbuttoned.

Now, the mind is terrifically push-buttoned so that if you are reading: "The cat was black," and feel queer or feel repelled by this statement, "The cat is black," if you don’t know what you’re doing, you simply are repelled by the subject of studying "cats," or of studying or acquiring knowledge about "cats," or anything of that sort of thing, see? In other words, you’ve got a barred line, because you read the statement, "The cat is black," you feel odd, therefore you say, "I mustn’t study about cats," see? Actually, it has nothing to do with cats; it's the word "black" happens to be an end word.

You nearly always find yourself assigning to the wrong part of a sentence or the wrong part of the study material the reason why you can't study it, because the other is something one isn't confronting and one doesn't feel he can confront, so therefore he disperses and confronts something else.

Now, that is the basic principle you should know about knowledge and study: One, that even if you are simply looking at a tree to find out something about the tree, you are studying a tree. I don't care how briefly this is done, study isn't something being used here in connection with being very, very thoughtful and thorough, and so forth. You look over this tree to see what kind of a tree it is. Well, in that brief instance you've studied the tree, don't you see? In other words, you observed it to find something else out about it.

Now, you can pick up observation from the printed page; that's a secondhand observation but it nevertheless is the route on which almost all knowledge travels, since if you, individually, were called upon to re-evolve all the knowledge there was from the beginning of the world until now, all by your little ol' lonesome, you'd wind up stupid in this lifetime. I don't mean to be harsh, that's true. If you were called upon personally and individually to evolve all knowledge there was about anything, in one lifetime, you would get so little way upon that route – you understand, that's without having any other person relay anything to you, without having at your fingertips any works, texts, any reference books of any kind. That you were just going to have to do it all on your little ol' lonesome by thinking it up and evolving it, and so forth, and you were going to evolve all the knowledge and you weren't going to have any receipt of information from any other secondhand observation. In other words, you want to learn about volcanoes, well, you have to go and find a volcano. You would get so little done on this project that you would die stupid, I can assure you of that. Or you would be a ruddy fool and believe that you knew everything there was to know about the one room that you had been in that whole lifetime. Do you follow me?

So there is a value to secondhand knowledge. Now, firsthand knowledge, of course, is acquired by direct observation and experience. But even to achieve direct observation and experience, it is really much better to have the fruits of other observations and experience with which to profit and only in that way can you maintain and carry forward a culture of any magnitude.

Illiterate cultures do not survive and they are not very high. The natives of the tribe of the Bugga-Bugga Booga-Boogas down in Lower Bugga-Wugga Booga-Woog are mostly no longer with us or they are around waving red flags today and revolting against their central
government. They're having a bad time. Well, the British Tommy that went down there with his Snider or his Lee-Enfield and brought them higher education in the first place – was only occasionally followed by anybody who taught them anything. And they didn't learn fast. Their literacy was not up to absorbing culture rapidly. So, of course, they can be victimized by anybody who comes along.

Once the line is open, if literacy doesn't follow and if secondhand observation is not available to a people, they stultify, they die, they go to pieces, they degrade. They are struck by this tremendous volume of exterior culture. They've been very happily down amongst the bong-bong trees, you know, dancing up and down amongst the bong-bong trees and the highest level of their interest, and so forth, was their own back yard. They could tell you all about bong-bong trees and they could tell you all about you mustn't step in bug-bug bushes, because you step on a thump-thump snake and this was their direct observation.

The second they're hit with things – particularly the abstract ideas of organization – the abstract ideas of political philosophy – the abstract ideas of, really, engineering – things of this material nature where knowledge is moving in close to the MEST, you see, where the significance is immediately, directly applicable to the manipulation of matter – when they move in on that, of course, their culture fails. They are not able to turn out Lee-Enfield rifles. They are not able to organize themselves into a proper democratic civilization, no matter how many lend-lease payments are thrust into the paws of their greedy politicians. They can be victimized, they can be turned into slaves and they can be degraded.

What's happened? Well, they've been overwhelmed and presented with this tremendous cultural image. Here's this great, shiny civilization, you see? It's full of Cadillac cars and jet planes and electric razors and all kinds of wild things; and they look at this material animated world; they see people have conquered their environment to the point where they can live at leisure and where they can do various things and where some girl can – with a few push buttons can control 125 horses as the most usual thing that she ever did in her life. You understand? In other words, she can drive a car.

All right, all of these miracles all of a sudden hit these illiterate fellows, see, all these things! They don't know the words, see? They see the tune, but they can't sing it. And they go into just overwhelm – boom! They just cave right in, see? They just back right up.

Somebody who is fully trained in Moscow has also been trained: "Your brethren at home are pretty uneducated and if you push this button and that button and that button, they will respond and all of a sudden bring down the house and then we will be able to seize the whole place and get all the jute we need."

I mean, the ethical and spiritual nature of communism is very interesting, you know? They're out of jute, so they put their political mechanisms into – run to get them some jute. Their interest in South Africa is simply and entirely the fact that they need diamonds and they want gold. I mean it's very spiritual. They love mankind for what they can get out of him and the way they play their violin is just about as cold-blooded as anybody ever did, see? But it's mainly based on the fact that people don't know the words.

And you look at a communist array of vocabulary, you look at a communist vocabulary, it's very interesting vocabulary, it's very tricky. Their technology – their political tech-
nology – is worked out to one of the finest hair splits you ever heard of. Boy, they know how to talk to this one, they know how to talk to that one and they know how to argue with somebody else and they know how to put together this and they know the parliamentary control of a small meeting. And they're taught to do this and they're taught to do that and they know how to shuffle the motion down to the bottom of the pile so it never gets heard and only the motion which they want heard is heard. They're just taught this very carefully, you see? Technology – technology – they're all taught this with words. They weren't in on the 1917 Revolution. They got the whole technology right straight on up the line by being taught it, by it being relayed to them with words, much as I'm relaying to you information and ideas with words. But it's all secondhand, it's all hearsay and for those boys it really works. They are taking the world.

I see people standing around with their hands in their pockets in these Western governments, and so forth, not knowing what is going on, and it's something like a big, strong bull being chewed to pieces by a pack of small dogs. And this bull – he knows that a small dog can't do anything to him and so he's tried to ignore him – he tries to go on – he tries to do this. The next thing you know, he's going to be down with his throat cut. Well, he doesn't understand what they're up to and he's above knowing. Something like this, you see? All kinds of attitudes mix into this. He's deficient in knowledge of communist technology, so therefore he is being defeated by communist technology. It's very, very interesting that this technology is relayed by word of mouth. It's taught. It's not by direct observation, but it's material that can be put into direct observation by the communist – trained communist here and there.

The world today is being overwhelmed on the basis of illiteracy; the illiterate people of the world are being overwhelmed. It's always this, see? It's the fellow who doesn't know, it's those who do not understand, it's those who haven't got it taped who get knocked into the wastebasket. The death of a civilization is based upon its accumulated not-understandings – not-knowings – its ignorings – its failure to grasp the situation. It can also drift back into too many yesterday's clichés like: "Well, the barbarians always come down on the northern frontier and go home at harvest time," you know? And one time they didn't go home at harvest time and that was the end of Rome, see?

Rome at that time was illiterate on the subject of illiteracy: the barbarian. They didn't realize that their people had become very effete. Part of their information was missing: that a people who wishes to be free must not just know about the latest wine. They've got to know pretty well across the boards about most everything in sight. They've got to keep on the ball, they've got to keep on the qui vive, they've got to be right up there and alert.

The day that marks your death is the day that you sit back and decide you know everything there is to know about everything there is around you, so there is no reason for you to observe anything anymore.

Now, between the two points then of "no observation necessary because I know everything," you see, and "no observation possible because I don't know any of the words," there is a mean which makes life livable. You get what these two extremes are now? One is: "I know there is everything to know. I know everything there is to know – I needn't observe anything. I needn't really experience or do or look at anything because I know all there is to know." Now, that would be the end product of a dying civilization or a dying individual. And on the
other extreme we have the: "Don't know any of the words, don't know anything, don't understand anything that's happening in my vicinity," and so forth, and that's a very fast route to death, demise and decay, see?

So the thing to do is to know the words and to stay alert. That's the motto one reads out of this thing. And you'll find out there's always some new technology being boiled up someplace. Well, be curious enough to find out about it, see? Stay alert. Never become complacent about what you know and you'll go right on surviving very nicely.

Now, this is particularly true of somebody who gets up to a point of eminence or prominence, somebody who moves up to a point where he is superior to the ordinary or more average individual in his vicinity – he tends to become very complacent. A fellow is living in the vicinity of Ugga-Bugga and he can read and they can't. Well, he feels very superior, so he really doesn't even bother to read. Do you see? Now, if Scientology faces any danger, it is that danger of stultifying because they no longer believe they have to observe, no longer have to apply, no longer have to get on the ball.

Now, you want to know what's the difference between the successful individual and the unsuccessful individual: It is just that one can understand and do and the other one doesn't understand or doesn't... There are two ways of not understanding, as I've just told you. One is to suppose you know all about it so you don't have to observe; that's one method of not understanding. And the other is just not know the words, you see? Those two extremes are there. So, the individual doesn't understand and he goes off into a – in other words, he doesn't understand, so he quits trying – or he understands all there is, he thinks, and so doesn't bother to observe. Now, those two actions there amalgamate into a fellow who – either one of them – who is going to fail. This individual is going to go by the boards.

Now, who won't go by the boards, then? Well, it's somebody who can observe and understand and do – a person who can observe and understand and do.

Now, in view of the fact that the greatest body of observation is actually secondhand observation, realize that that is perfectly valid observation, when coupled with understanding – but that is particularly and peculiarly liable to having to be understood. Now, the less direct the observation then, the greater the understanding has to be. In other words, your understanding has to increase to the degree that you're not directly observing. Understanding has to increase in the degree that the observation is indirect. If your observation of a tree is indirect, you'd better jolly well understand about that tree, pretty confounded well. As a matter of fact, much better, oddly enough, than if you were standing there looking at it.

Now, understanding then is a substitute for mass and you have the answer to understanding in ARC. Understanding adds up to ARC. In study, understanding is a substitute for mass. Now, let's go over that again: If you haven't got a tree to observe and you are being told about a tree, then you'd better jolly well understand what you're being told, otherwise you're going to misobserve the tree. Now, if you don't understand what you are being told about the tree or you don't understand how the information is being relayed to you about the tree, you will wind up not understanding a tree and have been denied that mass, because the information received on a via. Do you follow this?
This is very complex material I'm giving you here, but is quite useful. If you can't – if you haven't got a tree to look at, then you jolly well – if you are trying to study about trees on a second relay, then you damn well better understand that second relay.

Now, there are two things to understand about what you're being told or what you are reading or what your secondhand observation is. See, secondhand observation can be after the fact because of time, too, you understand that? You say: "There must have been a tree here, because here is a stump," you know? "And there's going to be a tree here, because here is a sprout." Do you see that? That your understanding also can go forward and backward in time and it can be direct or indirect in terms of view. So understanding can be direct or indirect in terms of view. You can be there looking at the tree or somebody can be telling you about the tree. So there's two – there's actually several different understandings all in a packet.

Now, that's not to our purpose, right now, to examine how many types and brands of understanding there are, but I'm just warning you on this fact with regard to study and this is the only point I'm really trying to make to you. The other is just window dressing and cake frosting. It's interesting, the whole subject is very interesting, but it's this: If you are not observing something directly, if you are reading about trees – you got that? – you're not observing it directly, then your understanding has to be superior to the understanding which would be required in a direct observation. You've got to be more – you've got to understand it better, otherwise you're going to lose yourself a tree.

Now, this is quite interesting, because the difficulties of secondhand information are innumerable. You've got four men trying to describe an elephant, four blindfolded men that have felt all over an elephant and they're trying to describe this elephant or whatever that old saw was, don't you see? And the wise men that give you all the dope of what an elephant is all about, you know? And they didn't observe the elephant because they were blindfolded and they gave the most wild dissertations on what this elephant was. So now, let's realize that part of our understanding when we are engaged in secondhand observation – which is to say study on a via or something – we are engaged upon this – then our understanding must include an evaluation of the reliability of the information we are being given. You follow that? Our understanding must include the understanding of whether this is good dope or bad dope, whether this is the straight data or this is – got a – data with a curve. In other words, we have to be capable of evaluating the truth of the relayed observation. Understanding then, must include that.

And there is where the bulk of sentient beings – I won't just say man, because there are other sentient beings – fall down, and there is where they get crosswise, there is where they really have a time.

Well, I'll give you a marvelous example: There are people walking all over the place today and so on and so on and they think that everything in the field of the mind is all cared for. "See, when a little child is three years old, why he got – he got excited about something or other, he's been sick and that's why he's in the insane asylum and doctors understand all about this and everybody understands it and so forth and yah, yah, yah, the problem's all cared for." Well, we're in that state of the civilization where they say they're not only saying, "we know," they're also saying, "somebody else knows, and we don't have to know."
hey, what's this? What's – what kind of apathy is this? "We don't even have to know anymore. It's all right that somebody else someplace knows, that there are some authorities someplace on this subject."

I quote Eisenhower. He always depended on having an authority. The best source of information was always an authority on the subject and he never did anything without – he consulted an authority and it went along with this that he didn't have to know a blessed thing about anything.

There was never even a communication signal corps unit to keep him advised on moments of national crisis or anything else, when he was out playing golf or anything. There was no information lines ever run through this man. He got his national policies out of Newsweek. He did! He'd gotten to a point of where the expert was a newspaper reporter. Well, I admit newspaper reporters are pretty good and they all think that if left up to them, they can straighten everything out in a minute, but it seems rather interesting to have newspaper reporter policy being the dominant policy of a nation. They might really be trying to sell soap, you see? It might be motivational research entering in here, you know. You couldn't really trust that piece of information.

So, part of your understanding is what you're understanding – the falsity or correctness of your data sources – or what you're trying to understand.

So, study has as part of it, comprehension of the accuracy of your source of information and you've got to have some idea of that. And that's an experiential line itself. You say, "Well, this fellow tells me what he believes to be true and if he no longer believes it to be true or if he finds something else is true, why, he will tell me." Something like that.

You say, "All right. Well, that's that source of information and that's a good source of information. There's this other source of information, if he tells me something, why, he's just confoundedly certain that he's got to shove it down my throat in some particular line. It might be right and it might be wrong, but he will continue to tell me just because he has to be right." Something like this, you see?

Since I've just gotten through three textbooks – three textbooks written by a professor at Columbia University who never had color film in his hands in his life, I'm sure, who was writing on color photography… I had to study these and I had to know my business. I was going to be examined on this. I shot more color film than this man ever heard of. But here was a case where I had to study something to get a grade. I understood that. See, I understood the fact that I had to study this in order to get a grade. You get the subtlety then of the study that went on.

Also began to be understood this guy loved to show off. He loved to show off; he would introduce some ninety-dollar word of a technical nature, which wasn't included in any dictionary, into the middle of a sentence where it didn't have to be. Oh, boy, if that doesn't throw you. Now, right in the middle of that sentence you've got a word like "colored couplers." He says, I quote, "We are now going to introduce a new term, 'colored couplers,' which I will explain later." He never explained it. You look up in the photographic dictionary. "What is this thing: a 'colored coupler'?'" And you can't find it. It's not in there. You look everywhere and you can't find it. What are you supposed to do? Just lie down and die at this
point? No, your understanding has to embrace the fact that the silly ass didn't know what he was talking about, if nobody can define it. Well, maybe someplace somebody's going to define it but it includes **you don't have to know what it is in order to continue.**

Now, that is also a very interesting thing to do, because you go past one of these points of understanding and you know you're going to have trouble; but part of study is to know the technology of study and to know if you start developing a headache in the next half page it's because you didn't understand that word. Do you understand?

In other words, your understanding of understanding can get very subtle indeed. You can get very, very tricky. You are reading about the engineering works of the early Egyptians, which have been written by a modern engineer who is also a lecturer at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and should have been flunked for English. He can't write – maybe he can build bridges, but he can't write. (If he's teaching at MIT, he probably can't build bridges either.) But anyhow, there he is and you want to learn something about the bridge building of the early Egyptians, see, and this thing is strewn with words that have to do with stresses and strains of various kind and torsional – gahhh! And then when he really wishes to be clear, he all of a sudden gives you four paragraphs of solid integral calculus, without giving you what any of the letters he's using in the integral calculus refer to.

I've got a book on color reproduction upstairs, written by some Englishman that did this. It's marvelous. You get simultaneous equations, of all things in calculus, and this is supposed to explain something. Of course, what I did was not worry about the fact that I didn't understand it. I just laughed in his face via his textbook. In other words, I wasn't so obsessed on the line that I couldn't skip it and I was sufficiently informed on the subject of study that I knew if I ran into a liability of having skipped it, I knew what the liability would be, see, so I could go back and run it out if it got in my road. In other words, I could walk through this bunch of bayonets. Do you understand?

**Audience:** Yeah.

Well, you could get that clever about study, see?

All right, well, that's actually going to high school before you get to kindergarten, really, on the subject of study, but I'm showing you about where it extends to. You can get clever enough to read an MIT lecturer's dissertation in full panoply of engineering terms on the bridges of the ancient Egyptians without actually looking up a single blasted one of his confounded technical terms and survive right on to the end of the dissertation and, what do you know? Know something about the bridges! Now you're clever.

The latest editions of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* require this as a fine art, because all they're doing is showing off to the people of the profession. They've been so criticized by landscape architects for their articles on landscape architecture, that they now have written a professional piece on landscape architecture. Nobody can understand it but a landscape architect. Well, a landscape architect isn't ever going to look it up in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. [laughter] And that applies to nearly all of their very professional dissertations. That's why I... They've changed their style.
The modern style is to become incomprehensible and to say, "Somebody else knows about it," and then try to impress it and leave it all skipped and then, you know, say, "Well, if you're not an expert you're nothing – and there are experts around, so we're all perfectly..." It's all kind of a mishmash – decadence is what you're really looking at.

Now, I use an old 1890 edition. You read about landscape architecture in the old 1890 edition and it knew it was written for some fool that didn't know their nomenclature, see? You can find out what you want to know; but later editions, you can't. Soon that 1890 edition will become so antique, why, it won't be of any use anymore and then I won't have any encyclopedia left, see?

I'll have to do something desperate by that time, by – I don't know, substitute for it with some vast library of stuff. Oh – oh, yes. I know. Quentin's getting a whole bunch of textbooks and I'll keep collecting those. I've just solved it. He's getting all kinds of textbooks: The Boy's Book of Electronics, you know? The Boy's Book of something or other. You open these things up, it's actually "Integral Calculus Made Easy for 6-Year-Olds," you know. [laughter] Actually, they're way over his head. I don't know how anybody did that, but he does all right with these things. Crazy business! Yes, they're – they've got a penchant going that it's all right to make it easy for children to understand it, so I can collect a child's library and I'll be all set. That's what I'll do. Maybe the children can't understand it, but I will be able to.

Anyway, sources of information all add up, then, to comprehensibility and words form the woof and warp of any professional or technical area. Specialized words are used for specialized observations. Now, we move off into the field of specialized observations, as a specialist, which is perfectly fine. But where you are lightly tapping some field for just a moment's understanding and you collide with specialist vocabulary, you are lost at once. Now, it gives you an idea at once of the very unserious student of Scientology. One of the first things he does is complain about the nomenclature. Well frankly, we have less nomenclature than we're entitled to as a specialized field. Because nobody understood anything about the mind, how could they have any vocabulary about it? And they didn't have any vocabulary about it and if we'd used their lousy vocabulary, we would have misunderstood everything, because those words meant other things.

So actually, this bird stands around and starts complaining about our vocabulary. Now we know at once that he's not a serious student of Scientology. That's the first thing we know about this person: he's not a serious student of it. He's a dilettante; he wants to hang around the edges and pick up a few scraps. You recognize the brute now? He wants a few scraps. He really doesn't want it, because you've got to sweat for nomenclature, because the nomenclature is carrying with it a specialized understanding and unless you've got that specialized understanding, you will never get the technology.

Now, there's the difference between knowing about something and being a pro. There's a vast difference. And there's many a chap today walking around who is pretending to know a great deal about something who oddly enough isn't even vaguely educated in that particular field, and so forth. But it's sort of a "thing" to be a sort of a dilettante – that's a modern trend.
For instance, what's a medical doctor but a dilettante in the field of the mind? Really very much so! He's just — he's superficial — nobody. The effrontery of them! Six hours of lecture, they get up here on some hospital alongside of the Thames, as I have mentioned before; and this is their entire education on the field of the mind. But because they have a general practitioner's license it gives them carte blanche in the field of the mind. It sounds crazy, but it is true. That's what it is. So, the society at large is not — has gotten so dispersed that it doesn't mind calling somebody an authority who doesn't know anything about it at all. Because that is the authority on the field of the mind — he was taught for six hours.

This is their skeleton in their closet, by the way. This is why they raised the devil with us for so many years about how well we were trained, and so forth, and we actually — in any given week an Academy student anywhere in the world was learning more about the mind, in that week per hours of invested time, than a medical doctor got in his entire career. In one week!

Now, the effrontery of these boobs in trying to tell us that we were untrained in the field of the mind and so forth. No, no, we are not untrained in the field of the mind, we are practically the only people who are trained in the field of the mind. Now, there are other fields that are trained in the field of meat or neurones or something like this, as in psychology or brain surgery or something. But they are trained in the field of meat, they are not trained in the field of the mind. I'll give them that they are specialists on meat, all right! Somebody gets a bullet in his skull and so forth, they can probably do something about it. Well, all right, don't — let's not though pretend, because we can take a bullet out of somebody's skull, that we now know about the mind, because in the first place it didn't go into his mind — it went into his skull. Now, this was a slight difference, you see, in nomenclature.

Now, what I'm trying to bring home to you here, is there are various grades at which a subject can be approached. You can approach it as a dilettante: "Oh well, I know all about painting. Yes, yes, I had a course in art appreciation in junior high school, one whole semester. And the teacher stood up and showed us pieces of lithography on a piece of cardboard and — I got so I could call Rembrandt nearly every time. I got very clever at art appreciation, so I know a great deal about art." Well, that must have consisted of what? One or two or three hours a week, for maybe — I don't know — what's a semester? Sixteen weeks, something like that. Which made a total — he looked at pictures for fifty or sixty hours and now he's an art specialist. Well, of course, that's better than somebody out in the street that never heard of them; not much, but it's better. But it gives somebody the interesting idea that he now knows something about it, when he doesn't know a ruddy thing about it. It gives him a curious and very dangerous attitude to his own future knowledge. It gives him a false understanding. He now thinks he knows something about it. No, he knows the nomenclature of pictures. He doesn't know anything about art, he's never been taught anything about art. Nomenclature of pictures was what he would know.

It isn't really the amount of time invested that gives you this, although I've been mentioning time. It is more the seriousness with which it is approached. How much do you want to know about this? Do you want to know enough about this so you can talk about it? As would be very common on a Park Avenue debutante, don't you see? She could discuss art — how cute! At her coming-out party, if somebody happened to say, "You look like a
Madonna," why she would know they weren't necessarily talking religion, you see? [laughter] See, art, see?

All right, now let's move a little bit further into the field of art. Now, how seriously do they wish to approach this subject? Do they wish to understand something about this subject so that they just won't appear to be a dummy or do they want to understand enough about it so as to do something with it? Do they want to know how to use art to decorate a home? That is to say, how do you choose and match and hang pictures, and – you know, what do you do with these pictures, you know?

We could go, not necessarily further in that direction, but along another path: A guy wants to know about art because of the threatened inflation of the world, see? Threatened inflation. You can buy land and you can – which isn't very movable – and you can buy gold, if you can get your hands on it and you're not an American citizen, and it will grow in price as the money of the community inflates. Or you can buy art. And art today is big business amongst people who know nothing about it as an artistic activity but as a financial investment. And you would be amazed how big this business is. Well, does he want to know enough about art so that he knows whether or not the experts are cheating him? That's how far that fellow would want to go, see? He'd have to know enough about art to know who knew about art, so that he couldn't be tripped up in the field of art. Otherwise he'd lose his shirt, you see?

Or do you want to know enough about art to move over into the field and maybe teach people art appreciation. Let's go a little bit further; we'd have to know a little bit more about art, wouldn't we? Now we're getting the lower grade instructional levels. Or do we want to know enough about art so that maybe, if we were very good, we could sit down with a piece of charcoal and a piece of paper and draw a vase with a narcissus in it? Now, we say, "We've started back at the beginning again," because any kid in kindergarten is trying to draw a vase with a narcissus in it. We're back to the area of doingness.

I'll call to your attention that that little kid in kindergarten almost never connects. It's wildly wonderful what comes up that is supposed to be a vase and so forth, but they have what is called an "artistic talent" or they have this or they have that and nothing is more easily destroyed because it isn't based on knowledge or understanding. This knack will leave him. It will fly out from underneath his fingers if he does happen to draw something. Very easy to trip him up. A thetan is very naturally creative, but he's actually handling certain media that he doesn't know much about.

Now, you go into this again; you take yourself up a piece of black charcoal; you take yourself a white piece of paper and you set yourself down to draw a vase. Now your education begins. You know that if you change the position of your paper and the position of your head while you are doing that, you have changed the proportion of the vase. Well, now that takes some knowing, doesn't it? In other words, if you look at a vase close and then draw it for a while, you'll be drawing a big top, let us say, and then you sit back to relax and do the bottom and you've now got a small bottom; big top and a small bottom and it doesn't look right. But it looked all right to you. Well, your education on the subject of art began at that point: "You 'old your 'ead still. That something has to do with the point I view from and the
distance I view to, has something to do with what I'm doing over here on this sheet of paper."
Yeah, all right. Now you are heading for the long run, and you actually at that moment have
begun the path of becoming a pro. Now, even if you did it for fun, you would still be on the
path of becoming a pro.

What's the next thing you're liable to learn on the thing? Well, you're liable to learn
that if you draw one for one, it's dead easy, but if you try a reduction or an increase in size,
that is if you draw size for size, if you draw the vase on your piece of paper the same size as
the vase you see on the table, this is pretty lousy easy. But how do you make a one for one?
Well, you mustn't change the relationship of the paper or tablet to the table. It's easy as that,
you see?

Now, most people can't draw still lifes for very interesting technical reasons: they are
trying to do a reduction. They are trying to draw a big vase while looking at a little one, or
draw a little vase while looking at a big one; and as they shift, they swivel their eyeball from
the big vase to the drawn vase, they don't get a one for one size. See, they look at a big vase
and try to do a little vase and of course they can't get the proportion because the size is al-
ready wrong and this throws them. They don't know the easy route out, they don't know that,
"My God! That requires all kinds of wild mechanical and mathematical actions to take a big
vase and to do a little miniature vase of this big – oh man!" Now, you are getting "creak,
creak," see? Ah, dead easy. You set a vase over there and you get your paper here, and you
get – so the paper looks now the same size as the vase – and you take out your charcoal and
you draw the vase lines which you see there, the same size as you see here, you keep your
'ead where it belongs and you keep your tablet where it belongs and you keep your vase
where it belongs and you go scroomp-scroomp, put in a couple of highlights, scroomp. And if
you're not shaking with palsy, you will wind up with a nice sketch of a vase.

I'm just showing you, there's these little pieces of technology, don't you see? Well,
you're now on the route to being a pro. So, you might say that study which winds up only in
understanding is not without value and is a large part of the cultural pattern which a society
has. Study with no activity, let me put it that way. You don't intend to do anything about it,
you're not going to do anything about it, that's just cute, that's interesting, isn't that nice? A
tremendous quantity of the culture in which you live is understood to that degree and it's nice
to know those things – if you've got to know a lot of those things. For instance, you don't
know how to – have to know how to prepare or do the action of preparing an automobile, in
order to know about automobiles, see? But you jolly well better know something about the
action of repairing automobiles before you start paying somebody to repair the automobiles.
In other words, you're at a point of regulated doingness, don't you see? Your understanding of
it is sufficient so that you won't get gypped buying a "Mona Lisa," because Joe just bought it
yesterday, see?

Now, therefore – therefore, your understanding – widely in life can embrace a great
many things which you never intend to do. There's nothing wrong with that. But don't make a
habit of that, see? Don't make a habit of that. If you're going down some line, go down some
line, see? Don't stand around, for instance… Don't let some student – let me talk about Scien-
tology for a minute – don't let somebody who walks into your PE, and so forth, keep standing
around the edges of it. You'll find out they'll go hold meetings and they will talk endlessly
about Scientology, see? They couldn't define an engram if you held a pistol on them, but they'll talk endlessly about Scientology, see? In fact, there are groups all over the place that do pract... that do nothing else. They never audit, they never go into action of any kind whatsoever. Their command of the subject is merely an interest. Now, this is perfectly all right, perfectly all right, but don't leave them in a state of believing that they now know the subject.

That would be the cruel thing to do to them. They don't. They don't and they get confused to the degree that they think, now, if they do so-and-so and such-and-such, why, then this somehow or another fixes them all up, so they know all about it.

Now, it's at that point that a person's education starts to break down, because these people have dropped into what trap? It's just that one trap: "They know all about it, see, so life can go on." Well, they don't know all about it, they don't know your level of understanding of it. My God! You've been grinding away at it and slamming away at it and delving in it and getting comprehensions of it, and so forth, and you know how much there is there to know, man!

This character is saying, "Well, I..." so on. Well, if you followed through some of his logic, you would be fascinated. See, if you followed through some of his think and some of his statements and some of his doingnesses on this subject, if he did do anything on this subject, you would practically cave in with laughter at times, because it's so far away from anything you could imagine anybody interpreting anything like that as. It's just a gone proposition.

Somebody will say, "Well, I settled the dog, and I was using Scientology processing, and so forth. You know, I beat him." How the hell did we get over there, see? It's that goofy. But to let that person go on believing now, that he knows all about it, so therefore does not have to address it directly and seriously in order to achieve any doingness level in it, would be a very, very cruel thing to do to this person because he'd just have nothing but a failure. Here's this broad subject which is there, which if he did it at all properly, would give him results and he could go someplace and he could do something with this, do you see? But to have him sit there and think he knows all about it when he doesn't know anything about it, of course, is letting him fall into this other category.

Also, to put him in the position where he thinks he can't know anything about it because it's so vast and so difficult and – also is equally cruel, because you've artificially created the two reasons for the demise of an individual or a civilization. You've put him into a state of "He is not only illiterate, but he is going to go right on being illiterate." "Well, of course only a specialist could know that and so forth. And I don't see why you're asking for the definition of a word like that, because it really doesn't apply to what you are doing anyway. This is all pretty difficult, you know."

I never follow such an approach. Some guy – if some guy comes up and asks me hostilely about something or other, I can't guarantee what he'll get back. I'm – it all depends on how I felt right at that moment. If I felt puckish about it, he's liable to go off packing a headache. But if he – if somebody asked me and they really want to know something – of course, you know me – I tell them, bang! like that, the best I could. Even though I didn't have any hope of their really understanding what I was talking about, I would still give them anything I
could tell them that I hope might assist their information or understanding of it. I always do something for them this way and usually, if somebody's just asking for information, why I let it go at that. But if they're asking for help and so forth, I always give them something to do, not only give them a piece of information, or an insight into it, if I possibly can, but I always give them something to do, too. You know? And you'd be surprised how workable this type of an approach is. Of course, if they ask you something hostiley or be nasty, or something like that, why just pull the trap, you know? I don't care what you do to them. Nobody demands of you that you be polite. Don't compromise your own communication lines.

The only time I ever get embarrassed or anybody get embarrassed, is this person was asking me a silly question which sounded like a hostile question, but they really meant it and they were quite serious about it and then you find yourself immediately in the position of having been very nasty and very mean back, don't you see, when they didn't intend to be. You sometimes can get that one crossed up. That's rather easy to do.

But doingness requires, of course, much, much, much more understanding than just lookingness. Doingness requires an awful lot of added understanding and when you go into doing a subject, it is sometimes very, very disappointing. Your first results – very disappointing. Your understanding wasn't up to match the doingness that you were doing, you see, and so forth. And what you learn out of this is – what you should learn out of this is that you should understand more about it, in order to do it, you see? That's the lesson you should learn; and the lesson you shouldn't learn out of it is: "It's just too difficult."

But on some subject lines there is another lesson you could learn, is that "It never worked anyway." Oddly enough, I don't think that is applicable except in the upper levels of supereducation and in the upper levels of supereducation, they've got a lot of stuff that doesn't work but is just hoped for, you know, which they're putting straight across the line. It was never intended to work – it leads to no final result at all. I mean, that sounds rather peculiar, but it is true. It's like doing the equations of aircraft propellers – or buggy whips, about the same category today, propeller aircraft and the buggy whip – with integral calculus and painfully sketching out all of the various contours and curvatures of aircraft propeller blades or buggy whip curvatures, with integral calculus. Why would you do such a stupid thing? Why, for instance, learn the tremendous complications of some very esoteric activity on a doingness basis which hasn't been used for three centuries, just to do it?

Well, it sometimes doesn't work at all. Sometimes nobody ever did it. That must enter into your calculations, too, when you're going up at that level of thing. Maybe nobody ever did it, see? Maybe it's too tough. Maybe it isn't too tough – maybe it just isn't, see? Maybe there is no integral calculus curve to a buggy whip, you know? I mean, you can go that far, that silly about it, you see?

This sort of thing is all part of your understanding of the subject of study. Where are you going with this study? But if you're going up the line with any study on a basis of doingness you should go up the line on a basis of gradients. And my first lecture to you on this subject had to do with gradients. And you will find the first time the individual's doingness caved in was right after, right after he had hit too steep a gradient. He didn't cave in on the steep
gradient, he caved in instantly before he hit the steep gradient. I'll talk to you more in a later lecture about processing people using this exact principle of too steep a gradient.

It's quite interesting, but it'll be the gradient that he failed on, was the gradient which came after the gradient he hadn't understood. He's one step late in recognizing this thing, see?

Now, what you want to do is give somebody a series of doingnesses on a gradient that they can do and that they can achieve. And in Scientology you have a rather marvelous thing called a "Touch Assist," and it is so workable that some people sort of park right there with the Touch Assist and that's only one little level of doingness which if they do, why, it gives them some confidence and they can go on to higher levels of doingness, you see? But it's something like having invented too good a kiddie-car. You know, this is too good a kiddie-car; and you'll find it sometimes hard to move people off on to the next step. But a confidence and understanding goes along with the doingness, so a doingness is just another method of achieving understanding. In addition to accomplishing something with it, and so forth, it's also a method of getting understanding. Doingness is a method of achieving understanding. And if you find yourself too bogged and so forth, well, you want to go do some of it and that sounds rather interesting.

Now, I know myself, I have just gotten through three books of archaic yesteryear's color films. I'm studying color photography on textbooks, that even though they are written by this institution, and so forth, have long since antiquated. They are dead and there is very little left of the actual materials they are talking about. And it's writ... was written by a professor at Columbia University who probably had never done any. And the directions, and so forth, were mostly taken out of the literature released by the companies that manufactured the stuff at the time. And they intended just a happy result which they didn't ever think anybody would have any trouble with. The net result of this amounted to a tremendously interesting, basic theoretical approach which was absolutely vital to an understanding of the subject which departed wildly on to a series of doingnesses which were no longer of use and were completely disrelated. So if this wasn't the world's worst mish-mash I ever had anything to do with, I'd like to know about it. They... a real mishmash. Here's vital basic technology, basic historical technology, basic put-together, basic chemical technology, all of this stuff is not only true now, it's going to hold true from here on out in this particular field, don't you see? Basics, fundamentals, and so forth.

Well, I got those down with spikes in spite of learning them from a professor. And the next thing, all of a sudden you collide with films you will never shoot and which you have to know all of the literature concerning. Oh, that's pretty grim, because in the first place, I have already learned that a manufacturer's table of use on the subject of any piece of film, much less color film, is something that you carefully don't litter the street with. You put it in the garbage can. See? Useless! Forget it! He isn't the user of the film in the first place. He's the seller of the film, not just its manufacturer, but he's selling this stuff, so he wants to put a very happy face on it. So he says its speed rating is up in the stars – when it isn't. And he says it won't do this, when it does. And all of this stuff, and how this stuff is handled and all of this – not even germane.
Why would anybody have even included it in the text in the first place? He already knew that color was an advancing field. It was advancing so rapidly that to expect of the individual, without modernizing the text, that he would have to know all about autochrome – haven't had any autochrome since 1920 – it didn't even take a picture then. Whoever heard of this stuff? Well, it's nice to know that they had some film like this and what its basic theory is, but now go and get the lens stops and settings for autochrome – oh come now! Well, what lens stops and settings for autochrome? In a camera system, perhaps, that isn't even used anymore. That's just gobbledygook then, isn't it? Well, your understanding has to embrace this fact and you somehow or another have to survive through the subject and still retain intact the basic technology and the vital fundamentals of the subject which you have learned without being so upset about the later enturbulences which you got into because that's now been overridden and developed.

Now, you are all faced with that merely because of the advancing line of Scientology. I've just experienced it in the wildest way possible. The third book was totally devoted to printing methods and I wouldn't be seen dead in a color darkroom anyway. See, I – bluh! Who wants to doodle-daddle like that? See? Well, there are lots of guys around that like to doodle-daddle like that and I'm happy there are, because they're going to do all of my doodle-dadding! [laughter] All I have to know in that is also an understanding of what I have to know. I haven't got the time or the inclination to spend forty or fifty hours on a salon exhibition print to get it registered properly. I haven't got the time or the inclination. Who would – who'd do such a thing? One of these doodle-daddlers. They work happily. Marvelous! Couldn't live without it! Don't you see? Well, I have to know enough to know whether or not they know what they are doing.

That's, once more, an understanding of what I need the information for, an understanding of what I'm going to use this information and, an understanding of what I have to have out of it. It's an understanding of what do I want; it's an understanding of the proper practical use or application of this information; and if it's for drawing room conversation, you would study it entirely differently. If you were studying art for drawing room conversation but not commercially, I assure you, the thing to do is to get an hold of a catalog that was published at some outrageous long date ago that lists all sorts of painters of the period of van Eyck or something like this and get all the contemporaries, see, get all of those and what they were noted for, you see, and memorize – just grind, grind, grind like you're memorizing this – an amateur play script, all of this stuff, you see, and so forth – drawing room conversation: kill everybody dead! They can't open their heads about – they say something about seventeenth century painters, you know, and you say, "Like Van der Dobin."

And they say, "What?"

You say, "Yes, Van der Dobin."

In other words, you can play "one-upmanship" with this thing, see? Mow 'em down, you know? "Well, Hobbema, after all – too blue."

And everybody says, "Gee, boy! He's in the know." [laughs]
So anyway, the nonsense that you could run that one into and the various lines is still included under the heading of "What are you going to use this information for? What degree do you have to know even inside one single subject?" Now of course, some of the teachers I had on the subject of antisubmarine warfare, were busy teaching me how to build – how to build, if you please – there was a war going on. I didn't have any time to build anything. I tried to explain it to them – "a QCB-1 antisubmarine electronic echo device, an ASDIC QCB-1. This is the way it is built." Fortunately, it was a lovely, lovely warm classroom and I was shipped for a very short time down into the south of Florida to learn about this sort of thing and that's one of the things they taught me, and boy, was I able to catch up on my sleep, because I just knew somehow, that out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, with my hands full of Jap submarines, I was not going to have to build one of these things. I was merely going to have to know how to use it and at most repair it and to know when it was in operation, when it was out of operation. I figured that would be about all, in the middle of action, that I would be able to need. That's all I would need to know about that equipment, so I had myself a nice sleep.

But the evaluation of what you want it for – how are you studying it – which direction it's going, and so forth, is all part and parcel to the whole subject of study. And if it is not included in the field of study, why, your use of the information is minimal and you can become very stultified and you can become very horrified and you can hang up on a lot of words and things that are getting in your road and upsetting you and that you don't understand, and you get into an obsessive "I've got to understand everything I read perfectly or I will hang up," and this is taught to you by the fact that if you don't understand what you read, a half a page later you're going to get a headache. Well, you also must include the idea that after you've read that half a page more and gotten a headache, that you've now got to be smart enough to know there was something back of you, find out what it was, spot it, get it out of the road. Say, "Yeah, that's a word I don't know," and go on reading.

In other words, in order to study, you've got to have a lot of the technology of study or the use of the information which you are getting is going to be minimal.

Now, I've given you a lot of stuff in this lecture today that is largely theoretical and that sort of thing – All of this, however, has very practical applications and it has a practical application to what you are doing right now. So having increased your grades very, very nicely after every one of these, why, please increase your grade again.

Thank you very much.
A lecture given on 13 August 1964

What's the date?

_Audience: 13th of August AD 14._

Thirteen Aug. AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. We've got another lecture here on study and education.

You probably have realized, going down the line, that we've got this pretty well wrapped up. But we didn't expect some of the bonuses that we got. This was actually quite an astonishing and adventurous thing to do as I've already mentioned and so forth, is all of a sudden pick up an analogous field of practice and study, in order to study that, in order to find something about study, so that you're not interiorized on your own subject, don't you see? So get an exterior view and study this as a lowly neophyte that is tyroing his way up the line. Both of those mean "beginners." And then carry this subject of study out through, not on a dilettante, but on a professional, hammer and tongs basis, you see? There's a great deal of difference between these two types of study.

And what remains undone of that now, of course, is the professional practice of what one has learned. And that will have to be added into it to help you out in that particular field and sphere. That doesn't seem to be too much but here is – the whole subject of education has as its end product the accomplishment of certain doings, the accomplishment of certain ends or aims, and education which doesn't lead toward this, of course, is just sort of doodle-daddle, monkey business, you know, sort of stuff. It's pure dilettantism, by which could be best defined as "one doesn't intend to do anything about it except annoy his friends."

The difference in these two fields of the doodle-daddle type of monkey business sort of and so on – I really wouldn't call it education. I wouldn't dignify it with that particular field. I would say it's acquaintance – it's acquaintancy. It's getting a nodding acquaintance with some data or a field to find out what is in it. In other words, it's just becoming acquainted with it slightly and doing a light skim around its edges and that would not, in my estimation, be education.

Education would be in the direction of accomplishing certain actions professionally. Now, that is my own word introduced into there, "professionally," but if one is educated in a subject, one expects him to be able to accomplish certain things with that subject. I don't care if this is merely a theoretical line of education, one is still expected to come out the other end being a good theoretician.
So education – education I would define as something that is for blood and I would say that many things pass under the heading of education which aren't. I'm not talking if – this is a good English dictionary definition, you see? Education means learning or knowing or accomplishing the knowingness of a certain subject, you see? Well, let's take that as a flat-out definition. If one is educated in a subject, then he knows that subject, you see? See, you know, exclamation point, he knows the subject. He's able to accomplish the actions which are taught in that subject, he's able to accomplish the results which are taught in that subject, don't you see? That's education.

Now, to call the modern school system "education," then, is quite laughable, because this poor little kid gets in there and they – they keep the kid's time occupied. Let's go down to that. Well now, that doesn't seem to me to have to have anything to do with education whatsoever, to keep the child's time occupied. And yet a survey of this field demonstrates that the best reason for formal education of youth and so on is to give their mothers a break. That's the fact. That's the way they look in that direction.

Well, what is this kid being taught to do? And right away, then, you see what your quarrel with young schooling is. He's not being taught to do anything, see? Voilà! So it isn't education. You see, if you just took the word in its pure definition, with an exclamation point, you know, "educated!" well, this has come to mean a sort of an esoteric fly-around that he – well, what? So you say, "This fellow was educated." You say, "He was educated at Oxford." Well, what is this? All right, good, he was educated at Oxford, fine, he's an Oxford man. Good. We expect certain stamps and social reactions and so forth. All right. If he was educated to be a gentleman – good! So he's a pro gentleman. See? Fine. Fine.

But you can't really disassociate education from an active doingness and a role and a professionalism, you see? It's not possible to disassociate this, to take this over, so we say, "Well, we wanted to give him a good education, not so that he could do anything, but…" Well, that is immediately a contradiction. That's saying, "We must pick up all the white peas by leaving all the white peas on the ground." You can't do that, you see? You can't just "educate" somebody without any end in view. It – because then he wouldn't be educated, don't you see?

And that is the modern quarrel. We have the largest budget, next to armaments, in the world, is child education. That's a big budget. And I don't care if the teachers all say they're underpaid and everything – which they are. It is, nevertheless, a fabulous piece of money which is spent in this particular direction. When you look at it all the way up the line and when you include under that heading of expense all the training, all the educational actions that are done in this world, you see that there's a terrific investment.

Now, practically everyone in the Western world has had a considerable sum invested in them to become educated. That's a considerable sum. It runs into the thousands of pounds; whichever way you want to look at it. It runs into the many, many thousands of dollars. By the time a young man has gotten through college, for instance, he stands, educationally, at something on the order of the ten-thousand dollar mark, or did ten years ago; that's an old figure. And he probably stands at a higher figure today. That's a lot of money to invest in a man – for maybe no result.
All right, so a lot has been spent upon his education but has he become educated?

Male voice: No.

Yeah, and that's the quarrel. See, there was – a lot is spent on his education but he didn't get educated.

I was rather shocked to find, the other day, that my young'uns couldn't write their name. They're being "educated" (quote unquote) at a remarkable rate of speed, but they couldn't sign their name. I wouldn't say that then they were being taught to write. They were not ed... being educated in how to write. No matter what they were doing, no matter how many "traveling ovals" they were making, if it didn't wind up with the end product of being able to sign their names – well, I should think that would be one of the first things that some teacher would think about. They'd say, "Well, you know, a kid should be able to sign his name." Because, frankly, that is almost the basic test of literacy.

The fellow that stumps aboard ship and has to make an 'X' on the articles is instantly and immediately considered to be illiterate. Well, maybe he could write in a flowing, copper-plate hand everything else, but if he couldn't sign his name he'd have a hard time convincing people he wasn't illiterate.

So it would seem to me to be first things first, and when I found this out I caused quite a storm by insisting that they learn how to sign their names. They – even the children got quite upset. It hadn't occurred to them that if they knew how to write they should be able to sign their names. They couldn't do it. So there's a lot of holes left along the line.

Now, you take arithmetic. Well, this is sort of taught as a handy, handy thing that is – you need so that you won't get shortchanged. I think that's just about the wildest short look at any subject I ever had anything to do with. And yet I'm sure that that is the basic reason why it is taught, because I've had children explain to me, patiently, this one point. So this has been taught to them as the reason they were learning arithmetic is so they wouldn't be shortchanged. Nobody ever tells them that there's another way not to have to worry about that, is also make enough money. Well, look at it. If you – if you made enough money, you wouldn't have to know arithmetic, because it wouldn't worry you if you were shortchanged. See, there are other ways to get around this. I mean – so therefore, there is some other route on this business of being shortchanged, although I offer that one as simply a ridiculous one, it's nevertheless quite a factual one. Midas never worried about being shortchanged.

So, what have we got here in terms of arithmetical education? Well, I defy the bulk of the teachers who are teaching arithmetic to give you much of an end product for knowing arithmetic. They'd say, "Well, uh-uh-uh-um – well, of course, he has to have it because it's a fundamental in so many other subjects."

Well, all right. Now we're talking about teaching other subjects. Well, we're not interested in other subjects, we are talking about arithmetic. How about this thing called arithmetic? Well, we wonder why people don't know arithmetic. Well, he can't be educated in it because it has no end product. The fellow says, "I don't want to be an accountant. I don't want to be a bookkeeper. I can learn to count on my fingers so I don't get shortchanged." Elementary. Why learn arithmetic?
"Well," you say, "well, you _have_ to have it to learn other su..."

"No, no, no, no. Let's talk about education and arithmetic. Let's not go worrying about other subjects."

"Yeah, well, if you put a restriction like that on the argument," they would say, "of course nobody can argue with you."

And you say, "That's the point. Who wants to be argued with?"

The point I'm making here is that arithmetic, having no finite end in itself – of course, it has – it has finite ends, and it could be described – but having no described, finite end in itself is therefore almost impossible to teach. And you have nearly everybody doing very badly in their grammar schools on arithmetic because it itself is not a subject, so therefore no one can become educated.

It's become more and more – this is very manifest in the university – I'm not talking over your heads here, this is something that's very, very bang! It's very obvious. You get into a university, you're all the time having problems being shoved under your nose in engineering schools that you're supposed to do by algebra; you're always having problems shoved under your nose that you're supposed to do with calculus, any one of which is solvable by sight arithmetic. That's something to think about.

Now, what has happened here? Well, arithmetic, not being a subject in itself, and being a somewhat degraced and degraded subject, has gradually shrunk and is ceasing to be a subject, but is simply an auxiliary subject which moves up into higher mathematics. And if you don't know arithmetic, you can't do higher mathematics. That's the way it's represented, more or less, to the engineer.

Well, I was quite interested in old _McGuffeys Readers_ at one time to find out how adept at arithmetic somebody was expected to be in 1888. The problems which they were expected to solve in arithmetic were the problems of algebra. And they were expected to solve these with arithmetic. And what do you know? It was a great revelation to me that it was very possible to solve these algebraic problems with their "Xs" and "Ys" and all that sort of thing by common, ordinary, garden-variety arithmetic. And it made a lot better sense – made a lot better sense. I looked at this and I've run into some old-timers who could take a column of figures about five figures wide and about ten figures tall and add them up in a peculiar way, which was very peculiar to me, of some kind of a crisscross addition that I would be quite at a loss to explain to you how it was done, but arrive with almost an immediate answer. And you say, "How did they do that?"

"Well," they say, "it's very simple. You see, nine added to something gives you itself, so all you do is go down the column and find all the combinations which make nine and forget those, and you add the remainder and you get the total."

What do you know, you know? Well, of course, that's just tricky stuff, but all this at one time was part and parcel to arithmetic and it's not here anymore in arithmetic. Where did it go? Well, you must have a dying subject. Why is it dying? Nobody is delineating its purpose to the student of it. No matter if some – no matter if some purpose does exist in it, that's
beside the point. Yes, you could figure out lots of purposes of it, but all you have to know is, is nobody is delineating, marking out, showing the purpose of that subject to the student so one doesn't consider that he becomes educated in arithmetic. Arithmetic is just some auxiliary subject that keeps you from being shortchanged.

So that as the purpose of a subject deteriorates in its advertisement or rendition – as the purpose of a subject deteriorates – the subject itself also falls away. Sounds like a very – a very strange sort of a thing to give you, but as the purpose of a subject falls away, why, so does the subject disappear from the ken of man. Manufacture of buggy whips? Go around and try to find somebody today who knows all about the manufacture of buggy whips. There's probably a couple of boys sitting around in England who know the subject backwards and forwards and who make all the circus whips. See, there are practically no more whips made. Dying, because it has no purpose. Nobody's got any horses to flip buggy whips over, see? So becoming educated in how to manufacture whips today would sort of be an end – a dead end. It would not be a very productive career.

Now, that doesn't sound very amplified, but let's take it in reverse and at once it will make a great deal of sense. Then, a subject for which the purpose is not delineated will die away, not only in the society but in the individual. Both of those two – those statements are true. The first one is so true that it's almost nonsense. But the other one is not nonsense and it's not been detected. If the individual to whom you are teaching this subject has not got the purpose of this subject, then that subject will die away in that individual. It might have a tremendous purpose, but if the purpose of the subject is not being taught to the individual, he's had it. Do you see?

So you can get the difference between a live study and a dead study. A live study is one which has purpose, has a use; and a dead study is one that hasn't any use. And the way you make a live study into a dead study is dual: Its use dies away as in buggy whips or one simply omits it as part of the educational process. And it will make the subject die away, not only in the individual but the society; not only in the society but the individual. Do you see that?

And we have to assume that a person cannot become educated, just by the definition of the word "education" as I have been stressing it here, in a dead subject because it has no end product.

So you find these things become obsessive. Somebody starts to study "miniatures painted in Holland by blind painters." Well now, miniatures painted in Holland, we've got some use for that. But "miniatures painted in Holland by blind painters," well, we would sort of look around for quite a while before we found any use for this particular subject. Oh, you could find uses for it, but don't get yourself all cluttered up on – on introducing your ingenuity to supply the lack in an educational system that – because by being reasonable, you cripple yourself. It's a question of "What is there?" not a question of "What could we dream up to put there?"

Oh, we could dream up some subjects, but let's just say this boy is studying this esoteric study – strange, weird, useless, nowhere. Do you know that he can easily become obsessed with it? He has no purpose for it, no use for it and so, of course, it's impossible for him
to become educated in it because he can never display his virtuosity. He can never display its use. Who would listen? He can't even tell his friends. They'd say, "This, guy is a ruddy crank! He goes around talking all the time..." Somewhat like your families and so forth have occasionally regarded you on the subject of Scientology. You're over their heads, you see? But much worse than that — much worse than that, we would get it on this sort of a basis, see. Nobody knows what he is talking about and nobody knows why he is studying it and it isn't of any use and it's not of much interest anyway. Well, this poor bloke can never communicate it. He can never communicate it for the best reason that communication becomes difficult: Nobody will listen.

Did you ever think about communication being difficult because nobody listens? Well, just run this into the field of education. If the subject doesn't exist and has no use and has no application and has no this and has no that, well, to that degree their listening ceases because it isn't of any use to them, either. He's studying miniatures painted by blind painters in Holland. People sort of say, "Well, I could understand his studying miniatures painted in Holland... I think he's nuts!" That would be the immediate conclusion, don't you see?

Well, your families look at you sometimes, where you have run into this and collided with this head-on, and people wouldn't listen to you on the subject of Scientology or were impatient with you for studying it, and that was because you weren't talking to them about the purpose of Scientology. And you didn't talk to them about the purpose of Scientology within the framework of what it could do for them personally.

Now you are coming right on close to home. Your mother might have been interested if she heard what it had done for you personally because she's interested in you. But even your mother would conceive it to be a subject only when a purpose was delineated. Now we'll go a bit — a little bit further: when the purpose that was delineated could be executed to any degree. You know, the purpose you've given it could be executed to any degree. Now, your next stage is, is they don't believe it. See, you could give them the purpose but they don't believe it. In other words, the purpose isn't real to them. So you not only have delineated the purpose but you have delineated it to them in such a way that it is — seems to be an attainable purpose. An attainable or doable purpose.

So we walk up to this bird and we say — we say to this bird, "Your — your interest in this subject should be very great because this subject will make you a Clear."

He immediately says, "What wall?" because it's not an understandable purpose, see? The purpose ceases to be understandable when the goal does not seem to him to be attainable or valuable. And it can cease to be attainable or valuable merely because it isn't understood.

So for an educational subject to exist and continue to be a subject in which one can become educated, or if you ever expect anybody to ever be educated in the subject — let me put it that way — for it to continue to exist, for it to survive, it has to have a purpose which can be seen to be an attainable action. It has to be attainable. The purpose must be attainable.

Now, the value of a subject — the value of a subject depends, simply and utterly, upon the value of attaining that stated purpose. How valuable is it to attain that particular stated
purpose? Is it valuable to be able to accomplish this or is it not valuable to be able to accomplish this? And to that degree a subject appears to be a fringe subject or a vital subject.

So the woof and warp of the culture is made up of educations which are subdivisible – that's the woof and warp of a culture… (Woof and warp: rug term. Try not to put too many words on the line, here. The woof goes that way and the warp goes that way, see?) It's – the make-up of a culture is subdivisible into two general types of education. A culture is held together solely and only by education. Whether that education is accomplished by experience or by teaching, a culture, as a whole, is the summation of its education. And those are two divisions to the educations of a culture, and one of those are the vital ones and the other one is the "nice" ones.

Now, an education achieved is remunerated to the degree that its service is understood to be valuable. An education is remunerated to the degree that its service is understood to be valuable. And it frankly is not remunerated one penny more. Sometimes they falsely remunerate, but not often. And that tells you that there must be some mighty funny, funny things, because there are some things in the society – because this rule I've just given you is true and the society at large then must be misunderstood to some degree because there's several educations in the subject at large which are remunerated to an enormous extent which are not held by certain educational authorities to be valuable.

Public must like to be fooled. They're always paying con men of some kind or another. There must be some real value in having hope shot up to the moon in the stock market because those birds are very often paid off heavily. You could reevaluate the society on the basis of what I've given you. Yes, you could say, "Well, the society makes mistakes in this direction. Yes, the society is lied to." Well, I don't think the society makes mistakes in this direction. That's a new thought, isn't it? Do you know that the most valuable profession in the United States is burying people? Hm, very highly paid! They've managed to convince everybody that the loved one should be in sealed bronze caskets and in concrete and steel vaults outside the caskets so that seepage won't trouble your loved ones. And they had the whole country absolutely convinced that this was Congressional law, that it was local law. And a recent Congressional investigation disclosed this fact and they found out that there isn't any statutes in the United States that compels anybody in the United States to be buried even in a board coffin. There are statutes that require them to be buried, but there is not even a statute that requires them to be embalmed. So you roll Aunt Agnes up in a blanket and dump her in a hole. [laughter] As long as you've got a death certificate, man, that's all you need.

So, this particular profession – this particular profession was selling what? They were sort of selling some weird life after death, weren't they? They were akin to some religious cult or something like that. And it was obvious that people did buy life after death. And we find out that one of the most expensive things you could do in Egypt was to die. That was a very expensive thing and that's gotten that way in the United States today. It's very costly to die. By the time they get through with you, man, well, you've got no estate left.

But this is very peculiar. The society remunerates this and rewards it. Well, it's just about the most educated art you ever had anything to do with in your life. Undertaking is a
supereducated art and the society of undertakers themselves - "morticians," they like to refer to themselves - these birds run their own schools and their own technology and that sort of thing and they really hammer-pound it in. And the final end product is very visible. But these guys are quite sharpies. I know, because back in the days when I was having a ball around New York as a writer, why, the medical examiner - that's what they've begun to call the coroner around New York now - they changed their names, too - the medical examiner of New York was a particular pal of mine. He was the coroner of the city of New York and one of the nicest blokes you ever had anything to do with. He'd embalmed personally, with his own paws, 15,000 corpses.

I got interested in this particular field by being sent in his direction to do a series of stories about undetectable crime and of course I wound up in the lap of the medical examiner of the city of New York and he started my crime education on the subject. And of course, this was in the field of what they call forensic or legal medicine. And this boy, he had it all at his finger tips and so forth. But the casualness with which he could roll off all of these various things showed a great familiarity with the subject.

This was not an esoteric subject. This had to do with lots of dead bodies which had been strewn all over the place in various states of dishabille, various states of knocked-about. They were untidy at times. This was quite a boy. And oddly enough, he conceived that he was not acceptable socially. Now I was very acceptable socially, so he and I formed a very good partnership, because he always liked to - if I was going anyplace and asked him if he'd like to come along and so forth, he was there on a rocket plane, you see? Right away, quick! But there wasn't anything - there wasn't anything that was wrong with this bird. He had perfect manners, he was a perfect gentleman and so forth. But part of his education was that his subject was looked down on and therefore he felt he was socially unacceptable and so forth.

Well, I don't know. A lot of people - lot of people look down on - street sweepers think they're looked down on and so forth, but street sweepers keep the streets swept clean, don't they? Hm? Well, this guy obviously was keeping the streets of New York from being littered with decomposing corpses. And oh, I used to see him every once in a while. When I was president of one of the writing societies there and so forth, why, he used to come over there quite regularly and he'd give detective writers talks if I'd ask him to and so forth. And they would go away from the luncheon or something like that the weirdest shades of green. [laughter, laughs]

But man, here was - here was data. Here was data. And it had a very definite end product, if only in the field of detection. A guy like that could take one look at a corpse and he'd say "Carbon monoxide, been dead about three hours." "Cyanide." "Arsenic." This, that, the other thing. Brrrrrr, boom! "Oh, I'd say that was botulimus poisoning, Joe. Yeah, yeah. Well, put him on the slab and we'll run a - we'll run a test on it, do an autopsy. Well, I'm pretty sure that's just botulimus, you know some - eating green beans in the wrong time of the year that had been in the icebox too long. That's - looks like that's what that is to me." Almost always just dead on the button, you see?

This was art, the art of observation, the world of death. But even in the days of Egypt this art was not accorded any social status. The boys who embalmed the bodies down in the
deadhouse and so forth were actually never even permitted to leave the deadhouse. They were held in. But here's this terrific, terrific amount of art, terrific amount of detail, terrific amount of technicality, terrific amount of stuff and it's come right straight down through these cultures from the days of ancient Egypt, and it is totally uninterrupted. It's interesting that such a bird as this could sit down and discuss the relative preservation qualities of modern embalming and Egyptian embalming. And he was certain he was doing better these days than the Egyptians were. It's the first time I'd ever heard that, because we've seen these Egyptian mummies in univer... in university museums and that sort of thing, and we've seen these things around and they're still there, all wrapped up and so forth. But his attitude toward it was the attitude of a true professional: "Well, their features hadn't been preserved and their coloring was bad." That's what he said to me one day, so forth. "Yeah, the next time you're down in the museum, Ron," he said, "if you don't believe it, if you don't believe that we're way ahead of them these days, you just take a look at one of those mummies. Features haven't been preserved and coloring is bad." And I said, "But man! Those guys – those guys have been dead for thousands of years!"

And he said, "Well, in a few thousand years one of mine will have been, too." And he said, "His features won't be bad, and his coloring will be good."

He said, "We can do a better job than" – almost – "we used to do."

Well now, here's a steady – I'm talking to you about a relatively debased profession, but a highly remunerated one. And keeping the bodies off the streets and prettying up the loved ones and so forth is very highly paid. Preservation of memory and so forth is a very highly paid profession. And it has been continuous – it has been continuous for a very long time without its know-how dying away. Wherever there's been a civilization, they seem to have known the data of the last civilization on this, no matter how many wars have swept across the top of it and they deal it off the cuff and so forth. Why, even the ancient tribal rites, they would go find a dry cave that would automatically embalm the corpses of their loved ones.

So here's this – here's this very interesting technical line. That's a technical line, man. What you have to do in order to keep a corpse from going bad and what you have to do to and know about what killed this person and what he died of, so that you won't get all mixed up in your embalming activities and what you have to do in order to straighten all this out, or so forth. And how you're supposed to bury them and exactly how you're supposed to handle the grieving family and exactly how you were supposed to sell them the most for the – for the most, you know? These are technologies, no matter which way you look at it. They are very broad and they are very prec... exact and boy, do they wind up with a finite result! You know? You've got the body, you embalm it, you bury it, you collect your money. Thud! Very easily understood.

So that we would say that the subject is – a subject is not only remunerated to the degree of its need but also to the degree that it is understood by the public at large. It's remunerated to the degree that it is understood.

All right now. How about this longevity? How about this longevity? The continuing need of a purpose can then preserve a subject. The continuing need of the subject can preserve
the subject. If the subject continues to be needed, it will be preserved; that's a corollary of what I just gave you a few minutes ago. But the length of time that it gets preserved is entirely dependent upon the need of and the relay of its technology. You see, you must have the technology continue to be needed and the technology must also be relayed. If it continues to be needed it will be also relayed, which is all very – very fascinating; rather obvious.

But where you get a subject coming on down the line – where you get a subject coming on down the line across the millennia and so forth, it is only because its purpose is carried with it. Its purpose has gone along with it and its purpose is understood. Now, one could destroy that subject by destroying its purpose – no longer needed, you see – or by destroying the relay of its technology in some fashion or another; or in being too insistent or too – too forceful in relaying its technology and tacking lots of other things to its technology which didn't belong on it. In other words, "Before you can study engineering, you must have had a grammar school education, a high school education, gone to finishing school and learned how to knit." I can expect that will be about the next one, see?

You're not going to have any engineers after a while; all the bridges will start to fall down. Well, one of the reasons why you won't have any engineers after a while is very elementary, and it's contained in our own technology, but only in our own technology, the reason for this. And that is, you've given him too much takeoff. He's had too much of a run on takeoff and – and the longer in an – in education – let's get back on education now – the longer it takes to approach the education, the more opportunity there is for tacks on the runway. We could probably state that in a much more easily expressed way, but that's about the way it is. If this character is taking off, taking off, taking off and – and the longer in an – in education – let's get back on education now – the longer it takes to approach the education, the more opportunity there is for tacks on the runway. We could probably state that in a much more easily expressed way, but that's about the way it is. If this character is taking off, taking off, taking off, taking off, he's running on the runway, he's trying to get up speed, everybody is saying, "Well, you mustn't pull back on the stick yet. You must stay there on the runway and keep running on the runway, ready to take off, ready to take off, ready to take off." Well, by the time he's done this for about forty-five years and finds out he isn't off the ground, he doesn't take off.

The reason for that is, is the number of opportunities to fail are directly proportional to the length of the approach. That's a law: Number of opportunities to fail are directly proportional to the length of approach, or length of time that it is going to take to get up to where you're going to study this thing.

Now, that law is balanced by the fact that if you don't study something by gradients, a person can get into a mess by going into too high a gradient as I was talking about the other day. He went too steep, too quick. So there's – somewhere there is a proper length runway for any subject. It's a runway of the right length for the subject.

A runway of the right length for the subject, then, would not be so long that it needlessly multiplies the opportunities for failure and it had better not be so short that a person jumps a gradient and gets himself into a confusion. And what is the right length of a runway for any given subject? How much preparatory action should there be or how long should a course of study be and all of those things, those questions, are answered in this: Well, it should not be so long that it needlessly oppor... multiplies opportunities for failure and it should not be so short that it takes a person up too steep.
He'll fall off on his nose, like we used to do when I was in flying clubs in college. There's many a sad young man would pull back on the stick too quick. The evolution there was a "whipstall." Called a "whipstall" – technical term, aviation – you come up the line and you – there isn't enough forward speed to sustain the vacuum on the top of the wings, and you have just never seen an aircraft do anything quite as sickeningly funny as it does in a whipstall. It's flying along very, very nicely, and all of a sudden it's flying too slow, there's no longer any vacuum above the wing and it goes "Whooof!" It is fast! It's not for nothing it was called a whipstall. And of course, when you're only about 100 feet above the runway or something like that, and the edge of the field and so on, why, it – you don't develop enough speed in the process of falling to then be able to pull back on the stick and pull out of it. What they do is send a notice to your folks and get in touch with my old friend the medical examiner of New York.

Anyway, that's what happens to a student, see? He gets himself into a state of overconfidence or something like this and he pulls back on the stick and he hasn't had a long enough runway, he hasn't developed his speed, don't you see? In other words, he goes into too steep a gradient.

Now, Mary Sue did it the other night. She's studying typewriting, of all things. She typewrites pretty well, but she's decided – started to do touch-typing. And she's going to make the grade on the subject of touch-typing, hammer-pound – bang! And it's quite interesting. I ran an educational process on her for a very, very short period of time on this subject and busted the dam on this. I don't know that she's noticed it and – she isn't here just now; she wound up with lawyers, so – but she probably hadn't noticed that there is a coordination between her sudden interest in learning to touch-type and breaking the barrier on one of the old "too long a runway" propositions and "too short a gradient," too. I broke that with a process and now she's very interested in learning touch-typing and she's spending about an hour a night, with everything else she's got to do, sitting there hammer-pounding on a machine on a touch-typing basis. This is very difficult, because at the same time she uses the typewriter during the remaining hours to hunt and punch out notes, you see? So on the one hand she's busy touch-typing, you see, and the next, why, she's hunting and punching it out, you see, doing her work. And then she'll get back and she'll be touch-typing away.

I threw her. I gave her a metronome the other night and she suddenly conceived that her rhythm was off, which it was, and so forth. And she couldn't do anything with that metronome running. She said she had to shut that off right now. It was too high a gradient.

But she went onto the gradient of two rows of keys before she had licked one row of keys. Now, you see what I mean by too tight a gradient? This was too tough, see? And boy, did she whipstall! She whipstalled right now. And she just went into a total confusion. But knowing, now – yesteryear she simply would have quit; that would have been that – but knowing, now, the technology that we – that I've managed to get together here on the subject of education, she sits back and says, "Now, let's see, what did I do? Oh, yeah. Well, this is just too tough a gradient. I just went up on too high a gradient." She went back to one row, patter, ta-patter, ta-patter, ta-patter and then went over onto two rows and she had it, see? See, she – in other words, she moved up over that gradient smoothly.
So a person knowing this can actually guide his own traffic through very nicely. Nobody had to tell her that, don't you see?

All right. Then an educational subject is simply that something that winds up in a doingness and is approached by the process of getting educated in it. Now, that's a hell of a thing to have to say! But you know, hardly anybody really knows this. They don't really know it. They give it lip service all the time, but they're always engaging in activities which they do very badly and fail at like crazy and it never occurs to them they've never been educated in the subject.

I'll tell you something used to drive me stark, staring mad, down in Hollywood. Every director, every supervisor and as far as that's concerned, every actor on the set, they all knew how to be a writer. They knew – knew how to – they knew writing. They could all write stories. The place was just lousy with writers. You want to know why Hollywood never got out of kindergarten on stories; that's just because of it. They never recognized that it's a technology; it's a professional technology which is studied like crazy. It has more ins and outs and ramifications; actually it has quite a terminology. But all these birds knew they knew how to write. It wasn't anything you ever had to study, so of course if they did get a pro in their midst – and Hollywood developed very few professional writers, in fact it developed no professional writers. They come in from elsewhere and go to pieces. Well, the process is done by everybody there knowing the profession of the fellow who just arrived. See, he's a writer, he's a professional, he arrives, everybody else knows his profession.

Well, now, he won't give the movies the beingness necessary to realize that maybe movie writing has a few tricks of the trade, too, so of course he looks a little bit stupid to these people, whereas he's not stupid at all. He just hasn't learned that particular specialty of his own subject, which he could learn rather rapidly. And Hollywood, not realizing this, never bothers to teach him how to write for Hollywood. And they have never found out that it's necessary to be educated to know how to write.

So here's this wild profession which is sometimes remunerated to a fantastic degree and in which you can very easily starve to death and in which people grant you fantastic quantities of beingness and in which people ignore you utterly. So it is through all kinds of contradictions. What is a professional writer? Well, by test he's somebody who is successful and is getting his stuff published or at least read or viewed. But of all the subjects of the arts, this is the wildest one to have anything to do with because nobody grants it the beingness of having any technology.

And yet the boy who succeeds – you would be very interested – the boy who succeeds is not just somebody who wandered in with an idea. You go up to the Screen Writers Guild and you for – you find out that the reason education in writing has gotten a bad name is because it's taught in American universities. They have gone out and hired a bunch of failed writers. And failed writers either become editors or professors. And they dramatize their failure, by the way, and they try to make a writer fail. And I've never seen one do anything else. I beg your pardon, there have been a few that worked like mad, they were tremendously successful, whatever they had to do with succeeded and that sort of thing. But they weren't under the idea that they were writers. All these other birds still had this wild idea that they were
kind of writers, but here they were, editing, see? They weren't trained in it or if they had been trained in it, they'd failed at it.

Here's a chance subject. The whole society seems to run, to some degree, on the romances and imaginations and so forth of the writer. But you talk about a hidden piece of technical training. Well, the technical training of this field doesn't exist. If a professional writer wants a good laugh, if he wants just to lie right down in the aisle and laugh and laugh and laugh until his sides are sore, all he needs to do is read the curriculum of the professional writing classes of Princeton, for instance. You just double up in a ball. I mean, you – you can't help it. And I took the – a professional writing class at Harvard one time, and put them into paralysis. And I was told by the professor later, they never did recover.

I made the mistake – I was very young and very brash and of course when you're invited to lecture on your own subject, you see, at some very esoteric institution of this particular character, it rather goes to your head, and you chuck your weight around, you know? Particularly if you're very young and brash and me. [laughter] And so I stood up in front of this writing class, and I said to them, "I noticed your current subject here is style. Now, no writer really knows whether he has a style or not until he has sat down," and I was being very reasonable, "until he's sat down and written a couple of hundred thousand words. And by the time he's done that, he can probably detect in his work whether or not he has a style." From the professional writer's viewpoint this is the most reasonable statement ever made by anybody, because a pro, even – even Dickens would just think nothing of getting out a hundred thousand words in a month, see? Nothing!

I don't know where all this idea came from that they all write painfully with their blood while twisted in agony, see? They don't. They don't at all. If it took somebody seven years to write a great work, it's because he was drunk six and a half. [laughter] They write well, they write easily, and they write facilely. For instance, most of Dickens' stuff was written at the rate of 5,000 words a day. At one time I worked it out and handed it over to the press and it got national press. You saw that story kicking around and so forth. They thought less of his work then, of course, I suppose. But a writer can write. What better definition do you have for it, see? He can write easily, facilely and rapidly.

Well, all right, I said this to those poor blokes sitting there in their classroom and I noticed there was a sort of a shock went through the classroom. And it was very shortly after that, that I concluded my lecture and I didn't get hardly any applause. They were all sitting there sort of like statues, stunned. They didn't even bother to get up at the end of the bell. And finally one or two of them turned around to one or two of them, they muttered something or other. And the professor, who was a pretty good bloke, he came back and got me off the rostrum and walking out with me and so forth, and he said, "Well, you sure raised hell with that."

And I said, "Why? For pity's sakes, why? What is this all about?"

"Oh," he said, "they – they write 1500 words a semester."

And those people were upset, man! I was back there again, and that whole class, nobody even would speak to me. They were upset! They had thrown me overboard. I couldn't
possibly be a pro, you see? But yet my stuff was on the newsstands. But this must be a fluke. Something was wrong, because the data I'd given them must be wrong.

These birds had never been told that they should have to write! They were all being taught to be writers, but nobody had ever said to them: "Brother, write!" You understand? And I was the first one to announce to that class that were going into their fourth year that a writer should write. I don't know what a writer was supposed to do. He was supposed to discuss or he was supposed to do this or supposed to do that, but they – commercialism has a dirty word connected with it to such people and so forth. Why? It means hard work!

They don't disdain money. Never get those people wrong. They don't disdain anything that goes with it. They don't disdain being commercial or being anything else. It isn't their art they're holding on to. It's hard work to produce, to them. This is just too tough. So they had studied for four years and had not covered their first gradient, which is that you do it!

"We are now teaching you about ceramics. In the field of ceramics you make pottery and glass and other such objects. By the end of this course it will be expected that you will facilely and easily be able to make bits and pieces of pottery and tell things that are wrong with pieces of pottery that are not well made and so forth and you will know the technology of making pottery."

Somebody comes along and says, "Well, you're – you're really teaching a polytechnic subject," or something. No, no, man. Writing is simply cutting down trees, running Bulldozers, there's many a man out there digging a ditch that hasn't got the physical energy it takes to write. That's right. It's just another job. And when approached in that fashion, becomes reasonable and comprehensible and understandable, and you – then you sit down.

A writer isn't somebody who wears a red fez hat and blue slippers and smokes a pipe and gazes out the window. A writer is somebody who sits down to a desk with a pencil and a piece of paper or with a typewriter with some paper in it and he writes. What does he write? He writes what will be published and what will sell and what people will look at, because by definition a subject has to be accepted by the society in which it exists for it to be a professional subject.

Now, this is awful cold-blooded, hard-eyed looking. That's right down to earth. Now, I don't exaggerate when I say in a university they don't say this. The best professors will stand around and say, "Well now, when you're out in the field some day, and you're looking down that transit, don't blame me if you haven't got it level." No, they don't teach that way. They hand them a transit after class and tell them to go survey something and don't even give them a lecture on what the transit is, because it's some nasty object.

No, the tools of the trade are transits. Engineering: the tools of the trade are levels; the tools of the trade are big pieces of drawing paper and blueprints and bricks and pieces of steel and machines and bulldozers and tough foremen and shady contractors. These are the tools of the trade. They don't teach any course in "How to Keep Your Own Ethics While Working for the Bide-a-Wee Construction Company." They're not real, in other words. They've gone into some other never-never land.
So that was how I shocked the short story course at Harvard. And I never could figure out exactly why and how I had shocked them. It wasn't that I had told them too many words. That I assumed for a long time, but I know now, in studying education, what I had done. What I had done is simply told them that, "If you're studying writing, you write. You're expected to write. You're expected to turn out wordage." And it probably wasn't even in the phrase, "You won't know a style," because my whole talk was devoted to this single idea.

But it was when I finally gave them a quantity, right after what I meant by "words on a piece of paper." I remember standing up there on the rostrum calculating it rather rapidly. I said, "Well, I'll get some low figure that anybody in his right mind would be able to do in a few weeks, you know, and it won't buffalo anybody." So I said: "A couple of hundred thousand words," you know? "Gaaaarh!" see? Well, that was what they went: "Gaargh!" But that isn't what the shock was contained in. The shock was contained in the fact that my whole address to the subject of writing is that you write and that a writer writes. And that was what the shock was in.

If you're going to be educated in a subject, you should be able to do it. Now, it's not a dirty word to do things. Now, you don't have to go on obsessively doing this the rest of your life. It is very confusing in this course that I've just taught. I've just been taught. The very best of these teachers have been thoroughly grounded in theory, and have worked like madmen with lots of doingsness and lots of ramifications of it in their own field. Now, when you've got that combination, you've got a fellow, when he said something is so, there was something very believable about it because it was very right. It was very recognizable – he might not even know how to write well, but he could express this because it was his own subject and he knew what he was talking about.

Now you've got somebody who couldn't do it and that would show up – gahhh! Huge lights going up in all directions; the impracticalities of it, don't you see this? This bird – it's not the right emphasis. He doesn't tell you about the right things in the subject. He tells you about something that he thinks might be interesting, but he himself, through experience, doesn't know whether it would ever be useful or not, see? Makes a big thing out of some little thing, don't you see?

I had one the other day – it slips my mind right now, on – in this course. It had something to do with the fact the guy was just tearing – oh, yes! Yes! It was projection. It was the projection of transparencies. And if you had a screen six feet away, why – and a screen twelve feet away, then your light and density of the transparency – your light was, of course, much less on the screen twelve feet away for – not only because the footage was increased, but because it was more distant and therefore the density of the transparency was very important for projection. And transparencies had to be very, very carefully developed and printed and so forth, in their positive form, in order to overcome these differences of – I was – it was one of these boys. He was a little more esoteric than the others. Well boy, he was talking right up a... and Reg, did we have any trouble projecting any old kind of a transparency over there at the circus in the dead black of an open room at an unthinkable distance, up to a size of twelve by twelve?
Well, if you'd listened to this guy very carefully you would have gotten the impression through... he, of course, didn't have the experience; he never had probably given a lantern slide in his life. You know, it's an old technology, lantern slide shows. It is the immediate grandpappy of the cinema, see? But this boy had probably never given one, so he gives this terrific stress of how careful you've got to be to get this point at which – it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter how thick a transparency is, as long as it's a viewable transparency. It doesn't matter how dense it is or how thick it is or how hard it is to look through, if it's too far away, get a brighter light. And the thing has a solution. That's all. Put another lamp in it.

You don't do it in the darkroom, in other words. You do it while you're projecting it, but he didn't know this fact so he makes this big, labored halfpage that you have to sweat through about printing transparencies and making sure that you know beforehand at what distance they're going to be projected, because it makes so much difference between the – oh, no! You get the idea? Now, if this bird had been – had ever done this or had had much to do with this, he wouldn't make a mistake like that. So you – what you do is get wrong emphasis.

So true knowledge will give a correct emphasis and only a theoretical knowledge will give wrong emphasis. And I imagine the universities by this time are absolutely strewn with wrong emphasis. And you can keep moving something farther and further afield with wrong emphasis, up to a point of where the technology practically gets lost. Wrong emphasis, wrong emphasis, wrong emphasis! Maddening!

In other words, "Be very careful, now, about the varnish on your E-Meter. Now, E-Meters are varnished and we're going to go through, now, the next three weeks of study on the manufacture of varnishes for E-Meters."

Well, it's a matter of how unreal can you get? It doesn't have anything to do with the subject matter at all. Just because there is some varnish in a session – it probably never occurred to you till this moment there was any varnish in a session. [laughter] Somebody makes a big deal out of this, you see? He says – he figures out, because varnish is shiny, he figures out that light falling on this might possibly influence the preclear into being distracted by the meter. He's read someplace that something or other, you see? He's figured out that this must be true, but actually an experienced auditor would tell you that he has never had this complaint from any pc every place, so it's not a problem, so why solve it?

So these unrealities simply consist of this, and this is a very precise definition. Unrealities enter when an educational activity teaches solutions to problems which don't exist or fails to solve problems that do exist. And the mean between those is what should be taken up. And the one thing that gives this is experience.

Some bird has the – he has the activity of carving stone heads out of the mountain: Gutzon Borglum. He... this is it. I imagine you could go up and you could learn more confused things from a bird like that. I imagine he's got it down. But he'd expect you to have a whole grounding in the field of the world of arts and sculpting before you even got there. But nevertheless, there's probably a lot of specialized doodle-daddle that he would tell you all about, like, "You can tell whether that particular piece of rock that you're going to go into has a crack in it by the fact that there's discoloration of the pattern of it," and so forth, and this would all be very good, you see? Well, he's solving something real. You start to carve a
cracked rock and it goes "crack." And this is very disastrous, particularly when you've only
got one mountain to cut up. You can't order another mountain.

So this is probably a very important problem. And you go out there again and you look
it over and he's got a new assistant who has been taught all about how to fix up faces and
heads in mountains by somebody who never did. And now, Gutzon Borglum is faced with the
fact that he's got to train this -- first he's got to untrain this assistant and he's got to train him
again, so he's just got about twice the job on his hands, you see?

This bird's been taught that it's very, very bad to smoke at heights because it destroys
your aesthetic sense. Has nothing to do with carving faces out of a mountain, see? Carving
faces out of a mountain doesn't require very much aesthetic sense. It requires a lot of leaning
on these great big "widow maker" pneumatic drills and blasting powder and it's a very violent
activity. There's lots of motion and mass and doingness connected with it, you see?

But somebody that would never do it, he'd teach, "Well, you have to be very careful of
your aesthetic sense," and so forth, and blyehhh! see? He'd try to extrapolate a subject with
which he had no acquaintance and that would be a very difficult thing to try to do, to teach a
subject with which you had no acquaintance. And yet, apparently it is not -- it is very difficult
to do, but it is always being done. And it's given higher education a bad name today in many
areas -- it's given it a very bad name, because they're always being taught by people who ha-
ven't done it.

And I have really learned my lesson in this photography course. Boy, I can see one of
these birds coming up in the textbook a mile away now, and I -- ahhhh! I say, "Ronnie, here
we goooo! Wharoom! We are now going to solve all sorts of problems that don't exist, and
we're going to not have any solutions for the problems that do exist, but all of this will be
stated in such a way that it's impossible to extract any meaning out of it anyway. But you will
have to extract the meaning out of it unless you want to get barriered or blocked on this par-
ticular subject." Now, isn't that an interesting problem?

So it makes about seven times the amount of study, just easily seven times the amount
of study that should be there. He doesn't know what he's talking about, but you have to know
what he's talking about, so you have to read his subject and then sort of dream up one and
figure it out for yourself against your practical applications. It's a bum show.

So all subjects, regardless of whether people call them "pure mathematics" or "pure
art" or something like that, all subjects wind up in a finite doingness, a very specific doing-
ness; all subjects wind up in a specific doingness if they are educational subjects in which a
person can get educated. And if they do not wind up with a specific doingness, a person, no
matter how long he studied them, couldn't become educated in them.

Now, this isn't just for the definition of the word education. I haven't given it that
meaning. I mean, you could go on and on and on, and feel more and more baffled and more
and more baffled by this particular subject and so forth. Well, it is not a subject in which
somebody could become educated. Do you follow that? Well, that's your bafflement. You're
trying to become educated and it's impossible, because it doesn't wind up in a finite doing-
ness.
So, anything that winds up in a finite, specific doingness – that's a measurable, you know? It has limits and actions. Anything that winds up in a finite doingness is susceptible to being educated. In other words, you can educate it. But if it doesn't wind up that way, a person cannot become educated in it, no matter how hard he studies it because there isn't any way he can ever check out if he ever learned anything. So it becomes a total significance for which the mass is absent; and education in the absence of the mass in which the technology will be involved is hard on people. Education attempted in the absence of the mass is hard on the student. It's very tough on the student.

It makes him feel – physiologically, it makes him feel squashed; actually, actually makes him feel squashed, makes him feel bent, makes him sort of spinny. It – these are all physiological and mental reactions; makes him feel sort of dead, makes him feel bored, exasperated, makes him feel a lot of different ways. This isn't the only way a person can become those, by a long ways, but that is the result of studying the doingness of something in which the mass is absent. The mass of it is absent. Do you understand? You could understand that you were studying nothing, and therefore you would not expect any mass, so that probably wouldn't upset you; but you're studying tractors and you ain't got no tractors; no tractors and you're studying tractors.

Photographs help. Motion pictures would help. They would do pretty good, because they're something of the mass. They're a sort of a promise or a hope of the mass. But the printed page and the spoken word are not a substitute for a tractor! Remember that.

And this isn't the old argument, "Of course, we know that a person has to have something of the stuff they're studying around them." No, no it isn't – it isn't even into the area of your – your practical, and so forth. Don't look for a further explanation for this datum, because you have to understand this datum in its purity. And that is simply that educating a person in a mass which they don't have and which isn't available produces physiological reactions. That is what I'm trying to teach you. I'm not even saying it should be done or shouldn't be done. I'm just saying it produces physiological reactions. That's just a fact. You understand?

You're trying to teach this fellow all about tractors and you're not giving him any tractors. Well, he's going to wind up with a face that feels squashed, he's going to wind up with headaches, he's going to wind up with his stomach feeling funny, he's going to feel dizzy from time to time, his eyes are very often going to hurt and so forth.

Now, have I got this datum across? It's a physiological datum. It has to do with processing and the field of the mind.

So therefore you could expect that you would get the greatest incidence of suicide or illness in that field of education most devoted to studying absent masses. Clever, huh? And therefore I can tell you, knowing that datum, exactly what the French educational system consists of. I don't even believe they would be permitted to have a desk in the room if they were studying desks. I think the teacher's first action would be to have all desks removed from the room and then he would teach them the theory of desks.
Now, one of the ways you get away with it, I talk to you, for instance, in these lectures. You are looking at somebody who does have a mind and you're looking at a body and it's very live, so you've got more mass actually, in a lecture, than you have in a bulletin. You'd probably much rather be lectured to, live, don't you see, than you would be to a bulletin. All right, your second best is you've got the mass of the tape and the sound and that probably isn't so bad, but it starts reducing on down to a silence and a nowhereness, and a – so forth, and about that time you'd start to feel bad. And then if you were studying somebody without ever having them there – have you ever read a bulletin, for instance, and suddenly recognized something about the pc you were auditing? You actually have an impulse to go find him or her. Well, to the degree that you don't do that, you get upset. You've got an applied mass now, but you haven't got the thing there that it directly and immediately applies to, so your tendency is to go find it.

All right, one must understand that this phenomenon exists, because there is another series of phenomena that exists which are physiological, which are based on the fact of too steep a gradient. That's another source of physical or physiological study reaction, because too steep a gradient. And this is a sort of a confusion or a reelingness, goes on this and it's probably – a distinct physiological reaction, distinct from the other. Now, I confess to you, I haven't bothered to make a table of which gives which, but I'm just telling you that there is a distinction which could be drawn between these two things.

And then there is the third one of the physiological reaction brought about through – an entirely different one now; an entirely different set of physiological reactions are predicted to exist in this field – a bypassed definition. And the bypassed definition gives you distinctly a blank feeling, a washed-out feeling, a not-there feeling and a sort of a nervous sort of an hysteria will follow in, in back of that. Those are some of the physiological-mental reactions that follow this definition.

In other words, I'm talking now about the fact that you'd know whether somebody was jamming you in the arm with a pin, or hitting you on the toe with a hammer. Well, these are two different physical reactions, two different physiological reactions, see? Well, I've just given you three sources of physiological reaction to aspects of study and they are three different areas of study and they are three different sets of symptoms. And I haven't bothered to bring it out in a table form, but – I haven't read it or studied it enough to bring it out in a table form, but I recognize the differences which exist.

There might be a fourth and fifth, you understand? I'm not giving you this as the total grouping. These are the three I know, and know exist, and know that are important.

You've got the one, where – this is the least upset ones of the thing but it produces the most distinctly recognizable actions, and you'll wonder in vain at what is producing this if you didn't know it, and that is, it's just studying something without its mass ever being around or its space ever being around or something. Let's say you're studying a sky and nobody ever lets you look at a sky. You've never got a sky to look at, don't you see? Something like that. You can study a mind because you know that the mind has an invisibility and contains certain amount of masses and that sort of thing but you understand that and you do have minds around and it's quite obvious that you have a mind in front of you when you're auditing the pc,
don't you see? But if you were studying this all off in some ivory tower in Austria or in Belle-
vue Hospital or someplace else where they don't have any minds, you would very soon find
yourself experiencing these reactions, see? They'd be "zuuuu!" and so forth.

The manifestation of "blow" stems from the third one of the misunderstood definition,
or the not comprehended definition, the undefined word and so forth. That's what produces
"blow." A person doesn't necessarily blow on these other two. They're not pronouncedly blow
phenomena. They're simply physiological phenomena.

Well, you could therefore make a child feel sick or well in the field of study. Now,
that gives you a whole table of what you could do. Little Johnny is having an awful time in
school with his arithmetic. Well, obviously, let's get him some apples and give each one of
them a number and he's got a number of apples in front of him and there are no longer a theo-
retical number of apples. Let's give him the mass of what he is studying, see? See? We find
out, suddenly, that he had a problem that involved apples and by golly, he never had any ap-
ples on his desk to count. You understand? You know, we'll trace it back to an absence of
mass, see? Or we could supply the mass, which is – I'm trying to give you the positive rem-
edy – we could supply mass, we could supply an object or a reasonable substitute and we'd
find out that first one I gave you there would cure up.

The remedy for the second one is cutting back. Find out when he was not confused on
the gradient: what new action he undertook to do. Now, that's a – that's a doingness level, that
gradient. Or what action he understood well and let's find the missing point right in what he
understood well. Just before he was all confused, what did he understand well? And then we
find out that he didn't understand it well. See, it's really – it's really at the tail end of what he
understood well, and after that he went over the gradient, see?

All right, but that is most recognizable and most applicable in the field of doingness.
The individual is suddenly asked to learn handling his sensitivity control and he has been get-
ing along just dandy watching the needle of the E-Meter swing to the left and right and now
he's all confused about the sensitivity control. Well, there is something wrong with the E-
Meter's needle swinging back and forth. Don't go over and try to explain the sensitivity con-
trol. Because he doesn't misunderstand the sensitivity control. You have hit too steep a gradi-
ent. It was too much of a jump, because he didn't understand what he was doing and he
jumped to something next and that was too steep and it went too fast and he will assign all of
his difficulty to this new thing. So that's true in this gradient, see? That's true of gradients.

Now differentiate, because gradients, here, sounds terribly like definitions. But re-
member that they are quite distinctly different. Gradients are more pronounced in the field of
doingness, but they still hang off in the field of understandingness. But it is the action that we
are interested in, in gradients, where we have a plotted course of forward motion. See, we've
got a plotted course, he should go through this, he should go through that and then he's sup-
posed to go through that. And we find out that he was terribly confused on the second one he
went through. Well, we must assume that he never got out of the first one. That's the gradient
approach. And that is one whole set of phenomena accompanies that and it looks awfully like
this other one.
But this other one is so much more important than the gradient approach – which you only run into the intimacies of actually training somebody – this other one is so much more important, the last one, than gradients, that it's the woof and warp and the make-up of human relations, the mind, subjects. It establishes talent, it establishes aptitude, lack of aptitude, it's what the psychologists have been testing for years and it's all of this balderdash. And that's just the definitions of words: the misunderstood word. That's about all it goes back to: the misunderstood word. And that produces such a vast panorama of mental effects, that it itself is the prime factor involved with stupidity, the prime factor involved with many other things. If a person weren't this way, his talent might or might not be present, but his doingness would be present. See, he might not paint a great picture, but he'd be painting pictures.

So, his aptitude in being able to do it would have something to do with his sensitivity, have something to do with a little bit more, you see? You know? We're – we can't say that Joe would paint as well as Bill if both of them were unaberrated on the field of art, see? That's an unreasonable assumption. But we can say that the inability of Joe to paint compared to the ability of Joe to make the motions of painting, is dependent exclusively and only upon definitions. I'll go over that again; exclusively, only upon definitions. There is some word in the world of art that the person who is inept didn't define or understand. And that was followed by an inability to act in the field of arts.

That's very important, because it tells you what happens to doingness. And the restoration of doingness depends only upon the restoration of the misunderstood word; the misunderstood definition.

This is very fast processing, it's a very swift, wide, big result is obtainable in this. It has a technology which is a very simple technology. It enters in at the lower levels, because it has to. It'll probably be discussed at Level I, and it will be memorized and done at Level II. And it will be followed on up the line, but because it is low grade does not mean it is unimportant. It means it has to be at the entrance gates of Scientology, that's all it means. But it is a sweepingly fantastic discovery in the field of education. And don't neglect it.

You can trace back the subject he is dumb in or any allied subject he's got mixed up with it and you'll find out why the psychologist cannot understand Scientology. There is nothing wrong with Scientology, there was everything wrong with psychology. He never understood a word in psychology, so he doesn't ever move over into Scientology.

Got the idea?

_Audience: Yes._

Well, that opens the gate to education, so although I've given it last along that line, that is the most important one.

Okay?

_Audience: Yes._

Thank you.
Thank you. All right, I like you, too. Thank you very much. And this is the what of what?

Audience: 22nd of September.

Twenty-second of September AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. Is that correct?

Audience: Right.

All right. Some kind of an announcement here. Your last Friday's lecture's examination grade was the highest it has ever been. Now I'm trying to write some books and so forth. The more lectures I give, why, the less books I write, in actual fact. We may here – I don't guarantee this – but we may here have worked out the pattern here by which we will give a Tuesday lecture, being reheard on Thursday, and examined on Friday. How is that?

Audience: All right.

All right. Very good.

All right, today's lecture is a review lecture on the subject of study – a very rapid review lecture – and it doesn't mean that if you hear this lecture, why, none of the other lectures need be listened to or something like that because this lecture doesn't necessarily contain all that they contain; but I want to give you a fast review of this subject called study.

I've been meaning to write a textbook about it and I will do so in the very near future, but the textbook for this is not the type of text that you just dash off, because if I do a good job of writing this textbook on this material we now have here, you recognize that it goes into an area where there is no textbook or data or technology of any kind, which is study – how to study.

Now, you can look in vain up and down the corridors of the libraries at big universities and so forth for a book which simply tells the student how to study. I know that sounds fantastic, but that's all they teach, basically and foremost in a whole course on education, but they haven't got any book on it that says how to study. Not even in their – than their major courses of education do they have this textbook.

But here are all these poor blokes sitting around in a university being told at every hand that they don't know how to study, but there is no textbook on the subject.

Now, what do you suppose is going to happen with a textbook like that? If that just – textbook just sits down very calmly and goes about the business of what study and education are all about and how to study and how to approach this subject and what the bear traps are in
it and what to avoid and what a good textbook is and what a bad textbook is and all this sort of thing, and if it just took this thing up, chapter by chapter, and shook it all out very nicely with no fancy terms and said, incidentally, as it went along, that this was data derived from the subject called Scientology, where do you think that book would land? Probably land in the hands of every student who enters a university anywhere.

Courses of education would have to be pulled down and thrown away, because they haven't got a course of education. One of the things wrong with education of children in the United States right now is there's nobody has any technology of education. It's something on the order of trying to fix radios when you have no instruction book of any kind and you don't even know what it is. And trying to fix a radio in that state of mind would be a rather exasperating situation since you wouldn't even know what the radio was supposed to do if you did fix it.

To show you that the technology is out in schools and universities, a series of tests were given to children over a number of grades in school. This happened in Johannesburg, accidentally, and it – children in one grade and in the next grade and the next grade and the next grade, in various groups, were given graphs, and it was very apparent that the longer they went to school, the dumber they got.

Now, I couldn't figure out why that was, except I could figure out there must be something unknown about all this, if this could happen and nobody was doing anything about it. And sure enough, that was – that was the data that emerged from it. In other words, the longer they went to school, the dumber they got.

Well, what's this about "education is supposed to make bright people"? Well, there was obvious stuff there that it wasn't true. Here was the grade for the eight-year-olds and they got a certain IQ and a certain graph, and here was the grade for the nine-year-olds and they got a certain IQ and a graph, and the grade for the ten-year-olds and a certain IQ and a graph, and the eleven-year-olds, they had a certain IQ and a graph. And after these things were already graphed out and the factor was added that some of them didn't know as much language as another and that sort of thing, it made a terribly steep curve. Their IQ was going downhill.

The highest IQ that we have ever registered on any student was on a schoolboy in Johannesburg who was twelve years old. It was not on Oppenheimer or Einstein, see? It was a twelve-year-old kid – highest IQ ever registered. Well, that's an optimum age. He knows enough language so that he can read the test and he doesn't know so much language that he can't understand it.

So this showed me clearly that there was something amiss in the field of education if the longer you studied something the more stupid you got. Well of course, the longer you study something, we know now, the more chance and opportunity you have to run into words you don't know and there we go.

Now, in the field of the arts it is peculiar – well, it's just the longer you study the more chance you have of running into words that you aren't acquainted with and can't get defined.

So in the fields of the arts – since it is just misunderstood words which bring about this condition – in the field of arts particularly – and this is a field with which I'm very, very well
acquainted – the working, workaday artist, the boy who's out there making his coffee and cakes with the drawn line or the airbrush or the paintbrush or something of the sort, you know? And whether he's selling it to Mr. and Mrs. Gotbucks or whether he's selling it to the local studio or he's making a sidewalk exhibit someplace or another, that's immaterial. The point is this boy is in the workaday world; with the writer, similarly; with the – oh, heavens! – poets; even – you could even include various of the fine arts: architecture and that sort of thing. All of these boys have certain peculiarities which I never quite understood.

Peculiarities were these: When you reviewed a tremendous number of writers who were pros and who were good, and who were landing on the mark every time, you found nobody who had graduated from a course in writing. But nobody! I mean, this isn't – this isn't even the exception that makes the rule. He just wasn't present.

I remember sitting up in Riverside Drive at one time – sitting in a big, swanky apartment – Riverside Drive, New York – and the whole place, the whole salon of this apartment was jampacked with some of the best stellar names in the field of American fiction. There they were – all of them, practically. And scattered amongst them were some of their agents, you know, sort of keeping to the background and trying to look like the radiator or something. And this subject came up, not just the subject of writing but the subject of education in general.

And a census was taken on the spot and noses were counted on the thing and nobody there had ever finished the university amongst those writers – much less writing. They had never finished the university. They had all been kicked out – almost uniformly had been expelled – or they'd never gone near the place. And that was it, and then a check-over demonstrated, clearly and conclusively, that not one of them had ever taken a course in writing, from anyplace, from anybody about anything.

Well, this was also quite startling, too, and it's not something that you would write in a writers' magazine about, because it would be very unpopular with the magazine because of its advertisers and their fond ideas they have and their advertisers who sell courses in story writing and that sort of thing. So it isn't the kind of thing you have written up.

And I was about ready to dismiss the whole subject, you know, and say, "Well, that's it," because I had been sitting there keeping the notes for two or three other eager beavers who had been taking this over. And I was saying, "Well, I guess we've just about got that taped" or something like this you know, and everybody was laughing about it.

And all of a sudden here was a very faint voice over in the corner that said, "Well, your figures are not quite correct."

"What?" you know? "Wha-wha-what? Who was that?"

And "Well, I – I have a P – PHD in literature, and a – a couple of other degrees, and finished – fini – finished the university and several other universities, and I've taken a lot of courses in writing, and – and so forth, so it's not true of everybody in the room."

And everybody turned around looking at this guy trying to find out who it was. And of course, it was a literary agent! [laughter] He wasn't a writer. He'd never published a line in his
life. All he did was sit around and tell other people what was wrong with their stories. But he had tried to be a writer and he'd failed.

So about this point I said, "There's something very peculiar going on here. There's a bunch of swindlers selling courses in writing that don't teach people how to write. Won't name any names because you don't have to. It's every big, brassy university in the United States. What's going on here?" Well, could have been a lot of things, could have been a lot of things going on.

But in the years following I ran the subject down. I got that interested in it that I ran it down a bit further, and I found out that no writing course teaches writing. They don't teach writing. I'm not sure what they teach but none of the technology which they employ and say is a writers technology, is the writer's technology. You get the point? See, they say there is this piece of technology but it isn't that piece of technology, you see? Writers don't use this technology, period!

If any of you have ever taken a writing course, I'm sure you heard about foreshadowing? And I'm sure you've heard about other writing gimmicks of one kind or another? And writers don't use them, and when they do use them, they don't call them that. Do you see here? There is a technology, then, which writers use but it is not taught in universities and it's not taught in courses in writing.

I remember with a horrible start one time, getting up to make a talk to a short story group, and I was about ready to draw a long breath and say, "Well, ladies and gentlemen, how are you this evening? Is there anything I can tell you about?" So I was just – and right in front of the desk, lying there, was one of my stories, wide-open, which they had been using as a text. And every paragraph of it had some weird symbol or word written opposite it to show what I was doing at each one of these points. [laughter]

Why, I would have wrapped myself around four telegraph poles if I'd ever tried to think of all that at the same time. This area was a foreshadow and this was a characterization and this was a this and that was a that, you see, and it was a tzsa-tzsa-tzsa and it was all supposed to have been laid out. It just stopped me cold, see? And I found myself looking at a piece of technology which I never used. And this was the pretense, you see? And here were these poor blokes trying to study writing, you see?

Well now, there is a subject called "writing." There is such a subject. The trouble is writers are professional liars and when they start telling people how they write they just go on and create. [laughter]

The most weird dissertation I ever read in my life, I think, is by Edgar Allen Poe on the subject and it's used in every textbook, I think, in short story writing I have ever collided with, and I think it's Poe writing about how you write. Why, I think it's the most marvelous piece of stuff you ever read in your life. If you want to read that – I did one time, just for kicks. And you don't find anything in his stories that agree with what he said.

They either want to be the only ones and cut down the competition or do something, but they never really say what they do.
So no technology is – exists in this particular area, but there are a lot of pretended technologies in this area. I'm just talking to you about a field which is offbeat which I happen to know well and which is a noncodified field which is one of the arts. And there's that field, completely uncodified.

Only when it starts to descend into technical application, like the graphic arts; the graphic arts are just a cut down from the arts, you see? They're the mechanical representation of the arts. They're "How do you take a painting and how do you handle this painting in order to reproduce it in a magazine?" It's not a creative art, in other words; it's a graphic art.

Now, that technology – boy, boy! You start doing something a little bit haywire with that one or you start doing something a little bit offbeat in the way you take your separation negatives – you know, the red negative, the green negative and the yellow negative that you've got to take of this thing in order to get three printing plates to run through the presses, you know, so that each one superimposed on the other one and – ooooooh, boy!

You've got to have the patch of gray that can match from each negative. It's got to be on every negative, and it's got to be at least a quarter-of-an-inch square, and it's got to match exactly on a densitometer. Boy! There's technology there, man. Wow! There's technology. There's exactly what is the factors involved in this: there's the various types of ink, there's the various types of pigments, there's various color charts, there's various systems which are employed. There's all types of reproduction equipment on the subject of fine lines and dots and – oh, my, my, my, my, my! Wow! There's a terrific, terrific technology – the technology of the printer.

The technology of – well, you take retouching. Bears about the same resemblance into photography. There's somebody who can take a picture and he can take a various type of ink or sauce or something and he can take this photograph and he can alter the features of the person in it. He can do this, he can do that. Terrific technology involved. Applied art, but very applied. Big technology.

Well, how come you have to know this when right next door to it, the thing it's a cousin to, which is the original writer, doesn't have any codified technology. Has actually a false technology. And the second that this thing that is written or the thing that is painted moves over into reproduction, moves into the high channels of communication, moves over into that field at all, drops into one of the most complex and exacting of technologies. It gives one to wonder how these things are even cousins.

Here's this whole area of writing; there is no technology. Everybody pret... it's worse than that. Everybody pretends there's a technology, that if you just studied it real hard, why, you, too, could starve to death in a garret, see? So – and right next door to it, here's this other.

Well, it bears some kind of a resemblance between – I mentioned retouching. You take any photograph that is a portrait of anyone, I don't care where or who or how or why. The number of times you get a perfect negative that you can print and make a copy of, you know, and frame it or enlarge it or do something with it and enlarge it and give it to somebody so they'll say, "How nice Izzybelle looks these days." You have to retouch it and all your big studios retouch. Sometimes they over-retouch. Sometimes they practically take out all the features in their excess of enthusiasm to make somebody look good. But any picture you've
ever had taken in a studio which was ever framed and enlarged and presented to you as a presentation piece, it had to be retouched. Well, this retoucher is not the photographer. They bear the same resemblance as the duke and a steward, see? The photographer's definitely the duke, you know? He's the boy who goes through all the stuff that gets the picture and so forth, and nobody much pays much attention to the retoucher. The retoucher is rather heavily paid, but he sits there quietly drawing his heavy pay, you see, with his very exacting work.

Well, the number of tricks you can do in retouching are absolutely almost unlimited. You can do one of the wildest things with retouching. You take this negative, you know, and you take a fellow who, or a girl — girl doesn't like to be plump, you know — and you can take this thing and you can thin her down, man. And this fellow doesn't like to look so old. Well, you can't take too many lines out, because his character disappears, but you can take a few lines out if you're very good — and boy, you can take about fifteen years off his age, you see? Thud! And he thinks that picture's beautiful, because he's — of course, the people who are buying these pictures are the people who are having them taken and naturally they only buy something that flatters them. So the whole world of photography is — in portraiture — is bent in the direction of making somebody look better — not more dramatic, but better — and... because people don't like dramatic photographs, really; they like pretty ones.

I read a dissertation of why they don't let the public judge an art exhibit the other day. It's because the only paintings or the only photographs or anything else exhibited would have to do with cute little kittens falling out of baskets or wearing babies' clothes or little children with jam all over their faces and those would be the only pictures that would ever get a winning award. And they have another penchant: If it's not sharp — the public at large has an index by which they judge a photograph — if it's not sharp, why, it's no good. Well, think if you took an expert picture of a mist, a very misty morning. Of course, it's not sharp but it's a beautiful picture, and the public would turn it down.

So judging has been taken completely out of the public hands for these particular reasons, you see? But portraiture is never taken out of the public hands, see? So it's got to be retouched within an inch of its life. Everybody's really got to look prettied up, you know? Tsk! It's wild! Some of those pictures don't any more look like the people they're taking a picture of, you know, than the man in the moon.

Well, what about this? What's this relationship? How come? Well actually, the retoucher steps in when the photographer fails. You can do everything the retoucher does with your camera and the lights. You can do the whole lot with the camera and the lights. But when the photographer falls down, the retoucher picks it up.

Well, they have various things — not to give you a whole bunch of nomenclature; don't pay much attention to this nomenclature. It's just, it's just words. They've got things like barn doors — very expressive, beautiful word. They put them on the sides of a spotlight and — so the spotlight won't shine into the lens or so that you can flap them over and keep the light from hitting somebody in certain portions. And then they have things called headscreens which stand up here on a big — like a square cardboard — and that restrains the light from hitting somebody's ear, see? You can tip the edge of this board in so that this person's ear is not well
lighted. You see, his ears are too big, let us say, see? Well, you can take that shadow and throw it just exactly across his ear, see? And his ear looks smaller.

Any part you want to emphasize, you put light on, the formula is. The parts you don't want to emphasize, why, you just let it drift away, and the parts you want to practically take out of the picture, well, you just hold the light off of them and there they go.

And because photography, of course: photo –, light; – graphy, writing – it's just writing with light. And when you've written well with light you get a perfectly retouched picture. You can turn people in certain ways that make them much thinner. You can make their noses longer and you can make their forehead shallower and their chins stop jutting and so forth. Of course, you can just easily make a strong-jawed person into a weak-chinned person and so forth. You can do all kinds of wild things.

But when the photographer doesn't do his job, why then, somebody's got to step in and straighten it all out. And there's where the technology builds up. And the technology builds up in the area of correction.

So I think you'll find in the field – this is a broad statement and might be subject to a great deal of modification – in any heavy, heavy technical subject, but if very, very, very technical, I think the technology is built up around an area of correction. It's dissatisfaction with something and the correction of that dissatisfaction. Do you follow this now?

All right, the photographer doesn't do his job. He doesn't put the head screen over right so this guy's ears look like a pair of donkey's ears, See? Well, all right, nobody's going to buy that picture, so when the thing is all finished and so forth, well – I mean it's been developed rather, not completely finished – and it's in its proof sheets, and so forth; they don't even show him the proofs. They won't even show the customer the proofs.

Retoucher takes ahold of that thing and he cuts those ears down and he subdues those ears and he makes that look better and they reproof it. Then they show it to the customer and the customer's very happy with it. Correction. Correction.

Now, you can say when it isn't done right in the first place it's got to be corrected. And where it is going to be corrected a great deal of technology will arise. You follow this?

Audience: Mm – hm. Yes.

All right, if it was done right now, then there would have been no further technology. But where it's done right you would then have something moving along the line very smoothly and very easy to get along with indeed, if it was being done right. If you had the technology of how to do it in the first place, in other words, everything would move smoothly from that point there on.

But let us say there's a bunch of technology missing at this point or it is not known or it's not practiced. Now we're going to get a very heavy complicated technology arising just on the other side of this thing which we're going to call a lower-scale subject and it will simply be totally corrective of the upper-scale subject. Where you – ever you have tremendously heavy technology, then that is all of a corrective basis. In other words, it was based on a cor-
rection. There had to be something corrected at this point. It wasn't running right in the first place.

Now, let's get on this subject of bodies. Let's take it a – a finite line. All right, the photographer didn't do his job well and so therefore we had to pass it over into the hands of the retoucher. And the retoucher had to go all over this negative and take out pieces of it and do this and that before he printed it, and so forth. Well, let's not stop there.

Let's move over just a little bit further, and how about building these bodies? Well, somebody didn't build them right if people are that dissatisfied with them. There's something going wrong over there. And I'm merely pointing this out to you – there's no technology known there. There's geneticists, there's all kinds of "Eat Wheaties," there's various types of false technologies. But they frankly – there's a second dynamic, Freudianism, and so forth, but they really have nothing to do with making bodies. I don't know what the second dynamic has to do with making bodies. It's just because they get connected and they are inevitable in sequence, but they do not necessarily proceed from one, two, see?

Now, what's all this? And we're into a totally unknown body of knowledge, aren't we? And there's a lot of false superstition and other things connected with it, so there's some bird down in Vienna in 1894 could say, "The whole trouble with the human race is they have no technology of building bodies," or "They've got it all in backwards," or something like this, you know? There's something wrong, see?

Freud, he builds up then psychoanalysis which has proven very popular. It isn't effective, it's popular. See, it depended upon the communication cycle of the analyst whether it was good or bad, not on Freud's theory. Surprise? If you had a good analyst that knew how to communicate with the patient and so forth, why, somebody would get better. Accidental though – they never studied the technology of communication. They didn't know anything about that and they thought they were dealing with the second dynamic. And they weren't.

Funny, you can read over Freud's records and you find out every time the guy got off an overt, he recovered. And you know, Freud never noticed it. You know, that's so remarkable. It will be buried somewhere in the notes, because it's not emphasized, and then he's – you're given the wrong reason for the recovery and that makes it very hard to relocate what was going on in this particular thing, and we're not riding a hobbyhorse trying to apply Scientology to it. It's one of the wo... it's one of the places we got the overt. And there seemed to be one present in every recovery; a disclosed overt and a recovery. They seem to go hand in glove, so a further study of this particular zone and area brought about a resurgence of technology in that particular field. And the importance of this thing was able to take place.

All right, but look-a-here, look-a-here. Here is the only thing I'm leading up to, rather circuitously, but to give it to you – more thud, to show you there's some background to it, with the idea of you understanding it a little bit better. Do you realize that all of education as it is practiced today is a complicated corrective technology? It's a corrective technology. It isn't education at all. See, there's no effort to relay an idea from point A to point B or mind A to mind B. See? There's an effort, however, to keep the fellow from or to keep him at it in some way or to do this or to do that. In other words, the educational system is built around the fact that education has already failed.
So you have this fantastic technology and some poor bloke could go to school for many, many years learning how to be a teacher and all he would ever learn is how to correct the corrections.

Now, it isn't that that data is un… is useless. Let me tell you, when an engine has gone into the ditch it's a very good thing to know how to operate a wrecking train to get it back on the rails again – very complicated technology, but it's a very good thing to know. But this doesn't make all of railroading lifting trains back on rails that have gone into a ditch, because railroading done right has the train on the rails all the time! It's only when railroading doesn't go right.

Well, so how about education where the students are committing suicide all over the place the way they do in France, and so forth? I don't – I don't know what this has to do with – education's somehow or another linked up with something or other and survival or something and they got it all in backwards and crosswise. And the poor students over there in France come up for an examination, you just start reading the roll call: "Pierre," you know?

"Oh, he's dead," and so forth. [laughter] "He took cyanide last night. He couldn't confront it any longer."

And they have a heavy, heavy suicide rate, because apparently in France if you don't get through this particular type of examination, or something like this, they execute you anyway. I think you're executed socially or something, and France hasn't any colonies anymore to ship anybody off to so you just have to stay home, in total disgrace or something. Corrective.

Well, look at the amount of force and duress which must have been on this student. Terrific force, terrific discipline, heavy! To what? Well, to keep him at it and make him study his examinations. Well, I don't know, I never had any trouble getting anybody to study something they were interested in.

So I think that if this much duress can exist in a field to drive students to suicide – and very often in England and the United States they go off their rockers, and so forth – if there's this much duress to get them to learn, then I would say it must be some kind of a corrective technology that moves over into this field so hard only because – it moves over into this field – only because the students missed it all in the first place.

Now, what kind of duress do you think it would take to get Johnny to learn what B was when he'd already missed what A was? Now, you're getting accustomed to this in handling it with definitions and that sort of thing and I'm talking to a rather informed group here. Supposing, supposing somebody came up to take his examination to you and you were checking him off and so forth and you stuck in on the second paragraph. You couldn't get past second paragraph, he couldn't seem to remember anything in the second paragraph or so forth. Well, your technology now says that you should go back up and look just a little bit earlier to find the word he didn't understand. And sure enough, you'll find one just before he went blank, in other words – just before he went blank, there was a word he didn't understand. When we trace this back we find this word; we get this word defined and straightened out. All of a sudden, magically, he understands that paragraph.
Well now, supposing we didn't straighten out the word and supposing we told him that he was going to be expelled if he didn't learn the paragraph. Now, supposing we compound this with about ten – somewhere between ten and fifty thousand instances and texts and we did this every time. I would say we'd have an adequate explanation of why the child at nine was dumber than the child at eight, the child at ten was more stupid than the child of nine, the child of eleven was more stupid… See?

In other words, this amount of duress became necessary because nobody would ever have understood anything, they wouldn't have been educated at all and perhaps better than nothing – perhaps. I don't think so, myself, but you could add it up this way. And if every time this fellow hit a rough spot on the road you simply applied the lead boot or the pincers or the brass basket full of rats or some other interesting medieval torture and said, "Now, if you don't get that next paragraph, you're going to have had it, bud." Now, what do – what do you think he would finally wind up? Well, he'd be in – he'd be in an interesting state, wouldn't he?

He'd be far removed from any idea of what he was doing. He'd be far removed from the subject and he would be treating the subject as something entirely different than the subject, certainly. He – you know, well, he'd say: "Well, there's this thing called physics, and I'm just trying to fix these weights here, and of course that physics, it doesn't have anything to do with these couple of weights I'm trying to fix on the counter here." It'd wind up in a nonapplication.

There'd be a – he'd have to short-circuit. He'd have to get all that duress out of his perimeter. He'd have to get all this stuff out of his circle of understanding. He'd have to move it all over here someplace and just squash it and suppress it and say, "Well, the devil with it. I'll have to make up my own mind about this," or "I'll have to try to walk my own way through all this," don't you see? You would leave him on a total only-one basis with regard to his subject matter and his information. And instead of helping him you would have taken away all the information that could have helped him. So I would say modern education was making it impossible for a person to utilize his training.

Well, this then should indicate to you that a decline of IQ could be expected to follow a misunderstood word. That sounds absolutely wild, but the longer you went past that and the more you had to know that, the stupider you could be expected to get. Do you see?

Of course, we have all the corrections for this, and so forth. We've got clay table and clearing and definitions and all that sort of thing now. So we're talking from a point of view of considerable savvy. But I'm just trying to show you what the world must look like.

Here you got engineers out here putting up skyscrapers. Man, I'm – after I've learned this about education and so forth, I hope they were put up by the foreman who was never near the college because otherwise I'd expect them to fall down on me head, I would. I don't think I'd trust one very good. I've noticed a peculiarity in this particular field to get unreal or kind of revengeful toward the subject or to do weird things or to slough off when they got near their trained area.

Now, here is another datum: How does the state suffer in various terms from miseducation? How does the state suffer from miseducation? Well, there's a country, you might not have heard of it, called Russia and it went by the boards a number of years ago and it im-
ported a German philosophy called communism and it had a ball, and it nevertheless is trying to go forward and make something out of itself, and so forth. It probably would have gone forward as fast as the Western world if it hadn't adopted a squirrel, offbeat philosophy. The Western world has advanced exactly the same distance and further during the same period of time. See, they were not mechanized either back in 1917. They were pretty bum.

If you don't believe it, one of these museums, go into one of these motor museums and so forth; look at a 1917 model – stuff. Well, that's a modern Russian car. I don't mean to be catty; they did copy a jeep. They got a lot of jeeps in there during the war and they copied them.

But they're pretty corny; and what they're trying to do, over there in Russia, is spread a civilization out into a very, very, very backward Asian world. Russia is basically Asian, it's not Western. And I will say that with all their handicaps – political and otherwise – they are making some progress of one kind or another and they've got an awful lot of virgin territory to spread all of this into. They've got the whole of Siberia to spread stuff into it, see, and they're really in a state of a sort of a pioneer country. And people have said, "Well, they're really entering their Victorian Age," and I imagine that they are. They're way behind. They're almost a century back of anybody else. Oh, just because Great Britain sells them some machinery and they change the labels on it and export it to Japan as Russian field tools or something is no reason why they're good in this department. They're not.

These boys are up against a tremendous frontier, and they have the frontier of ignorance and the frontier of this and that. They've got a vast wilderness. They have millions and millions of uneducated, backward people to try to do something with, you see? Their problems are fantastic! They're trying to solve them with education, and here's the outcome of their solutions with education. Of course, you can imagine a Russian commissar operating over a Russian student. This would be pretty grim.

And the figures are these: That on-the-job training of a great number of students who were trained at the full expense of the government and the industry which was training them to take future key posts in there left it one hundred percent at the end of their on-the-job training period, which was a two or three year period. One hundred percent took no further activity in that plant or that line of work. In another plant and an area – this is one specific plant – another plant, two out of several thousand did stay with the plant. And these are not just selected figures. These are the broad coverage estimates for the whole of Russia.

These are young people who have been educated under communist duress and have been moved out into a plant to be given on-the-job training to take over future posts in that plant. And at the end of that time, because things are milder over there now, they had some power of choice as to what they did now. And they all left. That was the exercise of power of choice.

Now, if you know education – and you know our technology of education now – you will see at once exactly what must have happened. Way back here in kindergarten or someplace the communist love of the reevaluation of words caught him. The favorite trick of the communist is not to change anybody's vocabulary but to make it mean something else. They change the meaning of words so therefore everything sounds familiar. The next thing you
know a person finds that the word means something else entirely different. I'll give you an example of this: Orwell's 1984, wonderful changes of semantics, the change of meanings, of words which went through 1984. "Freedom is slavery," you know?

Well, even Roosevelt was at it. We had freedom for a long time. Everybody knew what "freedom" meant. Roosevelt, he made it "freedom from." You had to be freedom from something. That was what – the freedom we were now fighting for, we were fighting for "freedoms from." Well, that's an interesting way of looking at it. "Freedom from." Well, that means you must be fighting it so you couldn't possibly be free of it. "Freedom" means "freedom." It doesn't mean standing up against something and pushing it away from you or worrying about will it catch up to you again, or something like this, or working day and night so that it won't happen to you. That's not freedom.

So, here's a change of semantics. Now, the Russian, of course had this entire Asian population, this huge mass of people, 200 million – one of the bigger populations of Earth in one country, all divided up into different lingual groups and different customs and so forth – and he moved in on them and then he had to change everything in order to get it all lined up and get them to work together at all and he had to reevaluate all their words. So that in 1964 we find he's lost his revolution. How did he lose his revolution? Well, he trains several thousand young people to take over the Pujas River Project and they're going to be the executives and the big shots on the project and they're going to be able to drive around in Model T Fords. And at the end of the on-the-job training they all leave the Pujas River Project. That means he's going to run out of people to run things.

Material which we've got right now in Scientology, oddly enough, was of great interest to the old man Stalin himself because he smelled that it might exist in the studies which I was doing and was – I was in contact with Amtorg in 1938. And the whole line of – is, "How do you evaluate the relative ability of a person to work? How can you find out which person will produce more than which person?" And I was engaged in a study of that at that time and had some rather revelatory information regarding it. I was extremely pleased with this information and it got noise the Explorers Club. The next thing you know, I was backing up at a mile a minute trying to keep my foot off that boat of going to Russia and talk to Stalin about it.

He had problems. He had worries in 1938 – plenty of worries. He was looking for help from anywhere. But where was his missing technology? The missing technology was "How do you get people to understand something and how do you get people to do things?" Those were his areas of no comprehension. How do you get people to understand things, how do you get people to do things?

Well, he thought he had solved "How do you get people to do things." "You set up enough machine guns in front of enough walls and give them enough examples, they will work." Only you can't keep it – keep it forever that way. That'll play out sooner or later.

Now, when you start working that along an educational line, you run out of educated people fast. They just get stupider and stupider and stupider and stupider. So that I think that the way the leisure class and the upper class was wiped out in England and suborned was not through any political revolution. I just think they educated them to death. [laughter] I think
actually they got too stupid to hold their position. Something to think about, huh? I mean, as a class they were just educated to death. Everybody had to go to college.

Of course, what did this leave? This left a bunch of commoners around who didn't have to go to college, so it didn't matter about birth or anything else. It left these boys who were on the outside smarter than the guys who were on the inside so the guys who were on the inside lost. I mean, it doesn't take much to understand that. That must have been what happened.

So we can make a further point; we can make a further point here. We could say, then, that the continuation of a culture is entirely dependent upon possessing a technology of study. Russia is going to lose hers!

We have an example of the upper class of England having gone through Oxford into oblivion. We have examples of – all around us – of changing face of Earth and so forth and that hinges basically on people; the future of the human race hinges oddly enough on people. And if you don't make people who are good people, you're going to have trouble.

And in the field of study if you don't have any technology of study, then the poor little bloke who goes into kindergarten and who starts running into incomprehensibles and who then is threatened with being flunked or shot or whatever they do to children in kindergarten if they don't get their blocks piled up in the right pile, moves on into the first grade and here he is shown a word which is cat and he says it's tac and everybody looks sad; the teacher paces up and down, writes notes to the parents, the father goes into a decline, holds his head in his hands for a half an hour, you see?

This is the standard accepted procedure, you see? "What is going to come of you?" you know? That is the question which is left burning in the middle of the air, you see? "You will never succeed in life," and all that sort of thing. Why do they have to put this much duress on? Well, it's because they don't know how to teach the kid to read cat instead of tac.

So you get this terrific cultural pressure. You get a bunch of cultural technology on "How do you keep a kid in line?" Then you hire a whole police force all over the nation to try to sit on him when he becomes a teenager. And then you have a real ball, now. You get the Mods and Rockers and so forth and your this and that. Well of course, these people by now have been taught thoroughly that they're no part of anything and that's the way they act. They act as though they're no part of anything, they don't own anything and that's it.

It's quite interesting to watch some young boy and so forth who's been catapulted out into the responsibility of the care of a family or something like that at ten or eleven, twelve years of age. It's very interesting to find. Today you can – in spite of child labor laws – occasionally find such a specimen. And he bears no more resemblance to the modern teenager, and he won't because he's already had to wrap his hands around this thing called life, you see, and carry on somehow and he hasn't had time – all the time necessary to sit in school and be made stupid and he's liable to become quite a success in life or something weird like this is liable to happen to him, unlooked for.

They're trying to bring in law and order while operating in the schools to create illegal activities and disorder. They're operating in schools to create it. And the last person in the
world that would stand up and take any responsibility for it is Miss Prince-Nez, there at the — Public Local Number 18: "Well, we just try our best," you can see her now, you know? "We just try our best." [laughter] Christ! Why don't they hang a sign across the door and say, "Juvenile Delinquent Factory — "

Well, all right. So once more we have this experience in Dianetics and Scientology in this line of work. Once more we have this experience of colliding with a zone or area of the society in which there's a pretended technology where actually there is none. It's not only that — it's absence, it's — there's a pretended technology sitting in its place.

Now, I don't think, however, you're going to have too much collision with it. I don't think there's going to be too much upset, but I could foresee there's going to be some upset about it. Anything we write on this subject is sooner or later going to be challenged in some quarter or another. But this isn't a codified field that is returning a great deal of money. Teaching is not really a vested interest because it doesn't make enough money and that's about the only reason why.

Medicine, however, is a vested interest and drugs are a vested interest because somebody is making money out of it. The multibillion-dollar drug empire and healing empire and so forth will be defended to the last stethoscope, see? Those guys will be standing around there — you'll still — I mean, twenty, thirty years from now there'll still be some bloke down here trying to cause trouble, you know? He says, "Rowr-rowr-rowr."

And you say, "Well, you don't understand some word in healing."
"Yeah, I understand all the words in healing."
"Well, you don't understand some word in Dianetics and Scien…"
"Oh, yeah, I understand all the words in Dianetics…"
"What the hell's the matter with you?"
"I'm broke!" [laughter]

Well now, the teacher doesn't make any money and the school contractor doesn't care what's built in those buildings that he's contracted to build and the state doesn't really like to shell out this much money, because kids don't vote. It's not an area where you can buy many votes. You can buy them — buy the votes of their parents somewhat but people really never connect the school to the administration. They're always somewhat disconnected. So you have no active vested interest there to go up against and I believe the whole area can just be gobbled up because nobody has ever seen it as a profitable area.

We're not looking at it as a profitable area, but they won't defend it because they don't see it in a profitable area. If medicine were a lot less profitable today, we would have no trouble taking over the field of healing. It's just the self-interest in the thing which keeps the opposition raving. I don't say that bitterly. I mean that's just a completely considered statement.

There isn't such an area in the field of education, so therefore I think a proper textbook which just goes down the line rat-a-tat-tat and doesn't find any fault with anybody and doesn't shoot anybody down in flames, you know, but just goes right down the line and takes up the whole subject from the word scat and carries it on through — why, it's pretty hard to get
over the chapter of how you can reduce IQ in a person because somebody would take that as accusative, but I imagine that that can be – not glossed over, because it's a piece of the technology that'll have to be presented. But it'd be presented gently enough so that it won't have people fighting that point.

And the next thing you know, why, you'll be in another business. But it's not in another business that you've ever been absent from. Your part of the business is making people brighter, you see? Processing people, clearing people, that sort of thing. Well, that fits hand in glove with this particular type of activity. Then you have Scientologists to teach so you need the technology and that was the only reason the technology was developed in the first place – just to make it easier to teach more Scientologists – that was why it was developed. But it's going to go further than that, you watch it.

Now, if we don't take some responsibility for how far it'll go, we're liable to be in more trouble than if we just released it and forgot about it. Therefore, I'm not releasing any small book on the subject. I have to release a definite text. And I think you will find out that gradually, as this starts to roll, that it will be necessary for you in your area to make it possible for teachers, on a Saturday and a Sunday or something of that sort, to drop around and have some lectures on this subject. And I think that you'll find that it sort of will tend to stand separate and distinct from anything else which you're doing, and you will say, rather faintly, "Well, you know, we can raise people's IQ."

"Oh, yes, yes. Now what did you say about…?" and some educational question will come up, you see?

And you say, "Well, you see, you can process somebody in order to…"

They'll say, "Well yes, but now in teaching a child, do you…

And you'll say, "What the hell, which way is this cat jumping." Well, I think you'll eventually see which way the cat jumps, and the way the cat jumps is the fact that they want to know all about education. And you better let them walk all the way through education before you start showing them that they actually have entered the field of philosophy.

And I don't think they'll route any other way because in education what you're actually studying is the difference between a Level 0 and a Level 1. And what sits there is this band called "education." And that's what's been established here is – that's of importance to us intimately and immediately. All these other ramifications, all these other complexities of education are not terribly important to us.

So the society of Russia will not be able to perpetuate itself. I'm afraid that would cause me to yawn almost wide enough to dislocate me jaw. So it won't be able to perpetuate itself in history. Too bad! Oh, that's terrible! The various other political regimes and so forth won't be with it. I'm afraid I just – that the state of mind I'm in with regard to these blokes, I'm afraid that I wouldn't even pick up a shadow for them if they dropped it. They're just not important.

But people are important and their systems are not important. Now, when their systems are built on lies, those systems must therefore be destructive. And the whole educational system as I see it of total duress, of total squash on the individual, in view of the fact that it's a
system that's full of lies, I think it's about the most destructive thing you could have around at all. I think it would be very rough to have to live with this kind of a thing. It's definitely incorrect – wrong.

But you're going to find yourself in this business and the only real point I'm trying to make to you here is: don't then consider – because you can't talk to them about processing when they're busy studying study – don't then consider that you have moved them over into some other field. Recognize that you're moving them up through the top of Zero into the bottom of One. Recognize that this is a necessary step. These people are not bright enough at this particular time to even sit down and wonder, "How come they've got this technology?" You know, they've put it on some other basis entirely.

So you come in and talk to a group of them and you say, "Well, study is so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so – and the IQ of your child could be increased by study, not decreased. And you could have a brighter child," or something like this or, "Your school could run with less upset," or to a group of police, "Juvenile delinquency is caused by miseducation. Proper education would reduce juvenile delinquency."

This will all sound to them like good roads and good weather. And they'll be very happy to cooperate upon this particular line and so forth. And you don't have to say anything else. And they won't really ever wonder, "Now, how the devil does this person know all this? Yeah, where is this information from? What's this all about?" Unless, of course, they're totally ARC broke and then that's out the other end. But it never really occurs to them to ask intelligently, "Ah, what part of the information and so forth? It says throughout this textbook that this is part of a body of information called Scientology. But then it just says 'Scientology' and everybody knows what Scientology is. It's a study of science, of course, naturally. Truth, and that sort of thing. And it's so on and so on and so on and..." See, they wouldn't even think about it.

And why wouldn't they think about it? I want you to get so you can see this one little point. They can't think about anything! See? You're wondering why a fellow with blinders on can't see. See? What you haven't recognized about this individual is the most fundamental thing about this individual, and that is he can't see at all.

So you ask yourself, "Why can't Joe and Pete see this and this and this?" You see, you're asking yourself too complex a question. See, you're asking yourself, "Why can't Joe and Bill see that so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so? And why do they always argue, and so forth and so forth?" Well, you yourself are just being too complex with your question. Your question is based on the fact that you haven't recognized that they can't see! Do you follow this?

You're trying to stretch it out into, "Why can't they see something?" see? Well, your basic thing is, is just, "Why can't they see at all?" Well, they can't see at all because they've never been – they've been trained into stupidity. And you're talking to blind men, that's all. Well, how do you talk to a blind man? Well, you talk to him damn carefully! You get smart about it.

You know this guy's blind, so you – naturally he's sitting there, he can't see at all, and you're trying to talk to him about the rose garden, which you can see right outside the win-
dow. Well, you say – you wouldn't say to him, "Well, you silly ass! Why don't you look outside the window and look at the rose garden?" Well, you wouldn't say that to a fellow who couldn't see at all. See, you wouldn't.

You'd say, "Well, over there to your..." You'd have to think it over, you see? You'd have to say, "Well, over there to your right there are a certain number of windows. You possibly can feel a cold draft coming in on you occasionally. Well, that's windows over there and there's light which makes things visible and show up so that you can see things back of things. Like, you hold your two hands together, you see, like this. Well, the light would fall on the first hand, but wouldn't fall on the second hand, so you'd see the second hand, you see – you'd see the first hand but you wouldn't see the second hand because there's no light on the second hand. Now, you can hold those up and you can feel it that way," and you gradually infiltrate it into his experience, don't you see? And you'd have to sit there and figure for a while on "How am I going to give this guy some dope so that he can get some idea of there's a flower garden outside the window," see? And you gradually build it up, and you'd say, "Well, outside the window there's a lot of space. You know, the last time you went out of the room, why, you walked for quite a ways before you got into another door. Well, that was all space and that's the outdoors. And you've noticed sometimes that you've gotten rained on and so forth while you were in under some spaces, but not into other spaces, see?" You know? And you take it up like this, "Now, there's a big wide space outside the windows."

And then you'd probably recognize, "Good God! The next thing I'm going to have to explain to a blind man is the aesthetics of color. Ooh! Well, let's see. How can I do this," see? "Well, all right. Be brave. Let's do this. Let's attempt it." You get the idea?

And you eventually find yourself – and the guy would be sitting there saying, "Yeah, you know? Yeah, yeah, yeah, well I now know what a flower garden is," see, something like that. You really would have communicated something because you recognized in the first place you were talking to a blind man. But when you fail to communicate, you do so for one big, awful reason. You don't recognize that you're talking to a blind man.

And when you start talking to people about Scientology, you are actually talking to them above the strata where you should be talking to them to. Somebody says, "Well, on this new PE Course, how do we get in ARC?" Well, you don't! ARC is too high. That's very advanced data; you've got to undercut this.

You've got to give them the idea of a datum and you've got to give them the idea of the comprehension of a datum and you've got to give them the idea that there are data in existence. You've got to give them the idea that they can learn something. Sounds incredible but this is your leg up, this is your edge in.

Then you can give them the idea that there is knowledge, because 99 percent of the people you're talking to have had the experience of "The technology taught did not operate." Most of them do not expect anything to happen even if they know the technology. So they're not able to give that extra little push that makes it work. When you run into these failures it's because of this, see? It's that little extra thing. They don't expect – what I'm trying to tell you is they don't expect anything to work because nothing ever has. So they really – don't really know what knowledge is.
Knowledge is some sort of a fakery that people think is, see? If you gave them the task of describing what is knowledge, you're liable to run into something like that. Well, these people don't know there's anything to know.

Look at the arrogance of the medical profession. They don't think there's anything to know about the subject of the mind or the spirit or healing. They brush all this off, they — wow! You know? The arrogance of these fellows! They're not producing any results, yet they think they've got it all wrapped up. Well, where do you suppose that comes from but Latin? Imagine, starting somebody to handle the human mind by getting them to go over into the next county for some word of a dead language that has no resemblance whatsoever to anything he has any experience with and say, "That's where you begin on the human body," and then you wonder why in the final analysis this guy is so eager to carve up human bodies and choke people off. Well, he wouldn't ever do anything else, don't you see? You've said, "This is the tibia," and you've looked for where the tibia is. It's this word in the book: tibia.

Actually, education is getting worse and worse. In desperation recently, Great Britain has taken a fantastic turn in the field of education, about which you're not reading any articles and with which you're — probably aren't getting much data. You've probably heard something of this, but I've just been getting it hot and heavy over the lines because I was working out to find out where Quentin could go to school and what he had to do to figure out some various things, so of course, typically me, I just got in touch with everybody on this subject and got the gen down.

A lot of interesting data is pouring in on the lines. The British college does not expect, within four years, to teach any degree course which goes consecutively to school. They want nothing to do with it. They consider this is a total failure and they want nothing more to do with it. And they tell you consistently, "You want to know what the expectancy of enrollment is in 1968. I wish we knew, but one thing..." one or several have said, "...that we can tell you for sure is the courses which are now available to enroll in will no longer be enrolled in."

"Sandwich training" is what they're using today in all technical fields. They say, "The arts — who cares? Any of these old, dead-language subjects, and so forth, and dead degrees and so forth, who cares about those? But we have found out that our engineers can't build bridges and we're jolly well doing something about it. And we're upset in the field of education, and we're just tearing it to pieces."

So all the big companies and the governments and the local councils and everybody else who can put his shoulder to the wheel is knocking out anything that has resembled engineering education in the past here in Great Britain. They are just knocking it in the head left and right. They found the school room was no place to make any engineer, and the future of this culture depends completely upon the quality of their engineers. They have recognized that entirely. So they're just reforming the whole thing. And by 1968 it won't even look the same.

They'll go six months to school and they'll work for six months. That's what's going to happen to the student, and he's going to go six months to school and he's going to work for six months. And he jolly well, damned better be working in the subject he's studying or he can't enroll in it.
A whole new face has been given to the field of education. Well, that is a corrective measure which is a recognition of the fact that educational methods have failed. But it's a corrective measure in the right direction and we may even have had something to do with it because, remember, we've been teaching an – we used to teach an awful lot of teachers up in London, and it was our idea of the familiarity of things and so forth. We may have more to do with the evolution of the culture than we believe. Perhaps we could overestimate it, but I think we commonly underestimate it. I see a lot of things happening. I noticed the other day something or other happening. It was straight out of our textbooks.

Oh, yes. There's somebody drew up the profiles of Home and Heath and whatever its name is – Mr. George something – anyway, drew him up and printed our personality analysis in *The Guardian*, and plotted these boys on our personality analysis, somewhat alter-ised. But they never took one of these things down and gave it to somebody – typically the psychologist at work – never gave it to poor Home or Heath or Wilson or any of the boys, see, but went around and asked some students what they thought of these fellows and put that down as the results, and then advertised this as the actual graph of these people. I think it's very interesting. It's only something that they would do in the field of psychology. You understand what I mean? They just asked some people their opinions of whether these fellows were, you know, this or that or up and down, you see? And then they put down whatever anybody said and then released to the public that this was the personality of these blokes. I thought it was fascinating. But nevertheless, that was our graph sitting there staring us in the face.

We've already infiltrated this field to the degree that they're already out the backdoor and playing in the yard and don't even realize that we're sitting in the parlor twiddling our thumbs. That's about the way the situation is as far as command and knowledge and technology is concerned. But we are at a very – we're a very unreal group to these people and we're unreal because any further knowledge is unreal to them, don't you see? They recognize instinctively that there is knowledge somewhere, and when we talk to them they recognize that we are talking that way, but it's all on a sort of an unconscious basis. And then they don't really connect this up and they're sort of hunted about the whole thing, and we make them nervous.

But frankly, our command value over such a person is rather fantastic. It's almost an hypnotic command value which is sort of interesting. They recognize that you're talking the truth but they are not quite able to add you up to it, so the words which you're saying as you speak to them are engramic, almost, as you speak them. It's all very interesting. Scientology could be in this state and simply put the whole society into some kind of an obedience basis without even trying. But that isn't what we're trying to do.

The way that you would follow this through – you'd have to get somebody into a state where he could learn. This is the way you'd bring somebody into Scientology, see? You'd get him into a state where he could learn and you'd show him there was something to be studied and then you would show him that there was a body of information about study and then you would show him that there was a body of information to study. And it's about in those – in that sequence that you would make a big win.
And you have never really tried to approach it from this particular angle. Your normal approach to the individual is, "We can help you, we can make you smarter, we can do this for you, we can do that for you, we can make you well." We have tried to talk to him and so forth and we're talking to somebody who can't learn.

All right, if this individual can't learn, why, then of course he can't learn even the words we're saying to him. So he's in a non-receipt. It isn't that we're even talking dully or uncleanly. He's simply not receiving. See, if he can't learn in general, why, he couldn't receive your – even your sentence.

So your approach isn't failing, it just isn't reaching. Big difference between those two points. So all you have to do is move the person up to where it reaches. See, you take your first step first. You pull him up to where it'd reach him.

Well, so he'd be very happy to learn that there was ways of studying. He'd be very happy to learn this. He'd be very happy to learn there was ways of broadening his information about the world, about things.

But right away, of course, you recognize you're dealing with a present time problem. He has a lot of things that he is having problems with, that, if he could learn more about, he would be able to handle his problems. So you must be at that point colliding with a present time problem on the part of the person you're talking to. Do you see that? His basic present time problems have to do with not knowing. See, if he could just learn more about women, he wouldn't have so much trouble with his wife. I mean, let's get it down to that simple an index, see?

But of course, it never occurs to him that there's any way to go about learning that he isn't going about. So if he were just to know that there is some way you could learn more about women or learn more about anything or if there was some way of approaching this field of gathering data or becoming more learned on certain subjects and so forth, why, boy, he'd be on your side right now because he would be applying them to his present time problems, not on a direct processing basis but on just a direct indoctrination basis.

You say, "Well, there's something you can do about your life. There is some hope for it."

"Why?"

"Well, you can find out more about it."

"Is that so?"

See, not that you become clever or anything else, but "You can just find out more about what's going on around you."

"Oh, I can? Isn't that interesting? Hey! How do you do that?"

"Well, there's techniques, various techniques of learning more about things that are quite surprising, quite surprising, and so forth. And one of them is to observe."

"Is that so?"
Well, you get how fundamental this gets? You observe. You think you have to be clever to teach somebody something like this. No, just be obvious; observe.

"Now, you – you say you want to know more about your wife? All right. Now, there's a good example. All right. Now, has it ever occurred to you to observe your wife?"

"No." [laughter]

"All right. Now, I'll tell you what you do. Your first lesson in learning something about study is to just learn how to observe. Just learn how to look at something. Just – that's it. All right, how do you look at something?"

Well, leave him wallow in it, man. How do you look at something? Hell, you look at it! That's the answer. And that's the answer he'd finally come up with. But how does he look at something? Well, he looks at it, see? And that would be his problem for the day, you see? He'd think there were trick ways of looking at things. Do you look at them through various colored glasses, you know? Do you look at them cross-eyed? Do you use eyeballs? All kinds of things, see? Let him solve that one. How do you – how do you observe something? Well, let him draw up systems of observation. If he wants to know more and have less trouble with his wife, well, he'd better learn how to observe his wife.

Now, that would be a primary method, then, of handling his personal affairs and his personal life. That would be right there or right down the middle of Main Street. He'd learn all kinds of things that just never occurred to him before. He's taken it for granted that observation is going on, don't you see? You've taken it for granted. You say, "Two people are living together, they both look at each other."

The only time a wife ever looks at him is when he comes home with a smear of lipstick. She can see lipstick. She puts it on her mouth all the time.

In fact, she put that lipstick on him that morning when he left for work, but she's forgotten that so now she has grounds for divorce: He came home with lipstick on his face. All day long nobody happened to tell him he had some lipstick on his face, see? But she can observe – lipstick on his face. End product.

You talk about observation. In any very big city – in any big city you can pull some of the wildest tricks to demonstrate nonobservation you ever cared to have anything to do with. The wildest things go unobserved in large cities. You wouldn't believe it. I, myself, used to make a gag out of this. I used to make a very amusing gag out of this; it paid off in many ways. Why, I used to tell some girl – if I were ever walking down Broadway in the vicinity of 42nd Street, you could always count on me to tell the girl I was walking with, you see, "Do you know that New Yorkers never see anything?"

"Oh? No!"

"Oh yes, you can do almost anything. I mean a fellow could drop dead out here, somebody could pull a gun out of his pocket and shoot somebody dead and the passerby wouldn't even pause in their stride. You'd have to actually actively block the pavement. If there was a fight in progress, they would only stop if the pavement got blocked so they couldn't go by and then they'd stop and eventually watch the fight. You can excite curiosity by blocking the
pavement and looking up, but you have to block the pavement before you look up and then they will also look up. But it's very, very funny but they never see anything. They don't pay any attention to you and if you don't actively block the pavement, why, they never notice."

"Oh, I don't believe you!"

You see, you get some girl from the Corn Belt or something like this. "Do you know that I could stand right here on the corner of 42nd and Broadway and kiss you and there isn't one single person would even glance in your direction."

"I don't believe it!"

"All right, I'll show you!" [laughter] Yeah! Never failed, never failed. Wonderful technique. [laughter, laughs] Yeah, there'll be a fee if any of you young fellows try that. [laughter]

Anyway, the score is that you take such – take such very unexciting words as "observation" or "inspection" or "familiarity," you see, the very unexciting words. You can actually build them up into mountains. They become very, very startling indeed! And when you're teaching somebody about this, what you want to do is take the obvious and expand it. Don't go going overboard to give them all – well, we're sitting in the driver's seat now. We've got the technology of education, do you see. It's contained in these lectures and so forth. There hasn't been very much to add to it, either. It appears to be quite complete.

Now, you're going to say, "Well, am I supposed to teach somebody education, huh?" Oh, no, no, brother. You're not supposed to teach anybody your technology of education. Let's teach them the introductory aspect of education. Which is what? How do you learn about things? Well, you could sit down and ask yourself that.

Well, how do you learn about things? Well, you learn about things by looking at them, by feeling them, by hearing about them, by reading books about them, by seeing what they relate to. You could lay all this down very easily, but of course you get out of it such things as "feel" and "observe" and so forth.

Now, if that's the breakdown that you make on your very, very introductory and elementary approach to learning, you see, if that's the breakdown which you make, realize that all of these things can be applied to all of the problems which any person at Level 0 or Level I has. You could give all kinds of gratuitous information about all kinds of gratuitous things which are being brought up with regard to this. Let's look at that.

So, it isn't for you, then, to say, "Well, let's see. I'm going to teach this fellow about Scientology. Well, there's such a thing as ARC. That's affinity, reality and communication and they form a triangle and so forth, and so on…"

"Where am I at? What – what's going on?" see. Well, he doesn't know there's any knowledge in existence anywhere that he doesn't know. That's one of the first things he doesn't know. He thinks everything in the world has already been found out. He doesn't know that the society is in any way deficient. Look at the way somebody out in the street will complain about a past life or complain about a something or other.
You can take some bird who's howling like mad about the fact that there's no such things as implants and start to say, "Well, say this word," give him an item in a Helatrobos line plot, and the meter goes bluu, and he goes bluu, and give him the next item, "Say that word." Bluu, bluu. Well, if there's no such thing as an implant where's all that coming from? Meters don't run for the fun of it, see? But to teach him something like this?

So what you in Scientology are up against is actually not the meanness of the society or the cussedness of the society nor the unwillingness of the society to be helped or any of those things. What you're -- you're not even up against the ignorance of the society; you're actually up against the incorrect study technology of the society, which prohibits them from learning what you're talking about and prohibits them from learning that there is more to know. A technology that stultifies the intellect, that freezes the individual into a noncomprehension of anything, which puts him into a woodenheadedness the like of which nobody ought to be put into.

In other words, you're talking to a stultified even ossified individual who has been carefully and systematically -- but accidentally and unintentionally -- destroyed since the first day he set his foot on his mother's knee and said, "Mama, what's a cat?"

And then she said, "Don't bother me now."

"Let's see. Cats are 'don't bother me nows.'" He's the product of an educational system which has threatened to shoot him against the social brick wall with all the social machine guns if he doesn't get "A" in every subject and graduate out of the top of his class where he didn't even understand what the word "school" meant.

Everything has militated -- everything has operated against this individual ever becoming brighter or more educated. And now you expect to come forth with a great body of knowledge that this individual would welcome with open arms.

Well, in the first place, he's been shot down in flames on the subject of study to begin with and this would just mean more study to him. Furthermore, you couldn't possibly exist because all study materials are bad because you get shot if you don't know them or something weird like this will be going on in his head. In other words, the communication line is jammed. What's the communication line jammed on? The communication line is jammed on study. So this is study in dissemination.

And do you see that the study itself is an excellent dissemination tool and would work like a shot and I'm sure that you will find yourself, if you start to use this, being pulled in faster than you know.

And I will only give you one little caution with regard to it, is don't get too studious about study in your address to the subject. Just pick the very obvious points of study and make them very studious points because it doesn't matter how studious you get about the obvious. A person can still see it. Do you see?

So that you say -- you -- some person, he wants to get things built up into some tremendous tower of complexity on this subject. Well, you just let him build it up on the subject of observation until it likes to reach the sky. He isn't going to get anywhere but observation, is he? He's going to get, in the final analysis, the fact that you observe by observing. This is
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what final conclusion he will have to reach. No matter how many systems he develops in or-
der to do the observation, he will eventually reach that point.

He can't help but learn things and learn things about learning if he observes things. So you've got any broad, fabulously simple point of this character which, if you put across and got it across, you would all of a sudden get tremendous agreement with. And you'd get that little "Hey! What do you know?" you know? "What's -- yeah! Yeah! If I observed my wife -- ah, yes! What is she doing? How does she look when I'm talking to her? Why, I have to check up on that." [laughter] And by the very familiarity of reach and withdraw by observation of his wife, he'd have less trouble with her. He'd become more familiar with her, he'd understand her better. You're talking to people who have withdrawn totally from life.

Study, of course, is one of the best methods in the world of bringing them out of it.

Thank you.
STUDY AND INTENTION

A lecture given on 18 August 1966

Thank you. Thank you.

Well now, if I look – if I look a little bit used today and secondhand, the… if anybody thought Clear research took it out of me, man, OT research – wow! Yeah, you think you got it all solved, you know? How did you get in this much trouble? How did I get in this much trouble? Yeah, man, you try to take the postulate of a 190-mile-high being and while you're only five foot ten and a half; or something like that, take it apart – it's "Where's your head?" you know?

This is very interesting. When you get Clear, I've got a little piece of advice for you: Why, get enrolled in the OT Course and do it step by step, politely and quietly. Don't get ambitious. I'm the only one that's expendable around here. [laughter] Every time anything happens to me they say, "Well, it serves him right," and any time anything happens to you, that's my fault. [laughter] Yeah.

Anyway, what's the date?

Audience: 18th of August AD 16.

Eighteenth of where?

Audience: August.

August.

Audience: AD 16.

AD 16. Thank you. You're helping me out today. And what planet?

Audience: Earth.

Earth. What… yeah, good. Earth? [laughs]

Well, actually, what this is all about – I really don't have anything to talk to you about today. I want to make a little bit of a – well, I want to make a little bit of a correction. If you, as I did after the last lecture, go and look up Dharma (D-H-A-R-M-A) to find out what has been preserved of all that, why, save yourself the trouble. Dharma is anything from "supreme law" to "the total caste system of India" to "fate" and respelled "love" and rephrased some other way, it is something else some other way, and so forth. And in no authoritative reference book that I've looked at to date that I have around at this particular time, is there any correct definition for Dharma. Boy, that is really great, you know, it's really great! And in Buddhism it means "the way," see.
Now, I tell you, you go around getting your name synonymous with things, you know, and then your name becomes the thing, you know. If you make very good Frigidaires, why, eventually all iceboxes are known as Frigidaires, you see. But it's worse than that, it's worse than that. The name becomes identified with the product rather than the source of the product, which I think is very fascinating. I just thought I would give you that as a little side note on the last lecture, because I thought, "I wonder what they're saying about that these days," you know. "I wonder if there's any record of it around," you know. By George, there isn't! I notice, however, in many books such as the theosophy texts, and so on, that it is bounteously mentioned, but it doesn't really say wherein.

Well, the age we're in, by the way – the age we started, by the way – already has been named. This might also be an interesting side note to you. It's the Age of Love. There was the Age of Reason and the Age of Science and the age of a lot of other things. But twenty-five hundred years ago, why, Gautama Siddhartha said that in twenty-five hundred years, the Age of Love would begin in the West and this is an interesting prediction because the first thing that Clears start talking about is love, you know. It's interesting. Of course, nobody ever made this before, so how was he to know? But, anyway, this is supposed to be the Age of Love. No longer the Age of Reason – thank God! [laughter]

Well, there are probably a lot of things I could talk to you about – I don't know any of them at the present moment that would be more useful to you than another. Completions are up so I don't have to worry about that and you seem to be doing fine on the course, so I don't have to worry about that. But there is a lecture that I think you could use in a high degree of generality and that is a roundup of the study materials.

There was never really a final lecture on the study materials and in this lecture I will not for a moment adventure to give you a summary lecture which includes all the salient points of the study materials. There are quite a few of them. But there are some additional materials about the study materials in general which I think you might find of great interest. And that is the basis of intent – intent during study. Now, this is a very; very important subject.

As you study, what do you intend to do with the information? Very important point!

There are points on the basis of faulty source, as you are studying. This we haven't really looked at. We have presupposed that all sources that we are studying are themselves perfect, you see, and have – (1) have information to deliver and (2) are delivering it in a way that it can be assimilated. We've more or less assumed that and the student is always asked to take the effect point and assume that he is studying comprehensible, worthwhile material. This fact, all by itself tends to knock the whole subject of study appetite over tin cup because very little of the material you are asked to study has any value or comprehensibility out in the wog world. And it is a rare textbook which actually relays the information and subject matter which you are supposed to assimilate – a very rare textbook.

Now, when you get study gone mad, you really have a mess. This is one of the reasons why there are such a tremendous number of suicides in universities – and there are a great many suicides in universities. The proportion is fantastic. It is not as high as psychoanalytic
practice suicides, which amount to one third in the first three months. Did you know that? Well, for some reason or other, it's never been advertised.

The source of that is the psychoanalytic bureau, or whatever they called it, in New York. We've more or less finished that subject, by the way. Very little of it left.

But the suicides which occur in French universities is probably the highest in the world and French students blow their brains out and jump out of windows all over the place come examination time.

The number of failures in a university do not, however, have anything whatsoever to do with the product turned out by the university. None of these things are related. Because their examinations are very hard does not make it a good university. You see, the ones with the hardest examinations are not necessarily those that produce the most brilliant students. It's not a coordinated fact.

There are many other facts which don't coordinate with regard to this and that is because study is a very fruitful field for a suppressive. It, like government, attracts suppressives like honey attracts flies. And you can get all types of suppressive reactions found in textbooks as well as behind the lecture rostrum. As a result – as a result, we have to, when we speak of the subject of study, discuss whether or not the subject itself has a clean bill of health. Is the subject an ethics – or the rendition of the subject – is this an ethics subject?

Now, I will tell you a field which, without any doubt whatsoever, would keep a thousand ethics officers busy a thousand years and that is the field of navigation. Now, I'm somewhat expert in this particular line, but I very seriously doubt if I could walk into a Board of Trade or Bureau of Navigation and pass today my master's examinations in the field of navigation. I doubt this very, very much, because it has so little to do with navigation. And I have had the unfortunate experience of having had to navigate in many oceans off the cuff; on my own – inadequate equipment, stopped chronometers, and all of this sort of thing, and missing tables, and so forth. And somehow or another these barriers would not put you into a position – must not put you into a position where, of course, you lose the ship. So you navigate.

And the method by which you navigate is the all-important thing in an examination on navigation and that you navigate is the only test that Old Man Sea requires of you.

And I usually – usually when some chap has just passed his navigation examinations with "A" and walks aboard a ship that I have anything to do with, well, I get very alert. Because this doesn't say to me that he can navigate at all – has nothing to do with navigation. I've had such a chap walk aboard, take a look at the helm and say, "So that is a wheel! Well, I've often wondered. And that is a binnacle, that's a compass! Oh, goodness! And that's an engine room telegraph! How interesting!"

And I thought to myself; "How interesting!" The man had his ticket; he must have passed his examination. But he hadn't even reached the point of where he knew the environment in which he was supposed to do his navigation.

And you break navigation down to its basic principles, you just have certain elementary principles which are just the facts of it, and they are very, very streamlined, obvious facts. For instance, the whole subject is dedicated to the location of where you are on a
sphere. And in view of the fact the sphere also has rocks, shoals and land masses, also has somewhat tempestuous areas which are less safe than others and has calm areas that you jolly well better stay out of; it becomes somewhat important that you know where you are.

And in view of the fact that the sea is a water surface which obscures the things even a few inches below it... I remember one time sailing along in a perfectly beautiful flat calm and doing all right and looking over to port and seeing a sea gull walking on the water! [laughter] You don't think at that moment I went slightly pale! Because of tide-races which had been caused by a storm or were going backwards according to the tide tables, and so on – the depth of water over a shoal just alongside of me was not twenty feet, but was one inch! So you see... It was supposed to be high water at that time.

Now, therefore, all navigation performed with mathematical activities only can only be counted on to do one thing: wind you up on the rocks. That you're fairly sure of. Because the whole subject is dedicated to knowing where you are. And the next thing is not running into, on or colliding with objects which you're not supposed to frequent or associate with. That's easy.

And then we have some other facts: that the stars don't move very much; and cliffs and headlands don't move very much; and the sun, it moves pretty regularly; and the moon moves erratically but very regularly – you can predict its erraticness. And so you can look at these things and if you have a chronometer which happens to have been wound up or can get a time signal from some place, you normally can locate where you are on the sphere by its reference to stellar bodies or, in case of piloting, by recognition of land masses. That's actually all there is to the whole subject.

Now, do you understand something about the subject?

Audience: Yes.

I assure you that you now understand far more about the subject than a first-year midshipman at the Naval Academy. Because he's given a book that is named Dutton. Dutton is the bible. Now, Dutton might have been a good textbook to begin with, but it has gotten into the hands of admirals; and it has been ceaselessly rewritten.

Now, the Primer of Navigation by Mixter was the elementary textbook which kept the officers who stayed off the rocks off the rocks in World War II. He published it in 1940; it became the bible of the young officer of World War II. And it now – Mixter is dead – is now in the process of being rewritten by the admirals. And when I read it the other day, I just picked up a copy of it and looked – read it – "This doesn't sound like Mixter."

So last night, I got ahold of a copy of my World War II copy of Mixter, and a brand-new copy of Mixter's that just came off the press, and I read them page by page against each other and it's considerably different! The words have gotten longer.

Now, Bowditch has undergone this process for so many years that from a little tiny textbook published at the end of the eighteenth century in simple language – so that even Bowditch's cook could navigate after a cruise to China – has become a textbook about three or four inches thick which is staggeringly full of sines, cosines, haversines, tables, traverse tables, equations and all kinds of mad things. And it's become an enormous book of tables. If
they don't know what to do with a navigational table, they put it in Bowditch. It is now an official textbook of the United States Navy I imagine there are things in the Royal Navy which have gone this same evolution.

But the main point I'm making here is that you would have thought somebody would have paid attention to such a subject – lack of knowledge of which kills men. See, you can die awful quick through an absence of navigation, you see – and not – sometimes not so quick, sometimes rather messily. You'd have thought they would have made every effort to make it simpler. Well, it's true that they've evolved simpler methods of taking star sights, but their textbooks are so complicated that the first time I ever picked up a copy of the Naval Academy textbook on navigation, Dutton, I read the first four sentences, I read them again; they still didn't make any sense. I read them again. I put the book down and that's as far as I've ever gotten with Dutton.

Many years later – many years later, I read the first four sentences again and I found out that if you were an expert navigator and needed no information of any kind on the subject, the first four sentences of Dutton made sense.

Well, I think that's very interesting.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica, in its earliest editions, is a rather simple encyclopaedia – very interesting. I don't like editions later than the eleventh, because you find all sorts of things in editions up to then. They're rather simply written. They're written on the basis that a person owns an encyclopedia because he doesn't know certain things, and he'll want to look them up and find a quick rundown on them. Well, more recent Encyclopaedia Britannica, I'm sorry to say, publish articles on the subject of landscape gardening that only a landscape gardener could comprehend or be interested in. We've gotten into the world of the expert.

Now, the expert, in writing a textbook, very often goes mad. Last night I picked up a textbook on the subject of… I'm using navigation at this particular time instead of photography, as I was using in the subject before, just to get a parallel subject. I picked up a textbook on the subject of yacht equip… yacht cruising equipment. Oh, very, very authoritative text, very modern. And there was a chapter there on binoculars. So I looked into this chapter on binoculars and it's just page after page after page about binoculars. It's very interesting because it takes it up from the days of Galileo. It tells you how to build – without being specific about it, but being very complex with complete formulas – a Galilean telescope. I think it's very useful; I can see me now out on a yacht in the middle of the Pacific building a Galilean telescope. I can see this now.

So anyway, it goes on from this – which is comprehensible – you say, "Well, anybody would put that in the first paragraph." No, he puts that in the first two or three pages.

And we go on from there to the assimilation and – of light by glass and various types of glass and how the glass is made, and we go on and on and on about the formulas now by which you grind glass. I can see me now, you see, just outside the Diamond Head at Waikiki, wondering which binocular to pick up and, "Let's see now, what is the glass formula that ground the glass of that binocular?" you see. Silly!
So anyway, it just goes on at this mad rate and at the end of it finally concludes, without any preamble of any kind whatsoever, that a yachtsman needs a 7 x 50 type pair of binoculars – an authoritative conclusion based on all of the optical formulas. A yachtsman is not an optician; what's he got the formulas there for? Completely batty!

Now, the truth of the matter is that that chapter does not contain the following: how to preserve, waterproof and clean glasses being used at sea. And you can wreck a pair of glasses just that fast if you don't know that. How to set a pair of glasses to your own eye prescription and be able to set up any binoculars that you pick up instantly so that you can use it instantly without fiddling about – didn't contain that. Didn't contain the fact that in small vessels, the vibration and the bounding about is such that the shake of the glass makes it impossible for you to detect numbers on buoys, or identities of or names of ships at any distance if you use too high a powered glass, and a 7 x 50 will inevitably blur out on the motion of a small yacht. It is not the glass for a yacht at all. What you want is a three- or four-power for a small boat, and then you can read the numbers on buoys. So even his conclusion was wrong.

Fascinating! He spends all these pages, see? But somebody comes along that's had to live with binoculars, knows all the things that dumb, brandnew, untrained quartermasters can do with binoculars – you see, he's used binoculars under all circumstances and he finds out that what the fellow wrote has nothing whatsoever to do with the subject.

But wait a minute, wait a minute. A fellow that's been using them for years under those conditions doesn't need that textbook, does he? And if that textbook doesn't inform the user of any of the data that he will require in order to use… What is this?

Wow! There's more to this than meets the eye. Considerably more to this than meets the eye. Let's read a few books picked up at random off the shelf on the subject of the sea. And unless you are very clever – and a Scientologist – you will not notice that all it speaks of is disaster. It just tells you, consistently, page after page after page after page, how disastrous it all is, how you must do this and that because this is going to happen, how you must do that and this because something else is going to happen, how you must not do so-and-so because something else is going to happen. You read in vain how to get another half a knot out of your sail set. But you read all about how the tracks to the front of the sail as they attach it to the mast – not to go technical on you – how these little gimmicks that they put on the sail to go up the Marconi track, how they tear loose in storms and jam sideways and make it necessary for people to get up and climb up mast, which is impossible.

And if you read very much of this, you would not go to sea; you would be scared stiff; just scared stiff!

And even on a person of considerable experience this creeps up on him and he doesn't notice it. And eventually he starts going to sea, and he gets in a sort of a half-hysterical frame of mind. Beautiful calm day, he's out in the middle of a channel fifty miles wide, there are no ships in sight and he's worrying about his azimuths, or did the subpermanent magnetism of the hull change the last time she was in dry dock, and is his compass reading right, and will he pick up – oh, just worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry. He'll never sit back, you know, and say, "Great!" you know?
Now, if you want to go into hysterics sometime, read coast pilots. For light reading, for those who like horror stories, that is what one recommends.

I remember one time considering taking the big jump down from Alaska – just going outside all protection in the middle of winter and tearing on down across the wide reaches of the Pacific and fetching up at a California port as a direct bang! you see, with an expeditionary vessel – without going behind anything, and so forth. And I sat there and the mate I had was sitting there, and we were both reading – we had two copies of the same coast pilot. And we were looking it all up – and it wasn't – but it was not the same coast pilot; his was British and mine was American – and we read it.

It seems that five hundred miles off of the coast there are fantastic currents which, when the wind and fog come together – because the wind comes with the fog at the same time in the middle of December and January – you can absolutely count on being torn to pieces, sunk, engaged, involved, becalmed, messed up and in general finished. And it was so bad – it's much worse than I'm saying – and it was so bad that he and I, sitting up… It was already, you see, complete black dark outside at high noon, you know, and we were going to take this run and somehow or other we were going to get the hell out of there. And we all of a sudden simultaneously broke into hysterical laughter. Nothing could be that bad, you see, but nothing! The British pilot, American pilot – nothing could be that bad!

One time I read about a terrible tide-race. And it was a tide-race. And it told all about how it had sunk a Canadian gun boat and lost two hundred men, and that this tide-race went sixteen knots and – every time the tide changed, and there was a huge rock in the middle of it that split vessels apart but was visible at night because of the spray leaping into the air.

Well, normally you would go through these things at slack water anyway. I went through it at slack water, and the cook, all the time we were going through it, was cooking up hot flapjacks and pushing them up on the bridge, because I was sitting there eating my breakfast the entire distance through this mad tide-race.

I shot another tide-race one time, a narrows, where "anybody that entered it was practically sunk, but sometimes the ships caromed off the sides of the cliffs and kept afloat somehow." And I was in the middle of this thing in the middle of the night, because there was an error in the American tide tables – a two-hour error – and I'd hit the thing at race instead of at slack. And the water was going through there just boiling white and, man, I came near that in a sailing ship and I was into it before I could do another thing. And the lights of the cabin were shining through ports on the cliffs, so close up that you could see the moss. And the tiller broke, and left us with no tiller. So I rigged an emergency tiller in the middle of all of this and steered her on out the other side and suddenly realized we'd gotten through it. And I realized something else about it: I never really at any time ever had to know anything about that millrace at all, if I'd hit it at slack water, high water, or any other way, it didn't matter if it was fast; it always sends a boat through. What was I studying tide tables for? So it runs fast. You get the idea?

Well, of course, it's very nice to know all these cautions, but what did the captain of the Indianapolis... He was a US Naval captain. And they have stripes, you know, that go clear up to their cap. [laughter]
This fellow took the cruiser *Indianapolis* through this first narrows I was talking to you about. And the local pilots cautioned him about it and he'd read all the tide tables and he was a graduate of the Naval Academy and he was a man of great experience, I'm very sure, and so forth. And he had all this information, because every time they graduate, you know, up – I mean every time they get promoted they have to pass complete examinations on everything, you know? I'm sure he had the information – "A" student all the way. And he got the *USS Indianapolis* crossways in that channel at full race, with its stern stuck on one bank and its bow on the other. This he managed. I can't for the life of me know how he could possibly have done it.

But if you look very carefully through these textbooks, you will find the bulk of them simply tell you not to go to sea, that it's very dangerous. And a person who studies them very, very hard and abides by them totally, eventually loses all the fun of going to sea – and doesn't.

So, there is suppression throughout that field. Now, of course, it is very nice for them to tell you that if you let the boat flood with butane gas and then strike a match, the boat will blow up. We're glad to know that! It's very nice to know where the rocks are. But let's not concentrate on them for the rest of our lives. Let's also point out where the open, easy-sailing water is, but we never hear about that; we just hear about the rocks.

And we could, then, take any subject and write it up for study purposes as a suppressive subject.

Now, you want to tell people the dangers – sometimes you can tell them too lightly, that's true. For instance, it – I'd hate to tell people... There's two extremes here: I'd hate to have to omit the idea that if you do an incorrect Search and Discovery you can make your PC quite ill. You get the wrong SP, the person can be sick; he can now get sick, because you've restimulated the right one, you see. And that is what's making him sick. You're not making him sick, the right one is.

Now, I can tell you that, but now to go on raving and ranting and describing S&D as only how not to get the wrong one because you're sure going to do it, I could get you into a frame of mind – I don't say I would – but you could be gotten into a frame of mind whereby you would probably never do an S&D because it's too dangerous. Interesting! You could be scared right off of doing the right thing because it's too deadly.

Well, now, that would be how you would curve a subject and make it suppressive. That's a suppressive rendition of the subject. It's not the subject that's... But we could just go on talking about "People get sick when you do an S&D on them if you do not so-and-so and you want to set up your meter because people will get sick. And your meter has to be trimmed, your trim knob has to be so-and-so because people are going to get very sick. And then it's your fault as the auditor, you see? And then so on," and we never talk about anybody ever recovering because of an S&D; we just talk how sick they'll get if you do it wrong, do you see? Then it becomes too dangerous to do.

Now, they've done this about the mind, and they managed to have scared off – the SP on the track managed – has managed actually to scare off all intelligent research on the subject of the mind and soul. You've heard time and again how dangerous it is. "You mustn't fool
around with the mind!" Perfectly all right to take a meat ax to the brain, but you mustn't fool around with the mind!

I got my belly so full in 1950 of psychoanalysts telling me how dangerous it was to fool around with the mind. But I finally more or less rejected it with laughter, because I looked at who was talking. And when he said fool around, man, he meant fool around, because I found out he could not study Dianetics; he could not do it.

And do you know our main departure from training psychoanalysts and psychiatrists and medical doctors is not really based on the fact we are antipathetic toward them at all. It's the fact that they can't seem to duplicate study materials. And it's just so hard, it's so tough.

A person comes off the street; you can teach him a Comm Course in a week. Well, you'll teach a psychologist a Comm Course in something like six or eight weeks. Rough, see? Because the guy has been very suppressively taught. He can't duplicate anymore on this subject. And it's contra everything else he has been taught, you see. So it's all going in sideways and backwards and he's got preconceived notions and he's actually in Remedy B of The Book of Case Remedies. That's what he needs.

Now, the suppressive subject then is something which booby-traps study, and all of the work which you put in to get somebody to know his algebra, and so on, might be all lost because he hasn't got a textbook which teaches him algebra. You see? Now, what is needed is an appreciation of the study materials by the people who write materials to be studied.

Now, blokes will try; they'll try very hard. I was reading a book on ocean cruising the other night. It was very fine. It was not ocean cruising but Coastwise Navigation Wrinkles. And he said, "But what you should use if you have a crew who isn't trained," something like that, "and it's much safer, you should always have a grid compass." A grid compass. He starts it out with the fact that everybody must understand his work. That was the condition under which he wrote it. And in the first few sentences here is this phrase "grid compass." There's no further explanation of any kind whatsoever. So, just for fun, I picked up various navigational and equipment texts to find if I could find a grid compass: a picture of one, a definition of one. I picked up two or three nautical dictionaries to try to find a definition of a grid compass. Didn't exist – very hard, very rough. Now, there was a guy who was honestly trying to do a good job and he skidded because he didn't know that he mustn't put in a word that people wouldn't know.

Now, in Dianetics and Scientology we've been consistently up against the fact that we're beyond the limit of language. The English language does not include the parts of a subject which was unknown. You understand, I mean, if you don't – if nobody's known anything about any of these things, you see, well, they have to be named, which unfortunately gives us a lot of nomenclature, and so on, which we could be very happy without. We have to have it because it isn't in the language.

Now, once in a while a psychoanalyst tries to turn it around, or a psychologist tries to turn it around to his own nomenclature, and you get the real reason why some things which could have been called by old terms aren't – is because he's got an entirely different definition and his definition is in argument with the other definitions in his own field, so they don't know what they're talking about. So, it's a completely messed-up area.
Now, where they did have some words, the words didn't mean what they're supposed to mean, do you see, and then there's argument about the definition of those words.

So the solution to this was actually to turn verbs to nouns where possible, to use nomenclature which was expressive to some degree of what it represented. Now, not knowing the study materials when the material was originally written, it was not possible to apply all this and go back to the beginning and sort it all out up the line. Now, this would be a very, very long and rough passage. This would be a tough passage to try to rewrite everything all the way down the line.

Now, we suffer to the degree that we don't even have a dictionary; we do not have a real dictionary at this time which would give – and that is because every time I get a copy of a dictionary, and so forth, I have to, myself; check the whole thing. And I find myself making changes and corrections in it. And then I have to work very hard, you see, on it, and then somebody else has been working on it, and it's a major project. And just about the time I will get started, you see some – a lot of it's been done, and then I've got to carry on through with corrections – something will come up, something will be totally demanding of total time, and it doesn't get done. And this dictionary – we've been on dictionaries for I don't know how long, trying to get you a dictionary.

Well, it's a rough job. It's a rough job at best.

But you will find nearly everything is defined in the text where it originally appears. Therefore, were you to cover all of the data, you would get all of the language. And that is one of the reasons why I said that a Saint Hill student had better go back to the original method of study. And the original method of study is you covered it all lightly. You covered it all lightly and you wound up then with a good grip on the entirety of the subject. And then, what you really had to know, well, you then studied that hard for star-rate. But volume was what it took.

Now, of course, you're up against not knowing where the word was originally used and there are probably a great many tapes missing. I don't imagine we have many Wichita tapes, and I know we have few or no Elizabeth tapes compared to the lectures. There were eight hours of lecture a day there on many days; five hours was routine, teaching different classes and units. But this gives us a difficulty right there. But we're clever enough to know we have that difficulty.

And now what I'm going to tell you is going to solve this to a very marked degree, and this is the subject of the intentions of study. For what purpose are you studying? Now, until you clarify that, you in actual fact cannot make an intelligent activity of it.

Now, most students study for examination. That's folly! Complete folly! You're not going to do anything with the examiner. You're sitting there studying for examination, studying for an examination, studying for an examination, "How will I regurgitate this when I am asked a certain question? How will I respond? How will I pass my checkout?"

Well, it's very hard to keep "demonstrate" and "example" and "clarify" into examination. It's so much easier to fall back on "What did it say in the bulletin," you see, and get direct quotes of the material itself; when in actual fact that's really not proper examination. Be-
cause the fault that can be found with education in the university, the argument the practical man has with the academically trained man when he first gets him on the subject and has to make him fully acquainted with it – you know, like the guy who's been out there building houses for a long time and he all of a sudden gets an assistant who's just been trained in the university to build houses. He goes mad! Guy doesn't know anything about the subject at all. He's been studying it for years, yet he knows nothing about it and he doesn't know why this is.

Well, I can tell you why it is, because the fellow who just went through the university studied all of his materials so that he could be examined on them. He didn't study them to build houses. And the fellow who's been out there on a practical line is not necessarily superior in the long run at all, but he certainly is able to get houses built because all of his study is on the basis of "How do I apply this to house building?" Every time he picks up an ad or literature or anything else, he's asking the question throughout the entirety of his reading, "How can I apply this to what I'm doing?" And that is the basic and important difference between practical study and academic study.

Scholastic or academic study is not worth very much. Why you have a fellow go through a course and wind up at the other end of the course unable to audit, it's because he in actual fact studied for the examination. He did not study to apply it to people. So he winds up with the material unapplied. That's regrettable. This is why you get failures in practice after certification, and is the whole reason.

Now, if a fellow were just studying for the examination, he would not have to know the exact meaning of all of the words. He could sort of gloss over it and pass it off because he could include the word in the totality of its sentence and merely quote the sentence if he was asked the question. And he wouldn't really have to know the meaning of the word. So he tends to move out the material over here and have sort of nothing to do with the material while he is busy studying the material, because he can just rattle it off. And this explains the student who can rattle off his material so beautifully but doesn't know anything about the subject.

See, you say to him, "Fulcrums." He doesn't know what a fulcrum is. He hasn't a clue, but he knows it fits in a sentence that says, "The law of the fulcrum is rat-a-tat-tat tat-a-tat-tat," so he can write it all down rat-a-tat-tat. And he knows how to solve fulcums because those are the formulas by which you solve them: distance, weight, so on. So he just applies it for the problem he's given, "Rat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat trrm-pa, there we are."

One fine day he's got to move a barrel. And he stands around and he looks around at this barrel and he scratches his head and he doesn't know how he's going to move that barrel, because he can't get one end of it picked up to slide anything under it, and he couldn't hold it up if he did, and so forth. And finally somebody who doesn't know anything about fulcums at all comes along, takes a pole, sticks it over the top of a stump and sets up a "fulcrum," see, and moves the barrel with the big lever. The person watching this is not likely to connect his lessons in physics with what the workman did. And therefore, we can get very educated dumbbells, and that's how they're made. It's on the intention of the study. He's studying it to be examined on, or he's studying it to apply it, and it's just those two different things.
Now, where a subject is booby-trapped and suppressive in the extreme, it can be studied for examination but can't be studied for application. Doesn't matter how complex a study is, no matter how suppressively written, no matter how badly organized, it still can be memorized. It can be spat back on the examination paper, if you work hard enough and your memory is good enough. But you can't apply it. You can't begin to apply that subject, because there was no understanding in it with which to apply it. Isn't that horrible! There was nothing there to be understood and if there was nothing there to be understood, of course, it couldn't be applied.

I imagine you could write up a whole textbook on the subject of "weejacks," and nobody would ever know what they were, you didn't know what they were, or anything else. You could write a very learned text that was full of mathematical equations by which the whole situation of "weejacks" could be completely fixed up, and wind up at the other end of it with a subject on which some students could get "A." Totally synthesized subject.

Now, on the other side of the picture – the other side of the picture – if you studied that subject for application, every time you hit a bump that was incomprehensible in the text, you yourself would require clarification. If it wasn't in the text to be understood and if it wasn't in any parallel text to be understood, why, in order to apply it you would have to clarify it. And you wouldn't run into a bunch of misunderstandings, because you would stop at them when you arrived at them, and you would get them clarified. Do you see?

Now, your difficulty in studying Dianetics and Scientology is basically the lack of a dictionary. But I call to your attention that I just got through turning you out two tapes and a bulletin which, if you look through them very carefully, you will not find anything in them that isn't defined in them. You noticed that about them? Well, that's the Dianetic materials which is directly being applied at this moment in the practice of Dianetics. Now, that's totally defined for total application, and so therefore, the application is possible and you can study it for application. And we notice that students who are auditing in Dianetics are getting rather interesting results.

Now, in addition to that they're told to study this material so they can go audit, right now! Do you see? Now, that would produce this other frame of mind of studying it for application.

Now, if anybody is making any – having any trouble with the Dianetic materials at all, it is simply that they have not studied the Dianetic tapes or bulletin for application. They have studied them for examination. Now, if you were to go back, brand-new, as though you'd never heard of it before and study it for application, and every time you got a single sentence of it, wondered how you were going to apply this to a pc or what this had to do with your performance as an auditor in the application of Dianetics to the pc, you would wind up at the other end with no case of indigestion. You would wind up with a complete grasp of the subject, able to get results. Bang! Bang! Bang! Do you see?

But one is taught very bad habits of study in universities and in schools in this society at this time, because so much stress is put on examination. The stress on examination is so terrific that one can become a social outcast through failing his examinations.
I notice in the United States, now, they call them "dropouts," "Rrrhh! Dropouts!" Guy flunked, he's finished. But it's also interesting to note that of the four fellows who dropped out (I think it was Princeton) in one semester – now this is very paraphrased data, I'm not going to try to give you their histories – four "dropouts" in one semester at Princeton, from the lower classes of Princeton (you know, freshman, sophomore, and so on), all were making in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars a year within the year. Wait! What! Whoa! What's that? Those weren't the failures; they were the successes in that class.

Now, we check in vain to find a single philosopher, except Mills, who ever got a passing grade in school or who stayed in school to its end. Read the list, man: Bacon, Spencer – just read them off. Bang! Bang! Bang! This one, that one, the other one, oh yeah, well, he was kicked out. He was in there seventeen days. He was at Oxford and they gave him the deep six, and so on, so on. Why? Why?

Well, man for a long time has just avoided this. He knows it exists. But he's avoided it totally because it's a complete assignment of failure to his educational system if it can't teach the bright boys. And he's given many explanations to it, and so on. But the explanation is simply that the study materials that are given are not for application, and these birds are doers in life and they want material for application, and the university texts are not arranged to apply anything to anything.

Now, I'm not riding a hobbyhorse in my own resentments, but I will tell you this brief anecdote. I was flunked in analytical geometry, and I was flunked resoundingly! I was given a great big "F." I know it sounds like a mathematics, and unless you're acquainted with mathematics in general you've probably never even heard of it. And that's because it's a dead mathematics. It has no possible use – according to the professors.

But I'd sat back at the end of – the back of the class and I got intrigued with this stuff because it could be applied to aerial navigation. And I found out that you could draw up a formula out of it which would solve the drift of wind – you know, wind drift, and a few other things could be applied very easily – and I found out that it might be a jolly useful mathematics. Oh, I made a mistake, man! That finished it. I made a mistake! I told the professor – name was Hodgson. If you ever saw a flame light in any man's eye, it was to see this beautifully dead mathematics being given purpose and application. I told him rather indifferently. I didn't try to push it through. I wasn't doing anything, not arguing, very polite. He flunked me just like that – the whole course.

Well, fortunately, I was able to go over to the chair of mathematics of the university. His name was Taylor, he was one of the twelve men in the United States at that time who could understand Einstein. And I don't think he knew whether he was talking to me or not talking to me, but I told him that I required a reexamination on the subject. So, he ordered Hodgson to take off and make a new examination. And so Hodgson put every formula in the book – you had to know every formula in the entire text verbatim, you had to know every theorem in it verbatim, and so forth. And he said, "I'll fix him – trying to make a live mathematics out of a dead mathematics." I got ninety-eight on the examination.

But this was a direct assault on the citadels of "We've got knowledge nice and dead, let's keep it that way." And I erred there by telling him there was a use for the stuff. It was a
fatal error on my part. I should never have opened my mouth. I was also flunked one time in a class on free thinking, and so forth, because I'd decided that you could think freely. [laughter, laughs]

The entirety of study materials depends, then, on the material to be studied and the attitude with which it is being studied – the purpose and intention of the student.

Now, if you were to go over Dianetic materials and Scientology materials just on the basis of "How could I apply this, and how can I use that, and how can I apply this?" And if you examined principally on the basis of "All right, we've got bulletin number 642…" I would expect people to know the auditing commands verbatim, but "How do you apply this? HCOB blankety-blank date," you know, and the Examiner said – he didn't say, "What's in this bulletin?" see – he said, "How do you apply this bulletin?" You just read it. I bet you would get an awful look of horror in many a student's eye. He has read it to be examined on; he hasn't read it to apply it. But now he, in actual fact, will have no use for it of any kind whatsoever if he has read it to be examined on. But if he has read it to apply it, then he will find it is useful information. Got that?

Now, I say you have the liability in the fact that you're dealing with a subject which has no tradition in its vocabulary; its vocabulary is new. There is – singularly horrible to have it missing. There's a missing dictionary, and so on. But most of the materials, if you're studying them broadly, are defined in the text themselves and you can gather what those things are. Also, your Instructor generally will know what it is, and you can ask questions to clarify them, and you should clarify them.

Well, now, these materials concerning study amplify, of course, the other materials we had about study.

And I'm very amused at one particular subject, which is one of – probably the biggest football and causes more trouble to man than any other single subject, and that is the subject of economics.

And the subject of economics has been used to forward political ideologies. So for every ideology there is an economics written up to fit it, to a point where people no longer believe there is a subject called economics. But the odd part of it is there is a subject called economics, and it has certain raw, fundamental basics which, if violated, wreck the works. But these things have all been carefully set aside and a brand-new facade has been erected in its particular position in order to forward communism or fascism or some other -ism, -ism, -ism; and then you, of course, you get the socialist using capitalistic economics, the capitalist using socialistic economics. I don't know how they do that, but they do, you know?

You know the Labor Party right now uses nothing but capitalistic economics. They're dedicated to the destruction of capitalism, but they're using capitalistic economics. I don't know how they're going to succeed with that. The Conservative, on the other hand, who is dedicated to capitalism, is using nothing but socialist economic proposals to remedy things. I think it's the most wonderful mess I ever saw.

But there was where a subject was taken to fit a certain, to use a crude word, pitch. You see, the subject was written up to have a curve. "This is communist economics," see?
"And the rudigadders of the whuterbuds all go whir-whir, and the formulas are 'for every man according to his bla-bla,' you know? Yuck!

The second you start applying it, it violates the subject that there is a basic subject. There is a subject called economics and it is a very simple subject indeed, and it's been obscured.

So there's something else you can do with a subject: You can pervert a subject to such a point that the subject is no longer applicable or assimilable, or if applied, becomes catastrophe. So, that's something else that can be done with a subject.

That's what they did with Freud's work. I'm sure Freud had a lot of workable technology. It's – doesn't survive in the practice of psychoanalysis, I assure you. Because what I was taught in 1924 as Freudian analysis isn't in any textbooks anymore. I know it seems a long time ago to be taught the first time about psychoanalysis, but it is true, that was when I first got this stuff and it sounded very interesting. It's all gone. I haven't heard any of that for years. I've heard other things. I've heard how the "autoerotic economic system very often recoils upon the society because of the perversion of the id."

You want to take one of Horney's books, or something like that on psychoanalysis, and to – read it to a party sometime. Just take a paragraph at random, read it out of context. There's nobody at that party will believe that that is in that book; they will be sure that you are just quoting gobbledygook. They're absolutely positive that you will be quoting gobbledygook, because no textbook could be like that. But that's how you could take a subject.

Now, all of man is being caught up in an economic web. He's being caught in an economic net at this particular time. Every hour of his day is being monitored by economics. It isn't – interesting that the subject of economics has been so overcomplicated and so bent and so badly defined and turned off and made so suppressive that nobody can get at the root of what they're doing. The most beautiful obfuscation, the most beautiful obscuring of motive which I have ever seen.

Now, you are studying a subject in which there is no curve. If it errs in any direction, it's probably you aren't warned enough at certain places. But there isn't any curved intent in this. You're studying, actually, along the line it was researched.

So that if you were to study this subject for application, you would quickly find out in it what was not applicable and you would find out what was incomprehensible to you, or just is there but is incomprehensible. You would find these things out. And gradually you would get any kink shaken out of your materials, whether I sat down and wrote a dictionary or not. You see?

So anyway, the next time you want a good laugh, pick up some text on some subject, you know, like "Landscape Gardening for the Beginner," and find out whether the book is an ethics case or not. It's quite interesting. You will find amongst the texts by which man is hoping to carry forward his culture and civilization, you will find the SP very well represented. You will also find perfectly good blokes who go right along fine. But you will also find that some of these chaps, who are very good and have done a good job, are the most damned people that anybody ever heard of.
For instance, Will Durant in writing *The Story of Philosophy* and attempting to clarify philosophy, and so on, if he's still alive, actually spent the entire latter part of his life in seclusion in California in shame and horror because so much hell was raised with him for writing that textbook to make philosophy simple and comprehensible to others. Interesting, they hounded the man till he just didn't want to do anything but die.

There's a fellow by the name of Thompson that -- nearly every calculus student in the university will sooner or later get ahold of this fellow Thompson's (oh, it's either Thompson or Carpenter) little textbook; and it begins with what calculus is and explains calculus. And you read the book, you find out what calculus is. And it's sufficiently simple that you wind up laughing, you see, and you go ahead and you can do something with calculus. But that isn't the calculus textbooks in the university. I have had professors who severely warned their students against this book, because it permitted the mathematics and its very abstruse language to be communicated to the student. So you will even find teachers who warn people against simple textbooks, and you will find large stratas of the society get a "down" on simplification.

Well, study materials -- study materials needed a few other remarks. Maybe this lecture has helped you out a little bit; maybe it's clarified what you're doing. The next time you're studying something, why, take a look at it and you'll find yourself up -- "And the Examiner is going to ask this," and so forth, and you just haul yourself up at that particular point and ask yourself this question instead, "Does this have application? Does this amplify my understanding of the mind? Does this broaden my grip of the subject? And if so, how? How can I apply this, if I knew this datum, out in life?" and so forth, "Of what use would it be to me?" And you all of a sudden will find yourself recover from any indigestion you have from studying too much too fast.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.
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Thank you very much. It's not deserved; I've been very mean to several of you in the last day or two; very, very mean, with good results.

Okay. What is this?

Audience: 24th.

It's the 24th of Jan. AD 12 – 1962 – in the Year of Our Travail, especially yours.

All right. Now, I have some good news for you.

Going to sit down in this lecture, if you don't mind.

But I have some very, very good news for you, some excellent news for you; that if you were beaten over the head, tortured, treated with sarcasm, hammered and pounded and generally abused, you eventually decide to find out – you go past, you see, merely attacking Ron, you see, that breaks down and you go past that, and you say, "Well now, if this much fuss is being made about it, maybe there is a right way to do it," and so you try that for a while and nothing much happens. And then if you are hammered and pounded and beaten some more, then you decide to do it right, and then all of a sudden there's tremendous dawning on every hand that there was something here. And that has just happened on this good day of our Dianetics in 1962. This just happened.

Several of you in just the last session you ran discovered that 3D Criss Cross worked like crazy; just discovered it – brand-new discovery. Some of you have not made that discovery yet, but many of you – the majority that were having any difficulty with this – all of a sudden it dawned that there was something here and that it did work and that the session ran like a hot bomb, and all became suddenly well.

Now, the old-time student here who has had a great deal of training – I will say this, a great deal of training shows up along these lines – got results with 3D Criss Cross at once. The second it was presented to them they started getting results with 3D Criss Cross, which is quite interesting, see. They looked it over, they said "That's okay," they started listing and everything, and the next thing you know, they were getting results with it.

But those of you who have just come up to the nervous state of newly created IIb didn't measure up this well. And you've been floundering and falling on your heads now for the better part of two weeks. It has been pretty gruesome. I mean I have actually suffered for you. I didn't suffer for the pc. I can always straighten out a pc. If I can straighten out a pc, why, I
don't worry about the pc particularly. But I suffered for the poor auditor, sitting there doing exactly what he was told (if doing it backwards), and with Ron shouldering the total responsibility of it all going bad because it probably didn't work, suddenly waking up, deciding to do it right, and then the second step: finding out that it worked like mad.

Now, that is quite a win. That is a win for me. However, it tends to validate this system of activity, a system of activity which begins with apathy. See, you confront somebody in apathy, "Nothing works anyway and there is no way to do anything right anyhow. But if you did do it right nothing would happen, because there isn't any way to do it right because nothing would happen if you did do it right."

Now, it is sometimes necessary in action to throw a bit of a hand grenade into that particular type of activity and just say "Yow, yow, yow!" outrageously, you see? Say, "Well, look a'here. You're only writing on one side of your auditor's report."

And the person says, "Well, yes, of course I'm only writing on one side of the auditor's report, and all auditors do, don't they?"

"Well, they mostly do, but you shouldn't, you see?" And then, "You should have known better than that, see? It has never been published or released, so you should have known about it." Expect the student to have picked it all up telepathically, expect the thing to have sort of leaked in through the pores by association with the tile, or something like that, you see? Doesn't much matter.

Now, this is very pertinent to you in the training of Class IIs. When you start training Class II auditors you should recognize this for what it's worth, and it's a little lesson that I could teach you on the subject of raising hell. That's the title of the lesson, "Raising Hell."

Now, there are two ways you could get somebody out of apathy, see? They don't know and there is no right way to do it and there are probably no results anyway. Now, there's two ways to approach this problem. One is on the route of making auditors and the other is on the route of auditing. Now, the way you make auditors differs entirely, of course, from the way you audit pcs.

There are two routes here that we employ, not necessarily for the betterment of cases but for getting the job done. Of course the net result of all this is the betterment of all cases, but there are two routes that we actually employ and you should recognize these as distinctly different routes. And the first of these is where a person is concerned as an auditor. And we have always had a bit of line on this, and you found in an Academy in the old days where they didn't have this policy in force they made very bad auditors. Wow! Terrible! And that was this type of an approach: "Well, we know you can't audit because you have a case, and we'll try to patch your case up, and if we get your case up, why, then maybe some day you will be able to audit." That type of approach does not work in the making of auditors. Just write it down to that.

You see, if we admitted that the auditor had a case then nobody on this whole planet would ever be sprung. Do you see that? So this is just a piece of arbitrary snarl. Do you see? This datum must not be true! It isn't that it is true or isn't true, it just must not be true! See, there's no logic to it at all. It just must not be true, because otherwise you would never bail
anybody out of anything because there would never be anybody to audit him. And true enough, over the years watching Academies that practiced the idea, "if we..." – the D of T, if he had the idea that "If we just processed all these students and somehow or another if I just gave them all a little bit of a case gain, and I got them all in shape so they could confront their pc and if I could get their cases from getting in their roads, why, then I could make them into auditors."

And this goes out as far as this: "If we only let 'good' people into the Academy..." We don't know what this "good" person is. He lurks out someplace under the rhododendrons or someplace but he never seems to have come near any organization to date, this "good" person, you see? "Now if you could just get 'good' people," that's the other song you hear, but that's just a little bit of a downgrade. Immediately after you hear this "good" people action the next tune that you hear being played on the out-of-tune street piano is "If we just could audit all of the cases in the Academy, why, then, you see, they would all be able to audit." And they of course have propounded a piece of nonsense.

You see, if there's nobody to audit all these cases in the Academy, how the hell are they ever going to get audited? And you don't have an Academy at all, you have an HGC. So this quickly defeats itself as a philosophy.

So very early, I think it was about the 7th ACC, this philosophy was entered into the training of auditors. And the philosophy is workable; it is not necessarily true, it is not necessarily easy, it is not necessarily kind, sweet or good. It simply works and it is in a workable line, true. But it's only a workable truth. And that is, simply, "Auditors do not have cases," period. That is the one thing that we must insist on.

Now, it goes as far as this, that if he's slightly warm and you can see a mist on a mirror held against his mouth, he or she is in shape to audit. If they can be dragged to the chair and if an E-meter can be propped up in their vicinity, they're in condition to audit. This goes to a total extremity. They could be sitting there with both legs cut off from a street accident, but they are in shape to audit. That's it. That's just it.

It's like when nations get down to the last – they're getting the conscripts from their 14-year-old class, you know, and the 72-year-old class and the 14 year-old class; anybody who dares walk back in through, you see, from hospitals or anything else, anybody who dares come anywhere near the assembly officers who are putting together new regiments, you see, is instantly just stamped hugely "FIT FOR COMBAT," see? We don't get it from that particular thing, but it just gives you the idea.

Now, when time goes on and a nation gets more fit to work, they start then saying "Well, this person is not fit for combat and should be audited," and that sort of thing. But let me call something to your attention: that we are not a nation but we are certainly a people, and this is very germane.

We are not in that condition today where we can say "Well, let's take this person and let's audit him for a while, and maybe he'll learn how to audit some day and – you know, if we get his case out of the road, why, maybe he can audit." We're not in that condition. We're not that wealthy. See, we're just not that wealthy in people, nor are we that far advanced along the lines. So this datum not only has been true but will be true for quite a while.
Now, oddly enough this is a workable philosophy, totally workable as a philosophy. It does work, and today is one of those days when I have seen this philosophy work. Some people with Class IIb who are so far from clear they would have to have a moonshot to comprehend it (I'm talking about cases now, see, just casewise, bluuhh! see?) have actually been driven in toward the absorption of data, the regularities of practice, to an actual recognition that what they were doing ended in a very, very powerful, fine gain for the pc, and that they could do it. That's much more important. Now, this is one of those days when that philosophy has worked out.

Now, I don't say that you're in horrible condition. I'd say when you get some processing and so forth you will probably get up to being in horrible condition. [laughter]

Compare the way you – the condition that you were in a couple of trillion years ago, or 500 trillion or something like that, whatever the outrageous figure might be, and you're not in such good shape these days, you know? And for you to actually start putting together a being – not a human being, anybody can put together a human being. You just take some electronic shock waves and some implants and kick him and destroy all their self-determinism, then destroy other-determinism, and then racket him between destroyed self-determinism and destroyed other-determinism, and you fix him up real good and get them to accumulate all masses and never as-is anything, and you've got a human being.

All right, so you just – it'd be no virtue to make one of those. Let's move it up just a little bit further – but to make a functional being, to take a big seven-league boot stride in the direction of making a functional being. Now, that has happened, and that's just happened just in the last couple of days. This sort of thing has been coming up. I'm very happy about this because it's far more significant than you might realize at first glance. It means that the thing can be bootstrapped.

Now, we expect somebody that's been under training for a half a year of heavy duress and so forth to be able to pick up a process and be able to do it, but I was very proud when those older students just did that and were able to do that and just kicked it off from the starting line and that was it.

Well, that was a little victory in itself, but it was not particularly a victory for this other philosophy because they have had good case gains and they are a long ways from where they were. The other people who have just come up to Class IIb had not had very significant case gains yet and they were able to do it. Now, that was very important.

Well, you see, this philosophy works, and it's a distinct philosophy: If he's warm he can audit. Get the idea? And that you can actually bring enough pressure to bear and enough training to bear on an individual so that he actually can do a properly laid out comprehension and action as far as the pc is concerned and arrive with a tremendously significant result.

Now, that's a victory, because if that weren't true we as a people would never make it. We'd just never make it, that's all. There would be a few able guys and they would quickly go out the bottom through auditing seven and a half hours a day. I've already scolded two or three Saint Hill graduates who have left and who all of a sudden sat down to a grind of auditing of about seven and a half hours a day and just didn't do anything else, didn't really bother to train anybody or try to pick it up or push it through. They were just going to audit people,
audit people, audit people, audit people – well, they can't audit enough people to do any good. It's just a spot in the ocean.

Now, if you looked around you would find out that there aren't on earth at the present moment enough auditors to give enough sessions to enough people to make any significant gain in the society at large in the next century. The mathematics are all against it. If you never made one more auditor, if we just took the auditors we had at this particular moment and everybody audited hammer and tongs, seven and a half hours a day for the next ten years or something like that, you add it up and you compare it to the world's population and you get a drop in the bucket. It's a discouragingly small amount. And if we never trained another auditor, the auditors that had been trained would have long since gone by the boards before they even got halfway through the population of New York City. You see, the mathematics are dead against it.

Don't think that you, with your auditing, cannot make a change in the society. You certainly can, you certainly can, but you would be making actually a rico and a pobre society. In other words, you'd be making the society of the rich and the poor, the aristocracy and the slaves, and so forth. It wouldn't help but do that, because of course you could pick out people here and there and put them into terrific condition and never fix it up so they're ever backed up, see? Well, they – oh yeah! They've got a big zone of influence, that's for sure! And they'll get things done, that's for sure; but let me assure you they would not, all of them, be tempered by the peculiarities that I suffer from which is that man should be free. Not even after you'd audited them would they suffer from that peculiarity uniformly, let me assure you. That just wouldn't be done.

And give it a decade, give it two decades, something like that, and they would be starting to get a little bit impatient. Enough victims would have been deposited on their doorstep for them to start erecting the stocks and the whipping posts. The next thing you know, we'd find we had two or three classes of citizen. We would have the clear and the slave, you know? We'd divide the whole society up in some kind of a line. It would just be forced upon us to do this.

That is actually a very dangerous direction in which to proceed because that direction has always led civilizations into decay and chaos. There is no such thing as a successful civilization which is made out of slave masters and slaves. I assure you that it is not successful. It's never been successful and it never will be successful. Now, it's attractive and it can be practical but it's not successful. It has no great duration and it doesn't make anybody much happier.

So this is quite interesting from a point of view of a long look. Very few of you ever give a long look to Scientology, you leave that up to me to a marked degree. Well, thank you; but when I look in the crystal ball and look up the line a century I can see a number of pictures presenting themselves, a number of aspects of what might come of all this. And don't think you can fire a shot of this volume and magnitude in a planet of this type without creating an effect. It might be a slow effect, just to the degree, you see, that it is practical. Its speed actually is determined not by the inertia of the masses but by the efficiency and effectiveness of what you're doing. And you can't let go of something like this in a society or a world of this
type or size without having repercussions that don't just go up a century. They'll be still racketing up the line until this planet is a billiard ball.

Now, it might become a billiard ball sooner than you think. But not all of you will forget Scientology even if you go to another planet. So you see we've never fired this shot silently or without effect, you see?

I'm not degrading what you, yourself, as one person can do. But if you're going to do the job fully and wholly or do the job effectively, then the job will be done rather swiftly; and in doing the job relatively fast you save many of the cataclysmic aspects of what might happen because of the entrance upon this scene of Scientology. In other words, the more rapidly you do it the better the job is done. It's just like auditing a pc.

You see in one pc the world at large, you see? He is the microcosm and the world is the macrocosm; and you see that what is happening to a pc – you know that if you audit him slowly and poorly he makes thuhh, and he goes duhhh, and he gets a little bit better and in about two or three days he says, "Well, maybe I'll make it. Maybe I'll bla-bla-blah …" and all of a sudden he doesn't feel so well, and so on; he didn't get much of a result and he slows down and goes into third gear, and he puts it all on the back burner, and so forth. Well, those fits and starts would be the fits and starts of the track of the civilization in which we live if we did not approach this problem effectively and do it with fair effectiveness.

And part of that effectiveness is make enough auditors. Now, you're not enough auditors. You just aren't enough auditors, that's all. There just aren't enough. We're not against a quantitative proposition here particularly, but when I say "auditor" I mean somebody who merely audits. You have to combine in your repertoire the ability to train auditors and then you're enough, then you become enough auditors, don't you see? Right away, just the people in this room would be enough auditors if they trained auditors. And providing you did your job superlatively well and you knew how to make an auditor do his job superlatively well, you see, if you knew that, then you – with that kind of progress you would wind up with enough auditors. Then you could do the job, you see? That could be done. But not otherwise.

I know I myself at times have felt rather muscular – mentally muscular – and have stood up baring my breast to the tirades and freakeries of fate and fortune and have said, "Well, this is enough. Just – I could do this all by myself, you know, just standing on my head, you know? No help at all. I'd just do it all by myself. That's easy, you know?" I just felt tough that day, you know? And before noon I didn't feel so tough. [laughs]

Now, in my particular levels of training and background I would have perhaps, not necessarily, but perhaps more reason than you to believe that I could do the job all by myself, see? I have done jobs all by myself and they were not necessarily easy jobs. Now, I did get away with them. I don't think I could do this one all by myself, see? Different type of job, it goes out in terms of longevity. It embraces many more lives and beings than anything else that's been attempted in this corner of the universe for a very long time.

Well now, the better it is done, the more rapidly it is done, the more effectively it is done, why, the smoother forward track it will have.
So therefore you are busy learning to audit. You are busy learning to audit and in that you are making progress and that's very, very good progress. We do not have here the facilities much to train you how to teach auditors, but by training you we can certainly give you a model and you'll know how to handle somebody else when you're training them, and maybe you'll profit by some of the mistakes we have made.

But don't try to profit in the direction of being kind. Don't try to profit in the direction of "If we just process him then he will be able to audit." Don't profit in that direction because there's no profit to be had there. If he's alive he can audit. He walked into the PE Course, he is a long-term Christian Scientist, until he got so many overts on Christian Science that he became a Rosicrucianist, and then had too many overts against Rosicrucianism to remain anything but a theosophist, and has arrived to prove that Scientology doesn't work. You can make him audit. You could teach him to audit; you really could.

But now we're getting to a dividing line: Why that many handicaps on the auditor, see? Why go quite that far afield to teach somebody to audit? No, there are people around you at once, in your immediate vicinity, that could be taught to audit well and those are the people to put lots of time in on. They are the people to put time in on, because if you make them very good auditors, of course they can make auditors. And it is better to have – right now, the way we're going – it is better to have a lot of crackerjack auditors than an awful lot of very mediocre auditors. See, that's better. And you sometimes look over "Who are you going to spend time on?" Well, the natural impulse is to take this bird I just described who has so many overts on Christian Science that they had to take off into Rosicrucianism, got so many overts on Rosicrucianism that they became a theosophist, and have wandered in to prove that Scientology doesn't work. You can make him audit. You could teach him to audit; you really could.

Well, unfortunately you could make a tremendous error, and do you know that instructors will do this? Even an instructor here, now and then, catches himself; fortunately he catches himself doing it. He's so outraged by the performance he sees in front of him that he gives that person more time than he gives the apt auditor who needs just a little bit more coaching to do a very fine job. Instead of that he'll give this total dud, you see, a tremendous amount of time and pressure trying to get them up to a high level of mediocrity.

Remember that, when you're training auditors, take those that are very apt and give them most time. See, that's the way to go about it; and let the others drift along. Let them drift along. They've got a certain rate of absorption. And it isn't that you should let them go. You shouldn't let this fellow go; oh no, oh, nothing like that, see? You might put him... downgrade him a little bit in the zone or area in which he's being trained but you don't forget about him. But he plods along at a certain rate and that certain rate has very little to do with anything you're trying to teach him. He's just kind of sloggy.

For anybody to assign the length of time it takes for somebody to learn something is adventurous. It can't ever be factual. I'll give you an experiment in this. Take one datum and try to teach it to somebody with the old educational processes of the 17th ACC. Those were very interesting processes, by the way. Try to teach him this datum. Take any datum in Scientology, say it to him and have him repeat it. This is the simplest of all these; just say it and have him repeat it, you see, and say it and have him repeat it, and then say it and have him tell
you what it is all about, you know, by giving you an example of it. You say it, he gives you an example of it. That is the wildest thing you ever did with anybody. That is quite incredible. As simple as this mechanism is, it has considerable horsepower and it is a very interesting thing. I have seen that datum move a very tough case, by the way. That was what was interesting about those educational processes. They were very limited in that they didn't move very many cases, but they could knock aside this "no effect" proposition on training.

Now, I recommend those to you. We actually don't have any students bad enough to start chugging in with these educational processes, and assign somebody to say a datum and he's supposed to say the datum back, and then he says the datum and they make an example, or any of the combinations of those processes. There were about three of them. But they're awfully good for the fellow you have despaired of utterly; they are much better than auditing. You assign a student to teach him with this system, you know? You of course don't have to use Scientology data. You can say, "The cat is black. All right, now tell me 'The cat is black.'"

And the fellow says, "Well, there are a number of instances I could think of where a cat wouldn't be black."

And you say, "All right, good, good. But now, now just tell me this one datum, 'A cat is black.'" And you'll finally get them to actually be able to – you say something, they can say something.

And then the second grade of that is you say something and they can understand it. In other words, let them duplicate the words and then let them duplicate the understanding. You in essence are doing this in training, only you're doing it live. You see, you're doing it all the way. You read a bulletin and then you go in and see Mike. Of course some of you – some of you wish you hadn't but that's all part of the game. And – I didn't manufacture Mike's 3D-terminal package [laughter], but I, I probably couldn't have done a better job than he's done.

But look a-here, he's not trying to be unreasonable with you; he's just trying to get you to do one thing – that's the one step of the educational process.

In essence what is happening is this: I have said something to you and then he's trying to find out if you can duplicate it. And don't think this isn't therapeutic. It is! It jolly well is! But we're not interested in it from a therapy line. We're interested in it from the basis of the communication of a datum, and you get, finally, so that you can actually take a datum and so on.

Now let's look at this. This process has been going on for six months or more with some of the older students here. And 3D came out incomplete, not well stated, just brrrupt! you know, and that's it. And they did it at once and got results with it at once. In other words, it took them – oh, perhaps 10 minutes to understand it; this is length of time to look at it and read it. I mean it was that fast, you see, and they could put it into action and they could do something with it, and all of a sudden this happened. Well, this doesn't mean that they've become puppetized, it simply means that their ability to duplicate it has now gone over into a second stage – understand – because of course they weren't given any data to duplicate.

Now, you look at the original issue of 3D, of the original mention of 3D that was given to you. Why, the first mentions of it are just some scribbles in the case histories, you
know, in the case folders, the first mentions of it, and then there's a rather incomplete description of 3D Criss Cross that doesn't amount to a hill of beans, and then there's class rumor.

Well, what I'm showing you is there was practically nothing there to duplicate in the way of wording, and yet these people had actually gotten to this point, where they not only could duplicate the datum that was said to them but they could get a – what this was and they could understand what this datum was and put it into use. Now, look at that as a considerable gain, and look at it for just what it is, as a gain, a training gain. And that's quite remarkable.

Now, the comm lag on others who hadn't had that much training has been something on the order of ten days to two weeks, to first duplicate the wording – and complain because there wasn't any wording, don't you see? They were still in a step where they had to have the exact words. And then finally, it took an amplification of a bunch of exact words and a lot of individual notations in case folders for them all of a sudden to do what they were doing and get a result, and the understanding is dawning. See, that's slightly different action.

Do you see this as a training mechanism? Do you see where this winds up as a training mechanism? Do you see what its stages are? In other words, your first gradient of the thing is no comprehension of the words. This is your first gradient, see, no comprehension of the words. Now, it's quite shocking to find that morale is suffering, and all sorts of things are going wrong in some HGCs, by being made to exactly duplicate a bulletin. Do you see where they are there? Do you see where they are on the training step?

It would not matter, by the way, as far as their ability to learn was concerned – let's look this over. Let's say we were just trying to increase a person's ability to learn. Learning rate – that was the only thing we were trying to increase. Let's just think of that, see.

It wouldn't matter if we were teaching them automotive assembly books; you know, manuals used in Detroit for the assembly of automobiles, to a person who is never going to assemble an automobile and has never assembled one and hasn't even played with toy cars. See, it wouldn't matter if we were doing that. Or the "Works Progress Administration History of Socialism and its Development in the Northern Part of Arizona," you know, there's probably volumes of books on that. They paid them – they paid them if they got out some stacks of paper to – on the Works Progress Administration. They'd get somebody who was out of work, so they made sure he didn't do any because otherwise he would have been in work, and all he had to do was pile up old clippings and papers, you see? They didn't have to relate to anything. And then at government expense they were published between very thick covers in very heavy volumes, and they were quite available for a while. You could get them to hold up corners of desks where the leg was missing, you know, and they were very useful; but they were the most non sequitur nowhere as far as data was concerned you ever cared to cast your eye over. We could use that, do you see?

We could use the "Legal Code of the Early Church of England as Interpreted by the Catholic Church." We could! I don't care what you're using, as long as there's some data stated. Doesn't matter how much dunnage or how little dunnage as long as there's some data studied. Is data there to study? You would still do this. You'd still use this as learning rate.

You see where we are? See, we'd read it off. We'd have the individual sitting there and we would read it off to the individual. This would be the stylized auditor type of approach on
this, and we would say, "All the churches of Northumbria were deprived of their windows
because of a window tax which was three and six per window per sabbatical." ("Sabbatical.
That's what it said, see.) And we tell the individual, "All right, say that." You know? "Now,
what did I just say?" you know?

And he'd say, "The window tax – window tax? What about window tax is this? What's
sabbatical mean? What's this? Yeah. What book are you reading, anyway? Where did this
come from? What part of Northumbria are you talking about?" You get all this confusion?
And you've got an example now of your first step.

As you try to merely get him to repeat a line of sounds (you don't even call them
words, you see?) he gets tremendous confusion. So your first step – your first state in which
the person is in is one of tremendous data confusion which blows off at any attempt to dupli-
cate data. So it blows off at once that there's an attempt to duplicate data on his part, he starts
blowing off this confusion. "Northumbria? What Northumbria? What sabbatical? Two and
six? Two and six window ta – but who would have been taxing them? Uh – who – what tax?
What is a tax? Was there anybody taxing anybody at that particular time?" Now you get down
to the communist level of this, we would have had a communist cell meeting to discuss
whether or not capitalists should exist, you see, because we've mentioned tax.

In other words, it just would have hung up on some button some place or another, and
would have come into a total collision with this button, and from there on we never would
have moved off the button.

This is of tremendous use, by the way, when you're handling committees. You know,
the art of getting something done through a committee has never been perfected. This has
never been perfected in the history of man. If you don't want to get anything done, appoint a
committee. And don't put anybody on it who has an individual responsibility for any piece of
its work.

Just give it in general to the committee. Now, now we've really got malfunction in
screaming exclamation points, malfunction from here on out.

Well, similarly, the way you can park any committee or any board – and some of you
might want to know this sometime; it's sometimes of great moment for you not to have some-
thing discussed, and not permit them to come to any conclusion or pass a motion. Commit-
tees, being only a medium of half-thought-out averages anyway, generally will arrive at the
wrong decision about most anything. You know, they haven't got much of the data, and
they're not really interested, and nobody there is responsible, and they sort of just want to get
rid of it all, you know? And they get into that state of mind, and they're suddenly discussing
something that is a very, very important point that is going to affect the longevity and man-
agement of this company or group, and man, you just are not about to get something like that.

Now, the first thing is to introduce – the way you want to do this is just to introduce
any button that will cause them to take zero responsibility. Just introduce any button that will
reduce their responsibility. Anything! It doesn't matter. Give them a restimulative word. Just
do it by symbols. You see, you're trying to paralyze this committee, that's what you're trying
to do, you see, just overtly, so they won't make a wrong act.
They say, "Well, I don't know. Shouldn't the pay plan that is being brought up some-
place – shouldn't the pay plan – this pay plan – maybe we could check with the guy – it's be-
ing prepared by the accounts department. Pay plan, shouldn't that be thought up by someone –

pay plan?"

And you say, "Well, yes." You can just see it now, some outrageous damn thing that
nobody could put into execution, you see? Nobody's particularly interested in this thing, so …

One of the principal buttons that is used in this is the word "study", see, and that just
hangs everybody. Just introduce "study" into the thing, you see? Bang! And it just hangs the
works here. And just say, "We'll make a proposal that the matter be given further study," and
hit "study" hard. And you get parked right there. It'll just stop. It's gorgeous! You don't have
to introduce like that. You can say something, "Well, wasn't the last time this type of proposal
was proposed, wasn't that – " you know, there was a fellow by the name of Bellham who was
just hated throughout the whole organization, you see, just say this word and everybody went
Eeeeee! and so on – you say, "Wasn't that last proposed by Bellham?" Everybody of course
takes no responsibility for it instantly, you see? And then they will get into a discussion about
Bellham, and you're all set. [laughter] But they just derail on a button like that!

And you'll see somebody do this, you'll see it when they're studying like this. This fel-
low's got lots of overts on the Sabbath. So you say "sabbatical," he's wondering if this is con-
ected with Sabbath, and you just get into a total discussion of "Sabbath. Is it right to have a
Sabbath? Where was the Sabbath originated? Really wasn't it a pagan introduction in the first
place?" and we go on and on and on. It has absolutely nothing to do with what we're studying.
He'll derail right at that point. That's very interesting.

Now, you'd think this person would have to have lots of auditing to get rid of this. No,
there is another system that gets rid of this and that is it sort of teaches him that he can ride
past these hung points, see, that the hung points don't keep him from duplicating. And he
gradually learns this, you see? These buttons that he's got really don't keep him from duplicat-
ing something. See, even if it's upsetting and he doesn't like it he can still duplicate it, and
eventually he begins to see duplication in its proper light. Duplication is duplication. It is not
running out buttons, it is simply duplication. It just is itself, that is all.

Now, you couldn't see at all unless you could duplicate. You've got to be able to look
down that row of doors or something like that, you look down the row of doors and you see
that there was a row of doors there. And – you can play this on some pcs in processing with
the most fantastic results. You just say, "Well, what's over there along that wall?"

And some fellow will say, "Oh, uh – uh – must be students' lockers. Those doors don't
fit very well at the top, do they? Well, they must be some kind of students' lockers. They were
probably put in there for some purpose or another." Then all of a sudden he'd say, "Well, do
you have a carpenter working for you?" What did you ask him? You said, "What's down that
wall?" you see? Actually all he's got to do is look down the wall and say "There's some doors
there," but he always does it the hard way. Just watch him at first glance and he will just do it
the hard way. That's the way it will roll off of this whole operation.

You ask somebody, "What is over your head?" just ask them that sometime. "What is
over your head right now?" Say it very meaningfully so that they really understand that it's
over their head, and you mean now. And brother, you're going to get some of the most interesting discussions you ever heard of. Things which are threatening them, and so forth; well, they're not quite sure. Some girl says, "Well, yes, I know my hair looks rather messy, but uh..." You get all sorts of oddball, offbeat derailments of the whole thing. Well, what's over your head right now? The ceiling, of course, is what's over your head right now. They always manage to miss the obvious. And factually, it takes a lot of drilling before people will observe the obvious, and that is all there is to that step, is obnosis: the observation of the obvious.

"What is in front of your face?" just ask somebody sometime who has low havingness and can't reach much. Just ask that question, "What is in front of your face?"

Of course, the obvious answer is "You are."

But, you know, you can get some of the most conditional and oddball responses you ever want to hear of from simple questions of that particular type. Well, that's because the individual isn't really adding significances into everything, it's because every time he thinks of something significance plunges in and he thinks he's got to pay more attention to the significance than he pays to what was going on.

In other words, what is happening to him right now, you see, is less important than what might happen to him or what is coming in on him or the consequences of all of it. He's consequence-happy so he's really not in present time at all.

Well, when you take this parking button called "study," people tend to go sort of "Ummmm," you know, on this anyhow, and that's a very good button to work on because it's inflow of data, therefore the duplication of data, and no more important than that, just the duplication of the datum spoken. You understand, I'm not now saying a datum like "there are ... a problem is postulate-counter-postulate."

I'm not talking about a significant datum. I'm talking about any datum, either significant or nonsignificant. You could say, "There is one Christmas in a year," and some people will promptly say, "Well, that is insufficiently important. Of course everybody knows there's one Christmas in a year." You'll get all kinds of chitter-chatter and so forth. The only thing you've asked them to do is repeat this after you, what you say.

You say, "There is one Christmas in a year."

And the person would say, "Of course I know there's only – any damn fool knows there's only one – what – what kind of a thing is it – you think – what – what is this all about?"

And you say, "Well, just rep... all right. Good. But – just – just – let's just repeat this after me, There is one Christmas in a year."

"Well, there's no sense in it. Of course, everybody knows that there's one Christmas in a year," and so forth. And they're into the terrible non-significance of it, you see? You stated something sufficiently non-significant that they can't do anything about it. There's nothing there to attack and they just get terribly disappointed, you see?

You say – you say, "Most men are male." You know, "Most men are male." Or you say, "Women are females."
"Women are females. Well, of course we know most women are fe... what are you
talking about? Naturally," and so forth. "Naturally, of course, everybody knows that. What –
what are you saying that for?" And you will get – all of a sudden the fellow becomes very
curious about you, and what your motives are and what your intentions are and what you're
trying to do here.

Well, it's a fantastic proposition. You just say, "Women are females." "There's one
Christmas in a year." "Days begin at midnight." Some people would not realize that, you
know, and they'd say, "Oh, really? Do they?"

And you say, "Well, all right. But 'Days begin at midnight,' I just want you to repeat
that. Just 'Days begin at midnight.'"

"Well, that's a funny thing. I never knew that before, you see?" And they've just flown
off into interest, see? And they're all stuck on the interest, you see?

And you're just saying, "'Days begin at midnight.' That's what you're supposed to say."

And the fellow says, "Ah, well... Why should I go into that, you know? 'Days begin at
midnight...' What are we studying here? Is this a lesson in Scientology or about time? Or is
time part of Scientology? Are there any axioms about time? Oh, I see! Oh, I see! Yes, I see!
The days begin at midnight! And it's – oh, what axiom does that refer to anyway?"

And you say, "No, no. Just repeat after me, 'Days begin at midnight.'"

"Yeah, but why?"

You get the whole idea, see? In other words, they have an automatic reflexive mecha-
nism. They're going on a total basis of stimulus-response and nothing else. Just total stimulus-
response. But what's responding? The person or a bank? And this is just another way of dig-
ging up a thetan.

Eventually you get to a point where the thetan responds. You say, "The day begins at
midnight." He says, "The day begins at midnight." It doesn't bother him any if the day begins
at midnight or the day doesn't begin at midnight. Has nothing to do with it.

You just say, "The day begins at midnight."

He says, "The day begins at midnight."

"Good!" All right. You say, "Christmas comes once a year."

He says, "Christmas comes once a year." Right?

Now, people who don't like this and are still enturbulated on it say, "Well, you're mak-
ing a slave there," you see, "that's slavery," or something like that. "That's something very
deep-seated and very significant. There's something very significant about this operation. If
you can get a person to do this, he of course thereafter is a slave, see, obviously!" – except the
data is never borne out. The only time you really get a person to talk back sensibly is when he
can do this, because he can observe what he's talking back about; and up to that time you get
people talking back about things that aren't happening, and that's very disconcerting.
Somebody comes in and raises hell with you because of the hussars that are all over the front lawn. And you go and look, you don't see any hussars on the front lawn. And you ask him to go look and see if there are any hussars on the front lawn and he says, "Why should I look? I just know."

And you say, "Well, that's fine. Well, let's go look at the front lawn and see if there are any hussars there."

"Why should I do that? Are you doubting my word?" And now we go off into a discussion of whether or not you think he is a gentleman. Do you see the various excursions that we get on this?

He starts with some unreasonable premise and winds up with an idiocy. All you're asking a person to be able to do is simply duplicate a datum. You say, "Christmas occurs once a year," and he says, "Christmas occurs once a year," and it doesn't bother him and it doesn't not bother him.

Now, at the same time this individual can turn around and do something else which is quite interesting. This individual can cause himself to be duplicated. So, he has a brand-new thought all of his own little own, and he said, "I'm going to paint this house green." And he goes out and he says to somebody, "Paint the house green."

And the person says, "Um-hmmm-mmm. Viridian, eh?"

"No, no, just green."

"Oh, well. There's lots of greens, you know? Green, there's lots of greens. There's lots of types of paint, too. What paint store do you deal with? Well, I tell you what I will do. There is a house over in the next county that is painted a particular shade of green, and we will write them a letter and find out what paint company they got the paint from and what shade it was, but of course you will have to go over and take a look at that house first to find out what color that house really is."

And you'd say, "No, I want this house painted just common, ordinary, run-of-the-mill, just green."

And they will try again. They will say, "Some paints don't last as long as others."

If you can do that, you yourself have developed the ability to get yourself duplicated on your own ideas. And you'd be surprised; if you can do this well, you'd be surprised as your ability rises how the duplication occurs with the greatest of ease. You go out and tell somebody to paint it green, he pulls a color card out of his pocket and says, "You want this one or this one or this one? You want that one? That's it. All right." He goes and gets the paint and he paints the house green, does a good job of it and that's all fine. This cuts down randomness like mad.

In other words, by learning to duplicate you can get into a state where you yourself can be duplicated. Now, this is not exactly a processing activity. This is the process of life and livingness that is most significant. And it's havingness like mad because you start to have the things that you're surrounded with.
All right. Beyond duplication comes understanding. Understanding comes after duplication, not before. Now, how much understanding do you think this fellow did when you said "Christmas comes once a year," and he said, "Well, why are we taking that up? It doesn't seem to have very much to do with the process," and so on and so on. Well, you'll find out nearly everything he's asking you summates into not understanding, or trying to understand. You've told him the datum "Christmas comes once a year"; this is the datum you've told him.

Now, he tries like mad to understand that datum and he can't grasp it. He'll just work himself frantic trying to understand this datum, to understand what datum is there, understand your motives in trying to get him to understand this datum, trying to understand what the datum applies to, try to understand why there is nothing there to understand; and you'll find out most of his "Ooooooo-ooooo-ummmm" is just some kind of an effort to understand.

And this is why study is such an important button, because that's "getting somebody else to understand relieves anybody of any responsibility for understanding." Every government in the world at the present moment is totally seized with this as a mechanism. This is their operating mechanism. They don't have to understand anything because they can always have it studied, you see? And that just absolutely stops any progress in a committee or anything else. You've stopped it instantly and at once. You say "It's going to be otherwise studied so therefore you don't have to duplicate any part of it; and therefore you don't have to… if it's going to be studied, you don't have to understand any part of it and therefore all we expect from you is to execute something which you have no comprehension of and haven't found out in the first place." And you get the usual democratic processes when they are totally abused. They're pretty mad. See, democracy does not work in the absence of understanding. It can't work.

Now, here's your second thing, then. If responsibility for understanding depends on personal study – and it does – why, then of course you have raised the person's ability to comprehend, or understand. Not only does Christmas come once a year, but now beyond that point he is capable of understanding and studying "Christmas" and "once a year" and what this refers to. Only now he's capable of finding out that it's a totally unimportant datum.

Up to that time it might be important, it might not be important; God help us, we never would be able to find out whether it was something we had to know, or something that we didn't much care about, or something we're liable to be shot because we didn't know, or something that we'd certainly better forget in a hurry, or something that goes along with the fact that most peoples have shoes, the bottoms of the soles of which are dirty. You see that?

So classification of the importance of data is the thing which lies up there as the second step. Well, that's your third step. Your first is non comprehension, non duplication, confusion. Your second one is merely the ability to duplicate. And after that we get the ability to comprehend, to understand, and therefore get the ability to observe. Judgment lies in that field and this is a road to judgment.

Now, nobody has really ever bothered to teach anybody judgment before in the last 200 trillion years. And you're not going to find much judgment in any bank you've got. If there had been much judgment in it, you wouldn't have it as a bank. Let's look at that. If this
valence had been capable of enormous study, differentiation and judgment, you wouldn't have it as an aberrative valence. Isn't that so? So this has been a scarcity on the track.

So you have here in essence, a new skill. It's going to be very difficult to process it into somebody because they've never had it. They were capable of observation once, but how did they observe? They always put a curve on the observation in order to make a game out of it or something like that. Pure observation, pure study, pure duplication, pure comprehension, or pure judgment have never been a study in the field of philosophy. They just don't exist. You just will not find these things as subjects of discussion, even. They are touched on very slightly by the Platos and Socrateses and so forth of yesteryear, but just touched on very slightly. Totally avoided in religions and religious philosophies. Oh, they're just avoided like mad! Oh, it's just like showing them a snake spitting in their face, you know?

Huuuuuh! Comprehension, understanding, duplication? Oh, no, no, no, no, no! That's what you're not supposed to do!

And of course we know what the source of all this is. The greatest overt there is is enforcing a noncomprehension. That's an overt! You don't believe it? Take somebody sometime, you say, "What have you done?" Oh, this girl has got withholds, she's got crimes, she can't wear any of her frocks because they're so bloodstained, you know? She doesn't dare reach into any of her purses because of the asps she's stacked away at one time or another, you know? She can't even open up her own medicine chest with any feeling of security because of the arsenic coming out, you know? And we say, "What have you done?"

And she says, "Done? Well, I ate dinner."

And you say, "Well, what have you withheld?"

"I haven't withheld anything."

"All right. Good. Well, what have you done?"

"Oh, I sat down here a while ago."

"Good. Well, what have you withheld?"

"Nothing. I never withhold anything. My life is an open book."

And you go utterly mad trying to security check this person because you can't find any responsibility on which to hang the Security Check. You've got to increase their responsibility before you can find any withholds. They're there but they're totally muzzled, you see, by the irresponsibility of the attitude of the pc. You see, one of the ways you tell if a case is gaining is whether or not it's getting more withholds off. Well, that's just a way of saying "Is the case gaining in responsibility?" Yes, the case is gaining in responsibility, because they're getting more withholds off. Weren't withholds up to that time.

But you can take this same person, this same girl, and you could say, "What doesn't your family know about?"

"Oh, well, that is something else. Well, they don't know that I poisoned Joe, that I shot Pete. They don't know anything much about where I hid the body last month. They don't know what happened to the children. Ha-ha-ha-ha! They – ah…” see, and "don't know" is still
a button. All the way down "don't know" is still a button, all the way down and all the way up. It's a button the whole way.

You can always security check with "don't know" and "not know," when overts and withholds are passing right over the pc's head like these orbiting space flights that aren't taking off, you know? See, "don't know" goes all the way.

So a study of not-knowingness has been approached by philosophy by two philosophers – notably two philosophers: one is Kant and the other one is Spencer. And they've concluded that what wasn't known couldn't be known. Oh, how interesting! In other words, the closest approach philosophy has ever made to "don't know" or "not know" has been that you couldn't know. That's interesting, isn't it?

So, as I tell you, there has been no road to judgment.

Now, for many years I've been trying to teach you characters judgment. It has been a tough and difficult job. Judgment on the subject of another being, the ability to understand what was going on in a session, and operating with judgment so as to do the right thing about it. Now, do you know what bars you from judgment? It's just the not-knowingness of it all. Well, where's the not-knowingness of it all come from? It begins first with duplication. There is the entrance.

Oh, of course you could security check it out. "What don't people know about you?" and so forth, and smarten the guy up no end; but that's a processing approach, and we're not now talking about a processing approach because there is nothing there to process to. You see, processing processes to what is there, see?

Now, if a thetan ever got himself in bad condition, he's invalidated his own judgment, he's come off of his own judgment. The whole lesson of this universe teaches a person not to duplicate, just as it teaches him not to communicate.

You know, there are only two crimes in this universe that you have committed and that you have made others guilty of having committed: One is being there and the other is communicating. Those are the two crimes. There are no other crimes than that, being there and communicating. Now, if those two crimes are crimes, and those things have been made into crimes, then there's only one other thing that you can possibly make up your mind about it: A person has to learn, you might say, not really learn, but become comfortable with being there and communicating. And the way and the route one would take to bring comfort on the subject of being there and communicating would of course be duplication of a datum.

Now, a datum is a location which doesn't have to be pinned down. A datum is a location, a cousin to a thetan, you know? All data is a sort of a cousin to a thetan. You know, he's an idea, he thinks sometimes and he's got ideas and he can communicate ideas. And you can always put a whole stack of ideas into your thetan briefcase and have no mass at all. So it's ideally portable, most portable thing in the world is an idea, so thetans chased out of here and chased out of there begin to use ideas for location. They feel comfortable when they have an idea, you known. And that idea that they feel comfortable about is an identity. Even though the identity is mobile, they feel more comfortable with an identity than without one because it gives them the sensation of being located. They like this.
So what's the conclusion here? The conclusion is that you can learn to have judgment, and the way you learn to have judgment is just those two steps: duplication of data, and, pursuant to that, understanding. There's the duplication, the understanding. You don't get it this way: you don't get understanding and then duplication.

Now, what you should know about this is it's any data would serve as long as it is data, any data. "Classification of the Geological Formations of the Middle East as Observed by the Geological Department of – Serving After the Fact of the Appointments from the Rockmount Foundation, Appertaining only to Schists and Slides of the Lower Saudi Arabian Canyons," in 185 volumes, folio, see? That's data, you know? It's wild data, you know?

"Anamorphic schists are often found most closely blended with hornblende." You say to the pc, "Anamorphic schists are most closely blended with hornblende." Well, this would be a "fascinating" situation. He would wind up, of course, with a drill. He would wind up with an ability to do something, and he would also wind up with judgments on the subject of women, which I think is marvelous. You know? Nobody could wind up with that. I've been trying all these years. [laughter] It's impossible. And yet he could, by studying the anamorphic schists for the formation of hornblende. Very interesting!

Now, beyond that you cannot go in the teaching of judgment. You cannot teach a man how he should judge something and still have him judge something. You understand that you can teach a person data. Yes, by force of beingness in you, you can relay communication and understanding to people and they do understand it.

Well, I'll give you an example of that. One ACC I did nothing but lecture. Nobody processed anybody this whole ACC and they all had marvelous profile gains. I gave them two lectures a day and we went over all kinds of data and so on. Well, that was just a relay of understanding and comprehension, and they felt better and they had a bunch of cognitions on the thing and life looked better to them. You understand? So that was in itself a kind of a processing. That had one of the highest gain ACCs we ever had, which is interesting.

Now, this is totally possible, and without that possibility of course we'd never get anywhere. So that possibility natively exists.

But let's take the other one. Let's take the other one. Let's raise a level of skill on the subject of judgment, just overtly and directly create a level of skill on the subject of judgment. We would do that by duplication.

All right. What's this amount to here? What's this amount to? We are doing this – you do not see how this is working out according to the educational processes of the 17th ACC; first reason (to have no withhold from you, and so forth) is it wasn't realized or rationalized from those directly. What you're dealing with right this minute is – stems from prior understanding to the 17th ACC; 17th ACC is an outcrop of that understanding of how to go about these things. Nor are you dealing necessarily with a preconcerted effort to give you understanding. You're not dealing with that either. You are dealing accidentally with two different things, and one of those things is just the action of understanding and duplication, you're dealing with that, and at the same time you are dealing only with the data of Scientology which you can learn.
But incidentally the data of Scientology is being used to develop in you judgment, not on the subject of Scientology. Now, you don't notice this because you're learning judgment across a pretty high, beefy line. This is a high-voltage line, you see? So if you can learn judgment off of this line, marvelous! Because this line, of all others, would tend to destroy your self-determinism and judgment, wouldn't it? Yeah, you're not given any chance to think what life's all about. My God! Is there anything else to think about than what life is all about? Isn't that right? Well, I'll give you what life is all about, and then you don't have to think about it at all, and you're all set, and that's it, hm?

Well, the data is true so therefore it tends to stick, right? Do you know that a lot of you, unbeknownst to you, have run straight through having been taught it. And some of you haven't noticed that you've gone through having been taught it. You've come up on the other side of the thing into a realization of it; and now you have the realization of it, not because you've been taught it, but because you realize it. And this is what we know as "making it your data." You've often said this to a student but some of you perhaps have not looked too closely on what we mean by "make it your data."

In other words, he has to go along the line of duplication of the data to an understanding of the data, and with that understanding of the data he has the final step, which is the realization, totally self-determined, of the existence of the data. And when you're dealing with truth you always have this fourth step. You have the ability to realize and to perceive.

So you have first this "Thaa! What wall? Don't ask me to duplicate anything." Then you have simple duplication, and that's followed by understanding, and that is followed by realization or own comprehension. So therefore one's own self-determinism is restored on such a track.

Of course it's most rapidly restored on such a track by teaching the person the exact truth of something. There is the truth of something, he is able to duplicate the truth of something after many travails, and this truth of something is immediately pursued by the understanding of that something he has been taught. You understand that that is a stage; he's still dependent on you for the understanding of what's been taught. And your next stage up is a realization, which he reached at a sudden step up the line on his own bootstraps, so to speak. He regained an ability to understand, and so then he himself could realize. That's the route that you're taking. That route has total self-determinism and other-determinism and, of course, therefore, pan-determinism all mixed up in it, all at one fell swoop.

The person becomes pan-determined over the data. The person can not only understand why they learned the data but why the data was taught to them, and understand and realize – of course the realization includes the independent truth of the datum regardless of having been taught the datum. And with that, of course, a person has reached a high peak of the ability to judge something. A person then has judgment. There's no other route that I know of. I mean if this is not a perfect route, all right, so it isn't a perfect route. There is no perfect route.

Perhaps there is a perfect route, but there is no perfect route to hand at the moment if this is not a perfect route.
But there is this, that it is the first route through to such an end product. It certainly is that. And it is married in against an entirely different function. So you get a side play of the same thing. That is to say, you've got this thing doing two things. It wouldn't matter – well, your instructor has the horrible idea occasionally – he says, "All right. Now, what time span is there in an instant read? How soon must the read occur after the thing, an instant read?" I don't know how many answers you've got. I wouldn't set it right for worlds; not for worlds, I wouldn't set it right. Gives the instructor a marvelous opportunity. He can say, "Yes. But that tape, see? What does it say on that tape? That tape!"

And you say, "Well, actually, it's a half a second, a quarter of a second, a fifth of a second, a tenth of a second, it doesn't matter. I mean there – there it is."

"Ah, but which one is it on that tape?"

"Well, I can't tell you what that tape is. It doesn't matter whether it's a quarter of a second, half of a second, a fifth of a second, and so on, so on. I mean, all these answers and so on" – natter, natter, natter, natter.

And he says, "Flunk!" [laughter]

And you go back and snarl, and run up a whole bunch of overts against me, and so forth, and listen to the tape again. And you say, "Well, what do you know? Hang on, let's see, what was it on that exact tape? Oh, gorblimey! I never heard that before! A twentieth of a second! Twentieth of a second! Kaaa! All right," and you go in. "Twentieth of a second."

"All right, that's it."

Now, you see, it'd be totally pedantic (and we're not doing it on this other system) for the instructor to say "What are the first seven words in the fifth paragraph of the third bulletin written in 1959 in the month of June?" See, that is just becoming a memory contest, and if you'll notice, nearly all study is devoted to memory contests. And nobody is asking you to engage in a memory contest. Somebody is asking you to engage in a duplication activity. If you can duplicate the data your memory will come up sooner or later – even yours.

It's very, very horrible; some of you first confronting this thing, you find it ghastly! You find it utterly horrible. It's the most terrible thing you ever confronted. Recognize the mechanism you're up against, and recognize that not for a moment is anybody going to relent on this datum. Also find out, as you go along, all of a sudden you're able to understand things you weren't able to understand before, which is all quite peculiar; and you possibly have never noticed this, but you're now understanding things you never understood before that have to do with other things that have nothing to do with training, nothing to do with the subject matter you're training on, which is quite amazing. You get something going like this, why, you've made gains in another direction, and that's what an auditor has to have. An auditor has to have comprehension. He has to be able to understand what he is looking at. He has to understand what is going on.

An auditor who gets into this kind of a situation is a dead one, he's lost. The pc says, "Ah, women are such a bore!"
And he's pulled the same gag you might have pulled on the committee, as far as the auditor is concerned. He said that fatal word—two fatal words: He said women and bore. These things are not compatible, outrageous! One can't possibly marry up those two words in the same sentence. Whoever imagined they could become bored with women?

This is incomprehensible, and the auditor just sits there and he starts some kind of a natter, natter, natter, interrupt the pc, you see? "Women, bore? Women, bore? What are you talking about?" And instead of saying "TR 4" cheerily, and going on with the session, he says "Natter, sub-natter." [laughter] He does all kinds of things, says Q and A, "What did you say? Where are we going? What are you doing? Why? Why did you say that? Have you got an engram there? What's happening in the thing?" and so forth. In other words the auditor goes into a "trying to understand," do you hear that?

Pc can sometimes put you into a "trying to understand," and you'll find yourself having a hard time auditing the pc for quite another reason. You don't audit pcs by telepathy, and this pc isn't talking very much or loudly, you see? And you say to the pc, "All right now, what is your opinion of women?"

And the pc says, "Ummm-ummm."

And you have to say "What did you say?" Not to understand what the pc says is a misdemeanor of the first water. The pc is sort of putting you on a point where you are made to think that you don't understand the pc because you can't understand what the pc's saying.

I remedy this usually quite well; pc goes—tips over, is all curled up in a ball, head is down in the chair, mouth totally compressed against the curve of the arm, and is saying "Ummm, ummmm," and so on.

I don't risk any ARC breaks on my part or theirs. I say, "Sit up. That's right. Sit up. That's good. Now speak up."

And the pc says, "Ummmmmmm."

You say, "All right. Now, what was that answer again?"

"Oh, women are such a bore."

"All right. Thank you very much," you know? "All right."

In other words, I make the pc communicate to me, which may be tougher but you'll find out that you'll run up ARC breaks when you don't. You pays your money and you takes your chance. In other words, if you leave him in that condition, you're going to have—soon you're going to be totally out of comprehension of what's going on with the pc. You're also going to feel that you don't comprehend what the pc is doing, and therefore you can't observe anything that's happening to the pc and all sorts of things go wild.

But let's get back on the other thing. Let's take an auditor who cannot happily duplicate a datum, a non sequitur datum, but always insists that he hang up on a button. And the pc says, "Women are such a bore," and he knows that this can't exist, and he himself has lots of trouble with women, and his immediate response is "Why is women boring? What is this?" and so on, and go squabble out of session here. "You've challenged me. I don't believe that. That hasn't anything to do with this. Just why did you come to that particular conclusion? I
don't see what there is in the auditing command that would make you come to that conclusion."

The pc finally says, "Well, it was just a cognition!"

And the fellow says, "Well, it's a cognition. That's a remarkable thing to say when you come to think about it, you know? It's a remarkable thing to say – just a cog…."

But the pc says, "But it's just a cognition. You know, I just said it, you know?"

He says, "Well, all right."

And the auditor goes on, you see, and audits him a little bit longer, and the pc says, "But all men are stupid, when it comes right down to that."


"All men are stupid."

"Why did you say that? Do you have a picture there?" and so forth. "What's going on? I mean, have you got an ARC break? Got some withholds? Are you withholding something? Is that what you're withholding, that all men are stupid? Just exactly how does this add up?" and so on.

And the pc says, "But it's just a cognition. I – I just – just – I – I – I just had the idea. I'm sorry. I'm sorry."

And you then have a pc who won't blow anything. You have a pc who is punished for cogniting. You have a pc who is punished for auditing and therefore have a pc who is punished for getting rid of pieces of the bank. And if you audit the pc in that framework the pc will make no gain because they're being taught not to blow anything, because they don't ever dare mention anything; and they're made sorry every time they open their mouths because there's no comprehension. They look up, the auditor's trying to understand, trying to understand, trying to hear, trying to hear, trying to find out what it is, what it is, what it is, where it came from, where it came from, wha-da-da-da-da-da – if you'll just – you don't – no, no – you've got the auditor on trying to comprehend, trying to comprehend, trying to comprehend. And of course you haven't got an auditor at that stage who is capable of duplicating what the pc said.

My God, I've heard pcs say some of the most outrageous things you ever heard of in your life. Now, this never startled me particularly, but once in a while I have been startled by something. You notice that you're normally most startled by overt or withholds the pc has which pertain immediately and directly to you, or to somebody you're close to or like, you know? You're immediately influenced by these particular overt and withholds.

Well, what if the whole session – supposing the auditor were in such poor state with regard to duplication that every bit of the auditor's auditing was as reactive toward the pc as your sudden Rrrrr! when the pc has just told you some fantastic lying withhold about you. Now, you know your own startlement when you've heard one of these occasionally. Well, supposing they're trying to understand – "Where did you hear that?" you know? You – right away you're just yanked out of it sometimes, you know?
He says, "Well I – I have a withhold. I – I saw you...."

You say, "Yes, what?"

"Well, I saw you up at the corner of the lane up there the other night with – well, you know who."

"Well, who? Who? Who?" you know, "Who? Who did you see me up there with?" and so forth.

"Oh, well – well, you know. We needn't really go into it."

"Well, what's this all about? Where did you hear that? I mean, did you see that yourself? Did you see it in person? Were you there? What time was it? Well, did anybody else see it?" you know? You'll get caught off base, and you will ask more questions about it than you ordinarily would ask about something else. That's your effort to try to understand because you're hung up on some kind of a button that concerns you intimately. Do you see that?

All right. Now, an auditor who can't duplicate runs the whole session in that frame of mind. Not just things that relate to him, but anything that relates to anything, the auditor has the same greeting of that – the same greeting from the auditor. The pc says, "It's been a nice day all day."

The auditor says, "What? What? Where? Where? Where? Where? I mean, where did you hear that? Oh, you-you what? Today. Oh, you're talking about today, not yesterday. Well, I thought it was a nice day today, too, that is, this morning, early. Er, yes, let's see. What were we talking about? Oh, yes. The auditing command was – what was the auditing command? Ah – yes – yes. Have I withheld anything from you? All right. Have I withheld anything from you?"

You watch it, man. Therefore, if you get a zone or area where the auditors are having one awful time trying to duplicate a bulletin, what must you also assume? That they've been in there endlessly trying to understand the pc, trying to understand the cases, being hung up on all kinds of wild-ball buttons, and they're right down there at the first stage I gave you.

They're in that stage. See, if their morale is going down because they can't pass any bulletin tests, you would know at once how they've been handling pcs. Do you see that? So duplicative training is absolutely essential. And it is successful. Now, you can make up your mind to that.

Now, what I've talked to you about you may or may not have found very burningly interesting. Naturally, it doesn't apply to you personally. [laughter, laughs] But in training auditors you should know it. The baptism of fire that causes people to look so pale and so drawn under the thing is, for instance, duplicating under resentment. See, they go through all kinds of emotional bars on this particular thing. Learn like mad but it's all resented like mad, you see, because "Uhhhh! It couldn't possibly be – uhrrrrhh!" and so on. Well, they pass through that one, too.

But sometimes you see a student here who goes around for the first two or three weeks, and they get paler and paler, and shadowier and shadowier, more and more hollow-eyed, more and more gaunt, things looking worse and worse. Or they look more and more
apathetic. You can hear them the way they start up their cars, and things. You can hear about how a new student is going, you know? At first, why, they start up their cars in a sort of a puzzled way; and then they start up a car, you know, very angrily indeed, you see? You can hear the gears crash about three times as they get up the drive, you know? And then eventually they wander up the driveway running into both sides of the verge; you know about what state they have reached, and so on.

That's all done by training, and it is not the route of processing. Don't consider it a processing route. It is just a route by training because it is a new skill.

You very often have been asked in the past to memorize "the structural components of a Mark VII space vessel with gyro rotators, complete, all number parts." I'm sure you've had to do something like this. I'm sure you have had at some time or another. And the funny part of it is you wound up at the other side being able to look at the space vessel; and on the other side of that somebody says to you, "Oh, well, these Mark VIIs – these Mark VIIs, they – they – they sure fly low, and they sure fly slow, Mark VIIs do."

And, "No, no, no," you say, "you don't really understand this ship, you know. You don't understand how to run one. No, when you first get them into the outer area of an atmosphere, you see, you turn on the coolers, you see, at that moment. See, you don't slow them down as you come in. Just turn on the coolers way out there, you see, so that you supercool the whole hull, you see? That's the way you really handle these things. And then you come in, hit the atmosphere on a skip, always hit it on a skip the first time, you see? And then sort of smush in, you know, with everything supercooled. Come in fast, don't lose your speed, you're all right, you see? And then have your counter-blasters in excellent condition so that when you come down toward the surface, and that sort of thing, right at the exact proper – and so as not to waste any fuel – these Mark VIIs, you really have to pour that blaster to it. And if you pour it to it very suddenly and very quickly you stop, you see? And then you land all right. And the reason they're having crashes with them is they just don't understand them."

And somebody comes out and watches you land a Mark VII, you don't land one that way at all, but you sure understand one. You understand how to land one; but every time you land a Mark VII you land it entirely differently than at any other time you ever landed a Mark VII. You never land a Mark VII the same way twice, yet you always land them and they never crack up and everything is fine. You got the idea? But you never drive the same ship the same way two days consecutively running. That's because you understand it.

Routine and rote, in other words, are a poor substitute for understanding. And the place I'm trying to get you to is a place where you can process by realization, process by comprehension, process by the exercise of judgment. If I can get you to that point, I will have considered it very well worth doing, no matter 'ow 'eroic it has been on the way.

Thank you.
Thank you.

There's a rumor going around that I'm supposed to talk to you about how to instruct people tonight.

Now, somebody tells me that that's what I said earlier today, but I have been run on not-knowingness, and the process was never flattened. We got back to five lives ago and I quit. I said, "That's that." I said, "That's that. If I've got all this to not-know all over again, to hell with it."

I want to talk to you about instruction. Instruction is an interesting subject. It's a very interesting subject, because we seem to be in the business of instruction. Now, you mind of yourselves as auditors. Auditing techniques are a method of bringing people to know. Think it over.

A great oddity here is that the common denominator of living appears to be learning. In Dianetics we had survival as a common denominator. In Scientology we discover, much to our embarrassment, that that's inevitable. So we have to find another excuse, and the best excuse we can find without looking too far or weighing our brains down too much is learning.

Apparently learningness has great breadth, and we find learningness at almost any level of action, living or operation.

Now, learning would encompass this operation: Fellow looks at the wall and learns it's a wall. You got that? So recognizingness is the lowest level of learningness and is still learningness.

We meet Joe. If we're in good shape, we can learn that it's Joe by looking at him. Some of us who are not in very good shape meet Joe and talk to Father.

Now, do you see how this fits? See how this could be pushed over into a learning category?

Now, don't be fooled. The truth of the matter there is there's an awful lot more (this ii. between us Scientologists) to livingness than learningness. There's a lot more of it. There is creatingness. There is a number of other factors than learningness. We're not going to go into any of them. We're just going to talk about learningness, and we're going to show how everything could be pulled in and by some slight adjustment, and maybe going around a few fast
curves, be common-denominatored into learning, which would make education our forte. Education.

The odd part of it is that a Scientologist can educate people that no one else has ever been able to educate. How do they do it? By auditing them. One of the main things that rises in auditing is IQ, which tells you of course, secondarily, that learning rate goes up. What is IQ but relative cognitionability?

Now, what then are we doing, what are we doing in actuality (below the level, of course, of solids and effort and so forth), but pushing thought around one way or the other? See, we're pushing thought around.

Now, people who think there is only thinking, of course buy at once the totality of cognitionness. See, they buy that as the totality of any action. If you can learn about it, you got it. They do this so well that they invent so many things to learn about that nobody is ever then able to get Clear by processes of education alone. They booby-trap the line.

Some fellow has a body: he can't look at it so he looks at somebody else's. He can't look at that so he looks at a dead body on the dissection table. He finds an awful lot of spare parts as he begins to cut it up one way or the other. He looks over all these spare parts and he begins to realize that there is no way he can bring order into the chaos of blood and confusion from this cadaver, except to apply new titles to everything that comes under his hand. So he writes a learned textbook on the subject. But actually he doesn't do anything. He doesn't even do a good job of cutting the corpse up, but he does do a splendid job of titling parts of the corpse. And he does a wonderful job of this, and he spends the rest of his life readjusting his titling.

Now, this is about as close as anybody ever looked at a body – I mean directly – in the healing professions. They've even taken the titling and put it over into a dead language that nobody ever speaks anymore, you see?

A psychologist trying to occupy a brain, that is to him only a series of titles, will not get very much reality on the close proximity of brain cells. He has so many parts of the brain that he is living in the midst of a bunch of titles.

Now, learning can very easily, then, be subjugated to learning some complexity which has been invented about something that one never looks at. And so learningness itself can get to some degree into disgrace.

There's an obsession about learningness which is quite interesting to handle: the technique of craving to know – "Put craving to know into the walls," and so on; makes people sick at their stomachs, and all sorts of interesting things.

Now, here's learningness, then, at its worst: learning large, long categories of invented knowingnesses disordered into some kind of a chaotic catalog, with another curve of another language being applied, and so on.

Botany is one of these classification subjects. Now, I'll tell you the total thinkingness that went on concerning botany. It would interest you very much. It was done by Francis Ba-
con in a little essay, and he laid down a (quote) "science" called botany because he supposed that this would be a good way to lay down a science. So he just took something that hadn't been laid down and dashed it off in a paragraph or so, that this is the way you would put together a science about flowers, growing things. And he dashed off this little paragraph, and that, since the sixteenth century, has been a science called botany.

Well, it's never moved in its actual technical activity from those few sentences. But, brother, has it got classification! Wow!

Now, you didn't know that a skunk cabbage was actually intimately related to a Wallaby rose, did you? Well, I didn't either, but some botanist would undoubtedly be able to accomplish this in some associative fashion.

All right. Now, let's take learning about the mind. I said some psychologist would be in the middle of a bunch of named parts, he wouldn't be in the middle of a brain. Well, then, his ability to contact or look at his own brain has been so low that it has escaped him that the classification of the brain was the classification of an item in which most of the psychology world has been totally, embeddedly resident. So this whole fact has escaped them.

Now, let's look carefully why it has escaped them. They couldn't look at it, so they looked at a substitute for it. They couldn't look at the thing, so they looked at a substitute for the thing.

Now, let's go on into basic therapies, old-time therapies of one kind or another, and we find one of those was psychoanalysis. And psychoanalysis is so interested in the significance of the experience that they have never looked at the experience.

So education has been in the past, or learning has been in the past, a system of avoiding observation. So a systematic avoidance of observation will sooner or later get something into trouble, and into trouble has come the whole of education itself.

We send a man to school for – I don't know, I think it's gotten up to an optimum now of 60 years till he gets out of college: and this individual actually has been put in a groove of avoiding knowing. You see that? He's on a system whereby he can avoid knowing something. How does he do that? By studying it!

Now, there are significances, and there are basic associations, and there are mock-ups, and there are floors and walls and machinery and cogwheels and botanical gardens. There are all these things. And anybody that you're trying to teach anything is normally into an interesting avoidance of the object by learning its invented knowingnesses.

Here's a great big machine, has chromium-plated cogwheels and gold-plated levers and – oh, it's a gorgeous piece of stuff, you know? I mean it's huge, so on. Two men walk up to it. One of them says, "What's that?"

And the other one says, "That's a nash-wheelsy."

"Oh? Oh, is that right? I didn't know that." And they walk away.
How easy it is to satiate somebody's appetite for learning by giving them a name for something. You ought to make a study of this. Somebody comes around to you and asks you, "What kind of a circumstance is this whereby somebody goes off the end of the pier because of a divorce? What's wrong with such a person, they had a divorce and they want to bump themselves off, and so on? What is that all about?"

Then you start to explain to them, "Look. What this person did to the other marital partner is kicking back as a motivator, you see? The person who is so upset about it must have done something."

Now, you explain this and you possibly would get it across very nicely. You see, possibly. You see, you would just take the actual straight-out anatomy of the marital difficulty. One person, after a divorce they want to kill themselves, and so forth. Well, they must have done something in order to inherit a motivator to this degree. Well, we explain this to somebody, we would give them some information. Why is it information? Because it can be used in the game of life.

But now, let's just completely and utterly sidestep any responsibility we have as Scientologists, or just kick it over sideways and say, "Ahhhh!"

And they say, "Yes? Why, what's the matter?"

"Well, that person has a-a-a-a-pseudomania. I mean it's a very serious circumstance. It's an illness – it's an illness which often comes after a divorce. Pseudomania – pseudomania maritus." And you would be fascinated how often this deep, profound piece of nothingness would turn somebody else around and send them away perfectly satisfied, evidently. You know? They "know" now. Well, what do they know? They know something to remember, that's what they know. And that's all they know.

All right. Let's look at this, and let's take a little closer view of this, and we discover then that that person is willing to avoid the situation. The person is willing to avoid the situation, and you gave him an excuse to. You gave him a fancy name. Then he didn't have to invade the thing any further. That was that, he could just avoid it from there on out and he's all set.

Or you have given him a little thread off your cloak of authority. An authority has told him this, so now he is an authority. And he goes down and tells his fellow mechanic that it's a – "You know – you know Pete?"

"Yeah, what about Pete?"

"Well, you know Pete, he – Pete's in a bad way."

"What about Pete?"

"Well, Pete has uh – pseuda – urn – has – he's got a dreadful disease!" That's the end of that datum.

All right. We Find, then, if this is dominant as a method of conveying understanding, that people must be avoiding to a very marked degree the actual objects, actions or being-
nesses of life. Must be! They must be running on an "avoid," somehow or another. They must be going off this way when they, as far as we could see, could go right on that way.

Some fellow wants to know how to build a small concrete dam. You teach him how to mix concrete, you teach him how to make a form, you teach him something about the pressures of water at certain depths, and the need of side embankments. And it's quite a subject, but you could probably teach him all this in an evening. They don't do that in this society. They send them to college for four years. When they come out, they don't even know what a dam is. They don't give a damn either.

All right. So, education could be one of several things, one of which could be the science of avoidance – how to avoid – and we could do all that up, and we could do a wonderful science. It'd be terrifically acceptable. We would write it up in such a way that never could anybody find out anything, anyhow, anywhere. We would teach them a system whereby, if they looked at a wall, it was then necessary to look it up in a book. And having looked it up in a book, they would then have to address a small slide rule which operated in phonetics. And then they could look at the name on the slide rule, one way or the other, and it would give them a combination of syllables somehow or another, and this, we would say, was it.

You would be very amazed, but a book on this subject written with a very sober, pompous style would probably be enormously successful. "The Science of Knowing How to Study" or something, you could call it, you know; you'd be all set.

You would do this by catering to their avoidance mechanisms. You'd permit them to avoid, wouldn't you?

Well, our systems of education are less merciful, much less merciful, because we operate on the very sound principle that it won't kill anybody to know anything. And they operate with the associative datum – you see, the datum instead of the thing, and so forth – they operate on the theory that a little bit of learning will kill you deader than a field mouse; that learning is dangerous.

There's even an old proverb, "A little bit of learning is dangerous," you know? How they would love to include into that "A little bit of learning or a whole lot of learning or any kind of learning about anything will kill you dead." That is the theory of avoidance in education.

Now, we come through and we don't subscribe to this. We don't subscribe to it at all because we know for a fact – we know for a fact that a person (that is, the person, not his body) could actually connect with or associate with anything with impunity. And the only things that are giving him any trouble are those things with which he dare not associate. The things that he's unwilling to learn something about are the things that are giving him trouble. And then, what does learning mean to us? It means, simply, communication. It doesn't mean a substitute datum.

That's awfully, brutally, horribly simple. You want to learn about something, communicate with it, see?
Now, one of the ways of communicating with it is talking it over. Now, supposing it's just a datum. Supposing it isn't a solid object, supposing it's just some thetan's postulate. The only way it disappears is to talk it over, and in many cases, think it over.

Now, a person gets down to a point where he can't think it over anymore, then he has to talk it over. But most people do both, they think it over and talk it over, and it goes boom.

Data consists of the postulates, or assignment of value, of thetans. That's data. That's all data is.

Now, when they have assigned a value on which they have rather uniformly agreed, they have a fact. You got that? Now, would anybody please tell me how the association only with these agreements, or the communication only with these agreements, would kill anybody? That's for sure. Well, it so happens that the walls got there that way. That's packing a postulate that says "I am a case of thereness, agreed upon and ratified by the Treaty of Ugveldt, 18 miles south of Cloud 9". That's the wall.

So if there's a vast difficulty in associating with other people's agreements, of course then we'll have vast difficulty. Because the vast difficulty is just another postulate.

So we get down to the fundamental of Scientology education, and that is that it doesn't hurt a thetan to communicate with anything, anywhere, at any time. And to educate him, all we have to do is teach him that. He has to know that. He gets to be a mighty smart boy if he subjectively knows, knows by experience – may require some processing, you see – that it won't kill him to know about something. If he learns that, then he learns learning.

It's a great curiosity that to go on then from that point and make any great tremendous complexity out of it is really rather difficult. A person can learn about what he can communicate with. And it won't hurt him to communicate with it.

Now, it does hurt – you understand, this is the "cross-up that gets this all off. When you push a body into a buzz saw, parts come off, which by common agreement is painful. That's quite different though – it's quite different – than a thetan communicating with a buzz saw. You get somebody exteriorized and push him into a buzz saw and he says "Whee!"

Now, the funny part of it is, if the body wasn't rigged by agreement to be destructible by its own experience – a body has agreed already to be destroyed by its own experience, you see – you could push it into a buzz saw, and when you pulled it off the parts would simply reassemble. If there was no experience factor added to the body, that wouldn't be painful either. But if you add an experience factor to the body, then you let people in for pain and destruction.

Old-time education could be defined in this wise, in this wise (it's horrible): placing data in the recalls of others. Therefore, old-time education accepts hypnotism, does not really allow for the usableness of the information, does not analyze doingness and completely avoids any havingness, which of course permits nobody to be anything. But putting data into the recalls of others causes others to rely on experience, not perception. These are two different things. Remembered experience is quite different than perception and estimation of the situation.
Now, I'm not running down old-time education completely; I'm just burying it.

Scientology has an entirely different category of action. Now, this has not at this time been laid out perfectly, all squared up at the edges and so forth. But it goes something like this: You offer data for the assimilation and use of others and facilitate their absorption of it, to the end of permitting them a better control of a better life. That would be a much longer definition, but it actually is more factual.

If you're going to attempt education at all, then it has to be a game with a goal. There has to be some reason why. And unless you add that into your definition you're going to get now-heres.

So when we offer a person a datum, that datum must be under the self-determinism of the other person, not in his recalls. Get the difference. It must be at the disposal of his own determinism. And if it is not, then it cannot be used thoroughly in living.

So we give them data in such a wise as to give them control of the data, and then permit them to use that data, align and evaluate and apply that data to specific beingnesses and actions in life. And we never let a datum hang up in the air without anything with which to unite.

Now, what I just said originally about the avoidance system of education happens to be any preclear you ever processed. He's sitting there in his mother's valence. He has a very bad heart, terrible! And he says – you say, "Anybody you ever know have a bad heart?"

"Oh," he says, "yes. Mother."

You say, "Well, all right. Do you ever remember a time when Mother's heart was bad?"

"Oh, yes, yes. Lots of times," and so on.

You say, "Well now, what about your – what about your – your own heart? Do you suppose that could have anything to do with it?"

"Yes, I dare say it has a great deal to do with it."

No data would fall out. It's all in there in complete black basalt.

I've had people sit and tell me exactly what was wrong with them. They'd studied it all out. It was still wrong with them, still wrong with them. They hadn't gotten rid of a scrap of it. Well, how come? It was probably all the wrongness they had left. It was probably the only lesson they had ever learned.

Now, anything that is wrong with anybody is simply a lesson they've learned. Well, people know this so they avoid lessons.

But the first thing that got wrong with them was to avoid a lesson, and then this permitted them thereafter to avoid more lessons, and every lesson they avoided could then victimize them. So here we go, here we go.
How many ways could you devise to simply teach somebody a great deal about education? How many ways could you possibly do so? Well, how many auditing techniques do you know? There's quite a few, quite a few. But in view of the fact that you're doing an educational activity, it of course depends in a large measure upon communication. So communication must be demonstrated to exist before any education can be undertaken that will become education in the Scientology sense, not another engram.

You can always beat somebody's head in and say "That'll teach him." It will, the rest of his life. It'll teach him every day. To what? Lord knows! Completely random, completely random.

Supposing the phrase in that head beating was "He is no earthly good." We actually got somebody from Northwest Airlines, I think it was, that had this phrase in the bank, and everything he had done on the ground had been a total failure. He'd taken to be a flyboy, and he hated being a flyboy: but he was no "earthly" good.

Some other fellow with the same, identical phrase becomes a parson. Man will insist on using his power of choice and he'll insist on doing something about anything. But unless his power of choice is in plain sight, and unless his somethingness is in very good view, unless the individual has a command over something and knows what he has a command over of, you know – that's very important.

If you're training lions – I've heard it said that when you're training lions you really should know it's a lion you're training. Yeah, I've heard of this. Some cautious souls have brought this up from time to time.

If you're handling a human being, why – huh! Lord knows what you're handling. You might be handling a lion, or you – look at these little kids. They run up and down the street snapping cap pistols at each other, and so on. You can't tell from one minute to the next who they are. Who are they? Oh. I don't know. They're anybody: Davy Crockett or Buffalo Bill or Nathan Hale or – he got hanged – somebody. They're being somebody. They're being somebody they're not.

It's only when somebody becomes somebody he is that he gets worried.

All right. Systems of education, then, must only take into account the unharmful aspects of communication, and the formulas of communication, and the facts of communication, and an alignment of the data to be transmitted so that it may be employed in living by the other person.

Terrific dependency, though, on communication, isn't it? Communication and its whole formula. Every time that was avoided when you were a little kid in school, you didn't learn something. There was something you didn't learn. That's for sure. They didn't bother to get your attention, they didn't bother to tell you where it applied; there you went. And to this day you probably think two and eight make twelve. Of course that's your postulate. If you were good enough they would, but that's beside the point.

Now, education oddly enough contains a nearly complete – outside of the definitions of it itself – rendition in the old Logics of Dianetics. And those are the anatomy of education.
They might be called the axioms of education. They were totally missing in the field of education.

Some of those were almost known back in the days when they used to teach a subject called logic and argumentation. Wonderful subject. I had a textbook on it once, just gorgeous. Such simplicity! How you defeat an opponent in a debate. Wonderful list. I mean, they took up the subject, they really meant to defeat an opponent in a debate; they had a complete anatomy of how you defeated somebody in a debate, which had nothing whatsoever to do with the debate and they said so; how you distracted his attention. It ran down to the most mechanical things you ever heard of: Have him called from the wings occasionally. It did. I mean, it was a wonderful textbook. Practical! Wish I'd studied it.

Anyhow, one of the little data in there – one of the data in there was the most marvelous thing you ever heard of: "Never engage the actual data of your opponent in a debate. Always engage his sources." Read that – how fiendish!

The fellow says, "Two hundred and ninety-one tons of uranium were used last year."

And you don't say – he's demonstrating the value of uranium, you see, and the expenditures on uranium, and so on – you don't say "Ah," or "Well, what do you know." You never agree with him. A debate's an argument. It makes that very clear in this textbook – printed about, by the way, about 1866 or '67 – at no time do you agree with him. You find out "Who said that? Where did you get that datum?"

"Oh," he says, "that's Borks and Snorgelbers, their mining reports, published in the Miners Quarterly." and so forth.

And you say, "The Miners Quarterly of what organization?"

And he says. "Why, the United Mine Workers, of course."

And you say. "Ahhhh."

Wouldn't have mattered if it was the Republican National Committee, you'd have still said "Ahhhh."

I think they killed everybody off that knew the subject. I think they all got annihilated for it, so we don't have the subject anymore. It was a gorgeous textbook. I don't even have a copy of it anymore.

But anyway, if we want to relay a datum completely so that it fixes forever and it's not under anybody's control, we have to lose or lie about the source: we have to get the source out of sight completely. We have to give it some other source. Then we have to alter it a little bit. And then we have to deliver it with enormous authority: and if anybody says that isn't the authority, or the authority has nothing to do with the datum, then let's back up the whole artillery on them. Let's flunk them, let's put them back half a term, let's send letters home to their parents. Sounds kind of wild, doesn't it? Just because they said that Snorgel and Fugeelbaum did so-and-so, why, all these penalties get lined up. If you don't believe it, you've had it.
Well now, that is old-time education. What good is the datum? It's no good at all. So Snorgel and Fuggelbaum said this – so what?

Einstein – here, I'll give you the reverse, now. Einstein had a lot to do, they say, with inventing the A-bomb. Well, it was invented on his authority or something. It was appropriated for on his authority. And we get down the line after a while, and Einstein at no time can say "The A-bomb will not explode tonight." He can't say that and have it happen. What the hell is this about authority? What difference does it make?

Actually, it has nothing to do, really, with the behavior of the bomb at all. The bomb explodes or it doesn't explode, and that's all. It's an open and closed fact. Mostly because Einstein himself is outweighed by a tremendous number of people who all agreed on the backtrack that atom bombs exploded. He's outvoted! So you get pushed into the horrible position that I'm pushed into of simply categorizing the majority decisions.

But the whole alliance of authority and education is apt to bring people into a Fixed state of mind. If what is being taught is true then they themselves will recognize its truth, since nobody can be taught, thoroughly. anything that he himself does not already have some knowledge of. No matter how ghostily, no matter how thinly, there's some knowledge of it.

For instance, you can't be taught usefully – so that you can use it – any datum about the human mind that you have not already agreed to. You can be taught an invention concerning the human mind if you are taught that it is an invention. Otherwise, you would have to be taught hypnotically, merely given a new-conviction, which you could not use or alter. That would have to be done on an hypnotic level. What good would it be? Well, it'd add a new datum. And if enough people were hypnotized into believing this, that all brains had Ford coils in them or something, I imagine the genetic line would grow Ford coils. But it hasn't yet. Remember that; it hasn't yet.

In other words, we learn most easily that to which we have subscribed. This is why so many people flunk science. Science is the doggonedest mass of invention you ever cared to read, but it's a rather uniformly agreed-upon invention which is built on top of an already top-heavy series of inventions or postulates which are agreed upon. This already top-heavy mass of agreements, then, needs no further inventions, I assure you. And yet, just for the sake of teaching somebody something, these things get invented. You get the idea?

Now, it's a sure test of a teacher whether he knows his stuff or not, the number of data which he insists on everyone assimilating without question. If he insists that a great number of data be assimilated without further analysis or question in any way, shape or form, we know this boy doesn't know his business. He's scared. Somehow or another he feels that nobody must be permitted to examine these data. So he's doing something else. He's doing something else.

Now, educationally, it is absolutely necessary for the teacher to preserve the power of choice of the student over the data which he is taught. And if it is not in agreement with the experience of the student, and will not be found to be true in the environment of the student, he permits the student to examine this and say so, and operate accordingly. Only in this wise would you have anything used or useful.
Engineering fails mostly because all of the originators in the field of engineering have died off. They're way back on the track.

A chap came to me recently – he rather surprised me: I was a little bit overwhelmed by this experience. He came to me in London, and the appointment was made by cable two or three days before the fact. The first whisper of it was about two weeks before the fact, and then the exact appointment was made about three days before the meeting. And he wanted to come by and see me at my office in London. He said he wanted to talk to me. He didn't say it was urgent.

So I sat there wondering what this could be all about, as the chap has a rather famous name. He's probably the leading boy employed at this time by the US Air Forces in the field of aerodynamic research. And I thought, "What on earth does this fellow want to see me for?" Had nothing to do – I haven't done anything, honest. You know?

And he sailed into the office, he sat down, he took one of my Kools, he accepted a Coca-Cola, rejected an offer of some vodka – said it was not national with him and chitter-chatted with me for exactly one-half an hour, talking about some recent developments.

I agreed with him. I thought these were fine, understood them a little bit, got some kind of an inkling of where he was going, fumbled with it a bit, said that's fine. He intimated that he was looking for some much younger man than himself, since he was about 71 and he was right in there with the Wright brothers, to replace him someday, and intimated – oh, how cursorily – that someday he might want me to process somebody for him. But this was quite obviously not the object of his visit.

Well, he looked at his watch, went outside, got in the US Embassy car, went back to the airport, climbed aboard a US Army Air Forces airplane, was flown on to his destination – which was Brussels, a large conference in Brussels – and then flown home. That was all he wanted to do in London. And I sat there and I scratched my head, I couldn't figure out what in the hell was going on here. Didn't have any idea at all. No idea at all.

And finally – after a lot of time went by I finally figured out what was wrong. The guy was lonesome! That's all. Haven't heard from him since. Told him to drop by here, he said sure he would. He isn't home yet. But this is an interesting thing.

But in his conversation it was rather easy to detect the fact that in his field he alone, he felt, was running on choice of data and theory. Everybody else in his field, his own associates and assistants, particularly his assistants, were all running fixedly on data which had now become agreed-upon data in the field of aerodynamics, but which is not necessarily true at all. In fact, I never have been able to figure out – and neither could he – how anybody ever applied calculus to an airfoil, and managed to build the same airfoil off the same mathematical sheet. He said he always inquired whether or not they had sent the test model over for measurements in building the actual model, and never felt comfortable unless they did.

But this man was a realist, terrific realist. If you couldn't think about it and look about it, you couldn't know anything about it, so what use was it? And that was the way he operated. That was it.
I am afraid that in the field of knowledge, to me nothing, including Scientology, is sacred. In fact, I'd have to be argued with and shot at awfully long for anybody to convince me that a datum was an unalterable datum which must never again be reviewed. I'm afraid I would be very hard to convince this way. Of course there'd be ways to do this. You could kidnap all of you and hold you for ransom until I admitted that the moon was green cheese and – oh, I'd probably say the moon was made out of green cheese, because I'd go easy the other way too.

I am not trying to hold up an inviolable integrity at the expense of something or other, I know not what, don't you see?

The only fate I'd know which was worse than death would be "totally fixed on the entire track with all data which had ever been invented and agreed upon." That's the only fate I know that'd be worse than death. But there's another fate which is almost as bad, and that is to shy off every datum simply because it's been agreed upon, see? You have to remain fluid in both quarters. In other words, you don't have to accept every datum as a fixed, unalterable datum, and you don't have to shy off anything that looks like a fixed, unalterable datum. You don't have to do either one. Don't have to accept them, don't have to reject them. Yawn once in a while. It's not that important.

So here we have, worked out in Scientology, a great many data which are apparently the common denominators of agreements on the whole track, arrived at evidently by the bulk of the people who perceive them now. And people have become disabused or have disabused themselves of their participation in their creation, and many of these people are shying off of them and avoiding them, because if they thought again what they had thought once it'd evidently kill them. And so as we inspect this we arrive at certain definite methods and agreements by which we can reach these, and turn them around one way, or fix them better the other way, or do something with them. In other words, we are actually capable of twisting and turning the various fixednesses and unfixednesses of existence.

Now, sometimes we do this well, sometimes we do this poorly; but we always unfix as easily as the thing was unfixed in the first place, and we always fix as easily as the thing was fixed in the first place. We always do those things, see? We can always unfix something that was awfully unfixed.

You know, a fellow's walking down the street and a thought flashes through his mind that maybe some of his behavior is not entirely masculine, maybe it is slightly effeminate. In other words, the datum is there "Maybe I'm a girl." Well, you see, it's very nebulous, you know, maybe, he's just playing a game with himself of worry, something. We come along, we pat him on the shoulder, he tells us what he's worried about. We don't even have to tell him "You're not a girl," see? I mean, he just tells us what he was worried about. he – boom! See, it's gone that quick.

He's walking down the street now with another datum – another occurrence. He's walking down the street with a datum that he's a man. It's pretty fixed, isn't it? He's walking down the street and he's wearing men's clothes and a man's head, and he's got a man's haircut, and he's really convinced he's a man. Now, we would unfix that one with a little more difficulty.
Of course, they do it easily in Hollywood, but we're not going that way.

Do you see, though, that the relative fixation of the data has a direct bearing upon our ability to unfix it. You got it?

Now, we can easily fix in his head that he's a man, can't we? He already thinks so. And we might have some success in fixing in his head this other earlier datum that he's effeminate. See, here's fixing and unfixing data, see? He's got the little ghosty notion that some of his actions are effeminate. We hear this, and we don't permit him to complete his communication, we shut it off in some fashion or another, we turn it around a little bit, and we ask him very searchingly whether anybody has mentioned this lately to him or not. And then we look very learned and we say, "You're sure – you're sure you don't remember it? Oh," we say, "it's a bit occluded, eh?" He's wondering what's happening here, you know? And we say. "Well now, I'll tell you how you cure this. I'll tell you how you cure this. One of the best ways I know to cure this would be to overcome any impulse whatsoever to wear feminine clothes or to use feminine things, you see, by simply buying some and putting them on the dresser. Therefore it'd be very easy for you, you see, to realize that they're not yours and that you have nothing whatsoever to do with them. And every time you look at them, get the idea that they are not associated with you in any way."

In other words, by this way and that way we might have some chance of fixing the idea in his head that he's a girl.

But by paralleling life we can take a lazy man's look at it, and a fellow walks down the street and he thinks he's a man, and we pal him on the back and you say, yes, he's a man. That's the easy look, you see? He says, "I'm worried about being a girl" – he's worried about it, that's good enough for us. Talk it over and he's no longer worried about being a girl. Don't you see? That's very easy. It's very simple.

Well, we do much better than that. We teach people how their minds get fixed and un-fixed. We do better than that. Then we show them how they can fix and unfix these various agreements and things and postulates. That's the business we're in. We do this well.

Here's an organization, a business organization, that even we consider disorderly. Some inkling has come through to its boss – some inkling has come through to the boss that this might possibly be a prevailing circumstance throughout the organization.

Well, we could straighten up his personnel and his comm lines. And we could look over this situation; we could do pretty well with this. Realize that if we didn't facilitate the communications in the organization that it would remain as confused as it was. We could do something about this. We could alter the situation more in the direction of a tolerable unit.

Now, what do we mean by a tolerable unit? Well, we could say "The unit works better." That's fine. "It better meets its goals" is a better statement. If a man is trying to be more a man, we can make him more a man, just achieving his goals; or we can get him to change his goals.

Now, a business that thinks it's confused, we could come along and educate it that it is totally confused. We could. We could simply go into nooks and crannies and pull old junk
out, and keep calling management's attention to how this person and that person in the organi-
ization had been stowing stuff away, and forgetting stuff, and so on; and offer him no solution
to this, you see? And carefully tell him every lime to refrain from boiling over about it and
not to get mad concerning it, because the entire tone of the organization depends utterly upon
his own mood. We'd produce chaos' I mean, the place would look horrible before you got
through. I mean, you'd really have chaos.

You could say, "Now, don't say I told you, because I don't want to get in trouble, and
don't mention it to anybody, but actually your stock department, you see, is keeping all of the
out-of-date stock and refuses to order any of the up-to-date stock. And then it won't release
any stock to anybody else in the rest of the shop. And the fellow there has to be treated very
carefully, because he's in a kind of a bad condition. Now, you treat him very carefully, and so
forth, and don't go in suddenly and mess all this up, because your attention really is needed
over here on much more important things." Get what you'd do here. It'd be pretty wild,
wouldn't it?

So, you could intensify any given situation, or simplify any given situation; or, by the
correct handling of data, return to any given situation its own self-determinism over what it's
doing.

Just by the process of education alone, just by the process of educating the people im-
mediately associated with living a marital life, on the subject of "These are some data about
life. Pays your money and takes your chance. There they are. You want to look them over,
okay. If you don't want to look them over, all right. Because this is kind of the way it seems to
be. Let's look around and see if that's the way it seems to be." Orient them a little bit, give
them some stable data, restimulate some stable data. All of a sudden, why, their environment
is liable to straighten out and run much more smoothly. This you would call counseling. Or
would you call it education?

Now, here then is a tremendous field in Scientology, and it does appear that all you're
doing is not just increasing the learning rate of a person, but increasing his power of choice,
over what he has learned. And if you can do that, why, then he can lead a much better and
more successful life.

Thank you.
WHAT IS A COURSE?

In Scientology a course consists of a *checksheet* with *all* the actions and material listed on it and *all* the materials on the checksheet available in the same order.

"Checksheet Material" means the policy letters, bulletins, tapes, mimeo issues, any reference book or any books mentioned.

"Materials" also include clay, furniture, tape players, bulletin boards, routing forms, supplies of pink sheets, roll book, student files, file cabinets and any other items that will be needed.

If you look this over carefully, it does not say "materials on order" or "except for those we haven't got" or "in different order". It means what it says exactly.

If a student is to have auditing or word clearing rundownns or must do auditing those are under *actions* and appear on the checksheet.

A course must have a Supervisor. He may or may not be a graduate and experienced practitioner of the course he is supervising but he must be a trained Course Supervisor.

He is not expected to *teach*. He is expected to get the students there, rolls called, checkouts properly done, misunderstoods handled by finding what the student doesn't dig and getting the student to dig it. The Supervisor who tells students answers is a waste of time and a course destroyer as he enters out-data into the scene even if trained and actually especially if trained in the subject. The Supervisor is *not* an "instructor", that's why he's called a "Supervisor".

A Supervisor's skill is in spotting dope-off, glee and other manifestations of misunderstoods, and getting it cleaned up, not in knowing the data so he can tell the student.

A Supervisor should have an idea of what questions he will be asked and know where to direct the student for the answer.

Student blows follow misunderstoods. A Supervisor who is on the ball never has blows as he caught them before they happened by observing the student's misunderstanding before the student does and getting it tracked down by the student.
It is the Supervisor's job to get the student through the checksheet fully and swiftly with minimum lost time.

The successful Supervisor is tough. He is not a kindly old fumbler. He sets high checksheet targets for each student for the day and forces them to be met or else.

The Supervisor is spending Supervisor Minutes. He has just so many to spend. He is spending Student Hours. He has just so many of these to spend so he gets them spent wisely and saves any waste of them.

A Supervisor in a course of any size has a Course Administrator who has very exact duties in keeping up Course Admin and handing out and getting back materials and not losing any to damage or carelessness.

If Paragraphs One to Three above are violated it is the Course Administrator who is at fault. He must have checksheets and the matching material in adequate quantity to serve the course. If he doesn't he has telexes flying and mimeo sweating. The Course Admin is in charge of routing lines and proper send-off and return of students to Cramming or Auditing or Ethics.

The final and essential part of a course is students.

If a course conforms with this P/L exactly with no quibbles, is tough, precisely time scheduled and run hard, it will be a full expanding course and very successful. If it varies from this P/L it will stack up bodies in the shop, get blows and incompetent graduates.

The final valuable product of any course is graduates who can apply successfully the material they studied and be successful in the subject.

This answers the question What is a Course? If any of these points are out it is not a Scientology Course and it will not be successful.

Thus, the order "Put a Course there!" means this P/L in full force.

So here's the order, **when offering training put a course there.**

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.jh
COURSES – THEIR IDEAL SCENE

(References:
HCO PL 7 Feb 65  Keeping Scientology Working – Reiss. 15.6.70 Reiss. 28.1.73
HCO PL 7 May 69 II Students Guide To Acceptable Behaviour
HCO PL 16 Apr 65  The "Hidden Data Line"
HCO PL 24 Oct 68 Supervisor Know-How, Running The Class
HCO PL 16 Mar 71R  What Is A Course?)

There are two ways a course can be run. It can be in-ethics or out-ethics.

An in-ethics course means that HCOBs are applied, verbal data doesn't exist whatsoever, schedules are strictly adhered to, musters are held, the Supervisor applies all the study tech, etc.

An out-ethics course would be anything less and sometimes becomes so obviously out-ethics that you see students goofing around on course, late arrivals for roll call, students taking cigarette breaks whenever they feel like it, verbal data running rampant, and a Course Supervisor that does nothing but stand around.

There's such a thing as group agreement and if a new student walks into an out-ethics course room, he will tend to go into agreement with it and join in.

There's no in-between point. A course (or any activity for that matter) cannot be run semi-standardly or with "pretty much in-ethics." It must be run with totally standard tech and in-ethics. If this is not the case you'll get a gradually lowered ethics level, admin will go out and standard tech slips down to "some of the tech being applied when we can."

When a student or Supervisor goes into a course room and sees things that are out-ethics or nonstandard or "not the way Ron says they should be" and doesn't do something effective to handle the scene then he himself will become part of it; he goes into agreement with it and will actually contribute to the out-ethics.

This situation is a widespread thing in our society today. It's not limited to our course rooms. You see it in marriages. It has become an acceptable thing to get divorced, create bro-
ken homes, cheat on your spouse. In the world of big business you're told to swindle Mr. X before he swindles you. This is group agreement. It is agreed upon out-ethics.

Now, if a course room is run like this you'll get auditors who won't keep auditing appointments, misapply tech, fail to handle their pcs' ethics, give and accept verbal data, have nonstandard admin, etc. etc. You will also train executives who will operate out-ethics, off-policy orgs. Either way, you're setting yourself up for losses.

Therefore, it is now a Comm Ev offense for a Course Supervisor or MAA (Ethics Officer) to allow the following out-ethics activities in their course rooms, with the result of declare of being a suppressive person:

1. Does not muster his students in the morning, after lunch, and after dinner, precisely on time, note absences and take action.
2. Permit students to talk to each other or wander around or take unscheduled breaks or goof off during course hours.
3. Permit students to eat or smoke in the course room.
4. Permitting persons to come into the course room and bother students for any reason.
5. Supervisor standing around or sitting at his desk not actively handling students who need help.
6. Not getting students through their course and graduated.

It goes without saying that all elements of HCO PL 16 March 71R *What Is A Course?* should be in on a course. A Supervisor who does not run a course per checksheet, lets students study without dictionaries and demo kits, does not make all materials available and does not fully apply study tech and use Word Clearing is of course suppressive and should be declared, as he is actively blocking Scientologists from having and benefiting from Scientology.

Flag and FOLO observers and missions should always have a target to see that this policy letter is fully in.

You see, our success in clearing this planet depends upon the success of our courses as this is where we train our auditors, C/Ses, Supervisors and administrators and *that* is the whole team!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

As Assisted by
LRH Tech Comps Pjt Ops
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Cancels HCO PL 31 AUG 74 FAST FLOW TRAINING REINSTATED, which was written for LRH and not by him.

URGENT – IMPORTANT

SUCCESSFUL TRAINING LINEUP

It has recently been found that there are blocks to Academy and major course training which are slowing the training of Auditors and C/Ses. It has been additionally found that the erroneous requirement of BSM before Academy contained in the above HCO PL had introduced a training cutative by taking the Student Hat and Study Tapes out of the training lineup.

It is well known that these materials have been the backbone of Scientology training since their introduction in 1964. They are therefore fully reinstated by this BPL.

The basics of successful training are simply the basics of Standard Study Tech. This means fast courses that encourage more enrollment and that produce Auditors and C/Ses and Supervisors who really know and apply Standard Tech.

Further, staff training is itself vital in an org. It is a matter of survival to an org to be able to train its staff quickly.

STAFF TRAINING AND HATTING

The only prerequisite for Staff Hatting is BSM done per the checksheet. PRD is not a prerequisite, nor is a Student Hat nor is Word Clearing Method 1. Where a staff member has had neither the PRD nor M1, he may not fast flow his hatting, but may only starrate checkout, and take exams to graduate.

Where a staff member has had PRD or Student Hat and Method 1, he may fast flow his hatting with no twin checkouts, no examination, but only by attest.

Staff training on Major Tech or Admin courses is as given later in this BPL. Staff training on major admin courses has prerequisites as follows: for OEC a staff member must
do a full Student Hat and Method 1 and may then fast flow the course; for FEBC, the PRD in full is prerequisite.

It is important to note the difference between staff **Hatting** and staff **Training**. For an exact outline of the basic sequence of hatting, see HCO PL 23 July 72, ESTO Series 23, The Vital Necessity of Hatting.

**FAST FLOW TRAINING RULES**

Following are the rules of Fast Flow Training:

1. The only prerequisite for a student, staff or public, to be able to Fast Flow his courses is Student Hat and Method 1 Word Clearing. Where a student has already done the full Primary Rundown, he is also qualified to Fast Flow his courses.

2. Requirements of twin training or checkouts for Academy are suspended.

3. The prerequisites for Major Courses and Academy training are Student Hat and Method 1 Word Clearing. BSM as an Academy prerequisite is abolished.

4. Where a student has not yet completed his Method 1 Word Clearing, he is not to be held up or denied his Academy Courses or put onto smaller courses, but may get on with his Academy doing Starrate Checkouts and examinations to graduate while completing M1.

5. The Student Hat Course including Study Tapes is one time only **free** and mandatory for any Major Course. (Note: A full Academy Package 0-IV must be purchased in order for this offer to be applicable – not just individual levels.)

6. Method 1 Word Clearing must be fully done with each word taken to F/N as well as F/Ning the final assessment.

7. Method 1 may be done either on a Student Co-Audit or in the HGC. If purchased in the HGC, professional rates apply for those students who have purchased the full Academy 0-IV. If done on a student Co-Audit, the Method 1 Co-Audit Course must be completed and is free for those students who have purchased the full Academy 0-IV.

8. The above rules apply to OEC training.

9. The above rules apply to AOs and SHs.

10. Method 1 Word Clearing is not a prerequisite for HSDC or HPDC, but is advised.

**FAST FLOW AND QUAL**

Students who graduate Academy training Fast Flow are not made to take examinations. Courses are passed by attestation at C&A that the student has: (a) enrolled properly on the course, (b) paid in full for the course (or has signed a no charge invoice in the case of 2½ or 5 year contracted staff), (c) studied and understands all the materials on the checksheet, and (e) can produce the result required in the materials of the course.
Internships and High Crime Checkouts requirements remain as issued. High Crime Checkouts and cramming actions requiring starrates are done starrated and not fast flow.

Internship graduation requirements are that a full Internship as formal auditing experience is completed. When actual honest evidence is presented to C&A that a student has demonstrated that he can and has produced flubless results, the Intern's Certificate is validated and made permanent. Until an Internship is completed as above, Academy certificates are **provisional**.

With other courses the person must demonstrate that he can apply the materials studied by producing an actual statistic in the materials studied, such as an Apprenticeship done in full. This evidence is presented to C&A and the student receives a validation gold seal, making his certificate permanent.

Qual has the responsibility of safeguarding the technology. Qual must be very strong to fulfill its responsibility, especially under Fast Flow training. Ethics must be accurate and not neglected. Ethics exists to get Tech in.

**False Attests** on Fast Flow get immediate cancellation of certificate and a Condition of Doubt.

A Provisional Certificate expires one year from date of graduation if not validated. Persons whose provisional certs have expired are required to take an Internship for their past Class levels, at which time if Internship is successfully passed, a Permanent Cert is awarded.

**CLASS VII**

Class VII is a vital level for training Sea Org Auditors. Orgs should have at least 2 Class VIIs on 5 year contract to deliver Power to contracted staff.

Class VII is **not** prerequisite for Class VIII. The Class VII Course is not now available for public, but may be delivered to Org Auditors on a valid and proven 5 year contract, and to Sea Org Auditors only.

**IMPORTANCE**

The importance of top notch, 100% Standard Training on Academy and higher level Tech and Admin training courses cannot be stressed enough. The foundation of this is strong, Standard Study Tech. Auditors and C/Ses and Supervisors and Executives who have not gotten in firm Study Tech basics have been seen to fail time and again and to themselves be sources of out-tech, declining delivery and declining income.

Full Study Tech is hereby going back in with a crash. Staff only are allowed to do BSM as a hatting prerequisite and that is only a study boost, not a full grounding in Study Tech. BSM may, of course, be sold separately, but does not fulfill any study requirements except for staff hatting or public mini courses.
The full technology of Dianetics and Scientology is there to be duplicated and applied. Please see that it is.

W/O R. Merwin CS-7
Assisted by CS-3

As ordered and approved by
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY
STUDENTS GUIDE TO ACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOUR

GENERAL

1. Adhere completely to the Code of a Scientologist for the duration of the course and behave in a manner becoming to a Scientologist at all times.

2. Get sufficient food and sleep. Always eat breakfast before class and morning session.

3. When being a pre-clear, be one, not a student or auditor. When being an auditor, be an auditor, not a student or pre-clear. When in class and lectures, be a student not an auditor or a pre-clear.

4. Get off all your known withholds. Know definitely that you have absolutely no hope for case advancement unless you get these known withholds off to your auditor. Any violation of rules must be reported by the auditor on the auditing report for the pre-clear so that they are no longer withholds from L. Ron Hubbard, Mary Sue Hubbard or supervisors.

5. If you don't know something or are confused about course data, ask a supervisor or send a despatch. Do not ask other students as this creates progressively worsening errors in data. Also dispatches from you to L. Ron Hubbard will be relayed if you place all such in the basket marked "Students Out".

6. Students may only use the coin box telephone during non-class periods.

7. You must get the permission of the Office of L. Ron Hubbard to leave course before you are allowed to leave. You won't be released if there is any doubt that you are inadequate technically or your case is considered in poor condition. Give an advanced warning as to when you are leaving.

AUDITING

8. Do not consume any alcoholic beverage between 6 a.m. on Sundays and after class on Fridays.
9. Do not consume or have administered to yourself or any other student any drug, antibiotics, aspirin, barbiturates, opiates, sedatives, hypnotics or medical stimulants for the duration of the course without the approval of the D of T.

10. Do not give any processing to anyone under any circumstances without direct permission of the D of T. (Emergency assists excepted.)

11. Do not receive any processing from anyone under any circumstances without the express permission of the D of T.

12. Do not engage in any "self-processing" under any circumstances during the course at any time.

13. Do not receive any treatment, guidance, or help from anyone in the healing arts, i.e. physician, dentist, etc, without the consent of the D of T / ethics officer. (Emergency treatment when the D of T is not available is excepted.)

14. Do not engage in any rite, ceremony, practice, exercise, meditation, diet, food therapy or any similar occult, mystical, religious, naturopathic, homeopathic, chiropractic treatment or any other healing or mental therapy while on course without the express permission of the D of T / ethics officer.

15. Do not discuss your case, your auditor, your supervisors, your classmates, L. Ron Hubbard, HCO WW personnel or HCO WW with anyone. Save your unkind or critical thoughts for your processing sessions or take up complaints with any supervisor.

16. Do not engage in any sexual relationships of any nature or kind or get emotionally involved with any classmate who is not your legal spouse.

17. Follow the auditor's code during all sessions when being the auditor.

18. Follow technical procedure as outlined on the course exactly and precisely.

19. Be honest at all times on your auditing report forms. Stating every process run, tone arm changes and times, sensitivity setting, cognitions of your preclear and any changes of physical appearance, reactions, communication level, or otherwise what you observe in your preclear.

20. Place all reports in the folder of your preclear after each session, turn into the examiner for classification.

21. Students must not read their own report folder or that of another student, unless he is auditing that student.

PREMISES

22. Do not make any undue noise either indoors, or when leaving class.

23. Use the correct entrances for entering and leaving the premises.
QUARTERS

24. Do not put cigarettes out in plastic waste baskets or on the floors.

25. Keep all your bulletins, supplies and personal possessions in the space allotted to you and keep your space neat and orderly.

26. Students are allowed to smoke during breaks only and always outside any study or auditing quarters.

27. The basket marked "Student In" is the basket where all communications, bulletins or mail to students are placed. Always check this basket daily to see if you have received any communications.

28. Report and turn in any damaged property or goods used on the course. Protect and keep the premises in good condition.

29. No food may be stored or eaten in the classrooms at any time.

SCHEDULES

30. Be on time for class and all assignments.

31. Buy any books you need from the invoice clerk at appointed times.

32. Follow all schedules exactly.

33. Study and work during your class periods and over weekends. You have a lot to get checked out on in order to get a course completion. You can't afford to waste time.

L RON HUBBARD

LRH:emp.cden
EXAMINATIONS

A student must not discuss any examination with anyone outside the Qualification Division. To give examination information to other students in order to assist them shows a misguided understanding of help. A student should pass an examination on the basis that he does know and can apply the data, not on the basis that he knows and can pass the examination. Only by being able to know and apply the data can a student be an accomplished auditor at any level.

Therefore, students are not to discuss examinations with other students for whatever reason.

Further, students who fail examinations or any question thereon are not to discuss such failure or reasons for such with anyone other than the personnel of the Qualifications Division. This regulation includes not only other students, but course supervisor. Data as to examination failures is supplied from the Qualifications Division to the Technical Division, and a student, not knowing the data sufficiently well, can cause Dev-T by reporting false data to a course supervisor as to why the examination was failed.

Any student who feels that he has been incorrectly failed on an examination can report the matter to ethics. This is the proper line for any complaint the student may have concerning an examination, if such still seems incorrect after taking it up with the Qualifications Division.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
IMPORTANT

ETHICS AND STUDY TECH

(Cancels the issue revised 7 April 72.)

The basic why of the majority of cases of post nonperformance of a staff member and out tech in an org stems from misunderstood words.

The primary point that has to be gotten in is study tech.

This is also our bridge to society.

Yet study tech is the tech that includes misunderstood word tech.

Thus if study tech is not in, people on staffs see nothing wrong with hearing or reading orders containing words they do not understand and have no urge to look them up. Further they often feel they do know words that they in fact do not know.

When this situation exists it is next to impossible to get study tech and Word Clearing tech in. For, the orders seeking to get in study tech may contain words the person does not understand. Thus he doesn't really comply with the orders and study tech does not get in. Thus the ability to hear or read and understand continues to be missing.

Therefore these ethics actions become part of standard ethics.

1. A person may be summoned to a court of ethics or executive court of ethics if it be found that he has gone past a word he does not understand when receiving, hearing or reading an order, HCOB, policy letter or tape, any and all LRH written or printed materials including books, PABs, despatches, telexes and mimeo issues which resulted in a failure to do duties of his post without his at once making an effective effort to clear the words on himself, whether he knew he was missing them or not as the source of his inaction or damaging actions.

The charge is neglecting to clarify words not understood.

2. A staff member who does not use study tech or get it known while studying or instructing may be summoned to a court of ethics or an executive court of ethics.

The charge is failure to employ study tech.
3. A student altering or misadvising others on the use of study tech may be summoned before a court of ethics.
   The charge is advocating a misuse or neglect of proper study tech.

4. An auditor failing to clear each and every word of every command or list used may be summoned before a court of ethics.
   The charge is out tech.

5. Any public division person, staff member or Scientologist found using terms, circumstances or data on raw public in public lectures or promotion or in PR beyond the public ability to grasp without stressing study tech or at once taking effective measures to clarify or releasing materials broadly to a wrong public may be summoned to a court of ethics if any flap or upset results.
   The charge is failure to apply study tech in dissemination.

SUPPRESSIVE

Furthermore, as study tech is our primary bridge to society and the basic prevention of out tech and out admin, if any offense as above found guilty in a Court of Ethics is repeated and the person has had two such Courts on this offense the person may be summoned before a Committee of Evidence on a charge of committing an act or omission undertaken to knowingly suppress, reduce or impede Scientology or Scientologists and if found guilty beyond reasonable doubt may be declared a Suppressive Person and expelled with full penalties.

AXIOM 28

Failures to teach, or use study tech or alterations of study tech are actually offenses against AXIOM 28 as it is applied internally in an org on admin and tech and from the org to society.

Study tech including its technology of Word Clearing is in fact the technology of Axiom 28.

The Axiom (amended) follows:

Axiom 28. Communication is the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from source-point across a distance to receipt-point, with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt-point a duplication and understanding of that which emanated from the source-point.

The formula of Communication is: Cause, Distance, Effect with Intention, Attention and Duplication with understanding.

The component parts of Communication are Consideration, Intention, Attention, Cause, Source-point, Distance, Effect, Receipt-point, Duplication, Understanding, the Velocity of the impulse or particle, Nothingness or Somethingness. A non-communication consists
of Barriers. Barriers consist of Space, Interpositions (such as walls and screens of fast-moving particles), and Time. A communication by definition, does not need to be two-way. When a communication is returned, the formula is repeated, with the receipt-point now becoming a source-point and the former source-point now becoming a receipt-point.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
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Note. Neglect of this Pol Ltr has caused great hardship on staffs, has cost countless millions and made it necessary in 1970 to engage in an all out International effort to restore basic Scientology over the world. Within 5 years after the issue of this PL with me off the lines, violation had almost destroyed orgs. "Quickie grades" entered in and denied gain to tens of thousands of cases. Therefore actions which neglect or violate this Policy Letter are High Crimes resulting in Comm Evs on administrators and executives. It is not "entirely a tech matter" as its neglect destroys orgs and caused a two-year slump. It is the business of every staff member to enforce it.

ALL LEVELS

KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

HCO Sec or Communicator Hat Check on all personnel and new personnel as taken on.

We have some time since passed the point of achieving uniformly workable technology.

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

If you can't get the technology applied then you can't deliver what's promised. It's as simple as that. If you can get the technology applied, you can deliver what's promised.

The only thing you can be upbraided for by students or pcs is "no results". Trouble spots occur only where there are "no results". Attacks from governments or monopolies occur only where there are "no results" or "bad results".

Therefore the road before Scientology is clear and its ultimate success is assured if the technology is applied.
So it is the task of the Assn or Org Sec, the HCO Sec, the Case Supervisor, the D of P, the D of T and all staff members to get the correct technology applied.

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

One: Having the correct technology.
Two: Knowing the technology.
Three: Knowing it is correct.
Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.
Five: Applying the technology.
Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.
Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.
Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.
Nine: Closing the door on any possibility of incorrect technology.
Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.

One above has been done.
Two has been achieved by many.
Three is achieved by the individual applying the correct technology in a proper manner and observing that it works that way.

Four is being done daily successfully in most parts of the world.
Five is consistently accomplished daily.
Six is achieved by instructors and supervisors consistently.
Seven is done by a few but is a weak point.
Eight is not worked on hard enough.
Nine is impeded by the "reasonable" attitude of the not quite bright.
Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are the only places Scientology can bog down in any area.

The reasons for this are not hard to find. (a) A weak certainty that it works in Three above can lead to weakness in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. (b) Further, the not-too-bright have a bad point on the button Self-Importance. (c) The lower the IQ, the more the individual is shut off from the fruits of observation. (d) The service facs of people make them defend themselves against anything they confront, good or bad, and seek to make it wrong. (e) The bank seeks to knock out the good and perpetuate the bad.

Thus, we as Scientologists and as an organization must be very alert to Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.
In all the years I have been engaged in research I have kept my comm lines wide open for research data. I once had the idea that a group could evolve truth. A third of a century has thoroughly disabused me of that idea. Willing as I was to accept suggestions and data, only a handful of suggestions (less than twenty) had long-run value and none were major or basic; and when I did accept major or basic suggestions and used them, we went astray and I repented and eventually had to "eat crow".

On the other hand there have been thousands and thousands of suggestions and writings which, if accepted and acted upon, would have resulted in the complete destruction of all our work as well as the sanity of pcs. So I know what a group of people will do and how insane they will go in accepting unworkable "technology". By actual record the percentages are about twenty to 100,000 that a group of human beings will dream up bad technology to destroy good technology. As we could have gotten along without suggestions, then, we had better steel ourselves to continue to do so now that we have made it. This point will, of course, be attacked as "unpopular", "egotistical" and "undemocratic". It very well may be. But it is also a survival point. And I don't see that popular measures, self-abnegation and democracy have done anything for Man but push him further into the mud. Currently, popularity endorses degraded novels, self-abnegation has filled the South East Asian jungles with stone idols and corpses, and democracy has given us inflation and income tax.

Our technology has not been discovered by a group. True, if the group had not supported me in many ways I could not have discovered it either. But it remains that if in its formative stages it was not discovered by a group, then group efforts, one can safely assume, will not add to it or successfully alter it in the future. I can only say this now that it is done. There remains, of course, group tabulation or co-ordination of what has been done, which will be valuable – only so long as it does not seek to alter basic principles and successful applications.

The contributions that were worthwhile in this period of forming the technology were help in the form of friendship, of defence, of organization, of dissemination, of application, of advices on results and of finance. These were great contributions and were, and are, appreciated. Many thousands contributed in this way and made us what we are. Discovery contribution was not however part of the broad picture.

We will not speculate here on why this was so or how I came to rise above the bank. We are dealing only in facts and the above is a fact – the group left to its own devices would not have evolved Scientology but with wild dramatization of the bank called "new ideas" would have wiped it out. Supporting this is the fact that Man has never before evolved workable mental technology and emphasizing it is the vicious technology he did evolve – psychiatry, psychology, surgery, shock treatment, whips, duress, punishment, etc, ad infinitum.

So realize that we have climbed out of the mud by whatever good luck and good sense, and refuse to sink back into it again. See that Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten above are ruthlessly followed and we will never be stopped. Relax them, get reasonable about it and we will perish.
So far, while keeping myself in complete communication with all suggestions, I have not failed on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten in areas I could supervise closely. But it's not good enough for just myself and a few others to work at this.

Whenever this control as per Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten has been relaxed the whole organizational area has failed. Witness Elizabeth, N.J., Wichita, the early organizations and groups. They crashed only because I no longer did Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. Then, when they were all messed up, you saw the obvious "reasons" for failure. But ahead of that they ceased to deliver and that involved them in other reasons.

The common denominator of a group is the reactive bank. Thetans without banks have different responses. They only have their banks in common. They agree then only on bank principles. Person to person the bank is identical. So constructive ideas are individual and seldom get broad agreement in a human group. An individual must rise above an avid craving for agreement from a humanoid group to get anything decent done. The bank-agreement has been what has made Earth a Hell – and if you were looking for Hell and found Earth, it would certainly serve. War, famine, agony and disease has been the lot of Man. Right now the great governments of Earth have developed the means of frying every Man, Woman and Child on the planet. That is Bank. That is the result of Collective Thought Agreement. The decent, pleasant things on this planet come from individual actions and ideas that have somehow gotten by the Group Idea. For that matter, look how we ourselves are attacked by "public opinion" media. Yet there is no more ethical group on this planet than ourselves.

Thus each one of us can rise above the domination of the bank and then, as a group of freed beings, achieve freedom and reason. It is only the aberrated group, the mob, that is destructive.

When you don't do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten actively, you are working for the Bank dominated mob. For it will surely, surely (a) introduce incorrect technology and swear by it, (b) apply technology as incorrectly as possible, (c) open the door to any destructive idea, and (d) encourage incorrect application. It's the Bank that says the group is all and the individual nothing. It's the Bank that says we must fail.

So just don't play that game. Do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten and you will knock out of your road all the future thorns.

Here's an actual example in which a senior executive had to interfere because of a pc spin: A Case Supervisor told Instructor A to have Auditor B run Process X on Preclear C. Auditor B afterwards told Instructor A that "It didn't work." Instructor A was weak on Three above and didn't really believe in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. So Instructor A told the Case Supervisor "Process X didn't work on Preclear C." Now this strikes directly at each of One to Six above in Preclear C, Auditor B, Instructor A and the Case Supervisor. It opens the door to the introduction of "new technology" and to failure.

What happened here? Instructor A didn't jump down Auditor B's throat, that's all that happened. This is what he should have done: grabbed the auditor's report and looked it over. When a higher executive on this case did so she found what the Case Supervisor and the rest missed: that Process X increased Preclear C's TA to 25 TA divisions for the session but that near session end Auditor B Qed and Aed with a cognition and abandoned Process X while it
still gave high TA and went off running one of Auditor B's own manufacture, which nearly spun Preclear C. Auditor B's IQ on examination turned out to be about 75. Instructor A was found to have huge ideas of how you must never invalidate anyone, even a lunatic. The Case Supervisor was found to be "too busy with admin to have any time for actual cases".

All right, there's an all too typical example. The Instructor should have done Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. This would have begun this way. Auditor B: "That Process X didn't work." Instructor A: "What exactly did you do wrong?" Instant attack. "Where's your auditor's report for the session? Good. Look here, you were getting a lot of TA when you stopped Process X. What did you do?" Then the Pc wouldn't have come close to a spin and all four of these would have retained certainty.

In a year, I had four instances in one small group where the correct process recommended was reported not to have worked. But on review found that each one (a) had increased the TA, (b) had been abandoned, and (c) had been falsely reported as unworkable. Also, despite this abuse, in each of these four cases the recommended, correct process cracked the case. Yet they were reported as not having worked!

Similar examples exist in instruction and these are all the more deadly as every time instruction in correct technology is flubbed, then the resulting error, uncorrected in the auditor, is perpetuated on every pc that auditor audits thereafter. So Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are even more important in a course than in supervision of cases.

Here's an example: A rave recommendation is given a graduating student "because he gets more TA on pcs than any other student on the course!" Figures of 435 TA divisions a session are reported. "Of course his model session is poor but it's just a knack he has" is also included in the recommendation. A careful review is undertaken because nobody at Levels 0 to IV is going to get that much TA on pcs. It is found that this student was never taught to read an E-Meter TA dial! And no instructor observed his handling of a meter and it was not discovered that he "overcompensated" nervously, swinging the TA 2 or 3 divisions beyond where it needed to go to place the needle at "set". So everyone was about to throw away standard processes and model session because this one student "got such remarkable TA". They only read the reports and listened to the brags and never looked at this student. The pcs in actual fact were making slightly less than average gain, impeded by a rough model session and misworded processes. Thus, what was making the pcs win (actual Scientology) was hidden under a lot of departures and errors.

I recall one student who was squirreling on an Academy course and running a lot of off-beat whole track on other students after course hours. The Academy students were in a state of electrification on all these new experiences and weren't quickly brought under control and the student himself never was given the works on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten so they stuck. Subsequently, this student prevented another squirrel from being straightened out and his wife died of cancer resulting from physical abuse. A hard, tough Instructor at that moment could have salvaged two squirrels and saved the life of a girl. But no, students had a right to do whatever they pleased.
Squirreling (going off into weird practices or altering Scientology) only comes about from non-comprehension. Usually the non-comprehension is not of Scientology but some earlier contact with an off-beat humanoid practice which in its turn was not understood.

When people can't get results from what they think is standard practice, they can be counted upon to squirrel to some degree. The most trouble in the past two years came from orgs where an executive in each could not assimilate straight Scientology. Under instruction in Scientology they were unable to define terms or demonstrate examples of principles. And the orgs where they were got into plenty of trouble. And worse, it could not be straightened out easily because neither one of these people could or would duplicate instructions. Hence, a debacle resulted in two places, directly traced to failures of instruction earlier. So proper instruction is vital. The D of T and his Instructors and all Scientology Instructors must be merciless in getting Four, Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten into effective action. That one student, dumb and impossible though he may seem and of no use to anyone, may yet some day be the cause of untold upset because nobody was interested enough to make sure Scientology got home to him.

With what we know now, there is no student we enroll who cannot be properly trained. As an Instructor, one should be very alert to slow progress and should turn the sluggards inside out personally. No system will do it, only you or me with our sleeves rolled up can crack the back of bad studenting and we can only do it on an individual student, never on a whole class only. He's slow = something is awful wrong. Take fast action to correct it. Don't wait until next week. By then he's got other messes stuck to him. If you can't graduate them with their good sense appealed to and wisdom shining, graduate them in such a state of shock they'll have nightmares if they contemplate squirreling. Then experience will gradually bring about Three in them and they'll know better than to chase butterflies when they should be auditing.

When somebody enrolls, consider he or she has joined up for the duration of the universe – never permit an "open-minded" approach. If they're going to quit let them quit fast. If they enrolled, they're aboard, and if they're aboard, they're here on the same terms as the rest of us – win or die in the attempt. Never let them be half-minded about being Scientologists. The finest organizations in history have been tough, dedicated organizations. Not one namby-pamby bunch of panty-waist dilettantes have ever made anything. It's a tough universe. The social veneer makes it seem mild. But only the tigers survive – and even they have a hard time. We'll survive because we are tough and are dedicated. When we do instruct somebody properly he becomes more and more tiger. When we instruct half-mindedly and are afraid to offend, scared to enforce, we don't make students into good Scientologists and that lets everybody down. When Mrs. Pattycake comes to us to be taught, turn that wandering doubt in her eye into a fixed, dedicated glare and she'll win and we'll all win. Humour her and we all die a little. The proper instruction attitude is, "You're here so you're a Scientologist. Now we're going to make you into an expert auditor no matter what happens. We'd rather have you dead than incapable."

Fit that into the economics of the situation and lack of adequate time and you see the cross we have to bear.
But we won't have to bear it forever. The bigger we get the more economics and time we will have to do our job. And the only things which can prevent us from getting that big fast are areas in from One to Ten. Keep those in mind and we'll be able to grow. Fast. And as we grow our shackles will be less and less. Failing to keep One to Ten, will make us grow less.

So the ogre which might eat us up is not the government or the High Priests. It's our possible failure to retain and practise our technology.

An Instructor or Supervisor or Executive must challenge with ferocity instances of "unworkability". They must uncover what did happen, what was run and what was done or not done.

If you have One and Two, you can only acquire Three for all by making sure of all the rest.

We're not playing some minor game in Scientology. It isn't cute or something to do for lack of something better.

The whole agonized future of this planet, every Man, Woman and Child on it, and your own destiny for the next endless trillions of years depend on what you do here and now with and in Scientology.

This is a deadly serious activity. And if we miss getting out of the trap now, we may never again have another chance.

Remember, this is our first chance to do so in all the endless trillions of years of the past. Don't muf it now because it seems unpleasant or unsocial to do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.rr.nt.ka.mes.rd
URGENT AND IMPORTANT

TECHNICAL DEGRADES

Any checksheet in use or in stock which carries on it any degrading statement must be destroyed and issued without qualifying statements.

Example: Level 0 to IV Checksheets SH carry "A. Background Material – This section is included as an historical background, but has much interest and value to the student. Most of the processes are no longer used, having been replaced by more modern technology. The student is only required to read this material and ensure he leaves no misunderstood." This heading covers such vital things as TRs, Op Pro by Dup! The statement is a falsehood.

These checksheets were not approved by myself, all the material of the academy and SH courses is in use.

Such actions as this gave us "Quickie Grades", ARC broke the field and downgraded the academy and SH courses.

A condition of Treason or cancellation of certificates or dismissal and a full investigation of the background of any person found guilty, will be activated in the case of anyone committing the following High Crimes.

1. Abbreviating an official course in Dianetics and Scientology so as to lose the full theory, processes and effectiveness of the subjects.

2. Adding comments to checksheets or instructions labeling any material "background" or "not used now" or "old" or any similar action which will result in the student not knowing, using, and applying the data in which he is being trained.

3. Employing after 1 Sept 1970 any checksheet for any course not authorized by myself and the SO Organizing Bureau Flag.

4. Failing to strike from any checksheet remaining in use meanwhile any such comments as "historical", "background", "not used", "old", etc. or verbally stating it to students.
5. Permitting a pc to attest to more than one grade at a time on the pc's own determinism without hint or evaluation.

6. Running only one process for a lower grade between 0 to IV, where the grade EP has not been attained.

7. Failing to use all processes for a level where the EP has not been attained.

8. Boasting as to speed of delivery in a session, such as "I put in grade zero in three minutes." etc.

9. Shortening time of application of auditing for financial or laborsaving considerations.

10. Acting in any way calculated to lose the technology of Dianetics and Scientology to use or impede its use or shorten its materials or its application.

**Reason:** The effort to get students through courses and get pcs processed in orgs was considered best handled by reducing materials or deleting processes from grades. The pressure exerted to speed up student completions and auditing completions was mistakenly answered by just not delivering.

The correct way to speed up a student's progress is by using two way comm and applying the study materials to students.

The best way to really handle pcs is to ensure they make each level fully before going on to the next and repairing them when they do not.

The puzzle of the decline of the entire Scientology network in the late 60s is entirely answered by the actions taken to shorten time in study and in processing by deleting materials and actions.

Reinstituting full use and delivery of Dianetics and Scientology is the answer to any recovery.

The product of an org is well taught students and thoroughly audited pcs. When the product vanishes, so does the org. The orgs must survive for the sake of this planet.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.lf.jg
SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY

For some years we have had a word "squirreling". It means altering Scientology, off-beat practices. It is a bad thing. I have found a way to explain why.

Scientology is a workable system. This does not mean it is the best possible system or a perfect system. Remember and use that definition. Scientology is a workable system.

In fifty thousand years of history on this planet alone, Man never evolved a workable system. It is doubtful if, in foreseeable history, he will ever evolve another.

Man is caught in a huge and complex labyrinth. To get out of it requires that he follow the closely taped path of Scientology.

Scientology will take him out of the labyrinth. But only if he follows the exact markings in the tunnels.

It has taken me a third of a century in this lifetime to tape this route out.

It has been proven that efforts by Man to find different routes came to nothing. It is also a clear fact that the route called Scientology does lead out of the labyrinth. Therefore it is a workable system, a route that can be traveled.

What would you think of a guide who, because his party said it was dark and the road rough and who said another tunnel looked better, abandoned the route he knew would lead out and led his party to a lost nowhere in the dark. You'd think he was a pretty wishy-washy guide.

What would you think of a supervisor who let a student depart from procedure the supervisor knew worked. You'd think he was a pretty wishy-washy supervisor.

What would happen in a labyrinth if the guide let some girl stop in a pretty canyon and left her there forever to contemplate the rocks? You'd think he was a pretty heartless guide. You'd expect him to say at least, "Miss, those rocks may be pretty, but the road out doesn't go that way."

All right, how about an auditor who abandons the procedure which will make his pre-clear eventually clear just because the pre-clear had a cognition?

People have following the route mixed up with "the right to have their own ideas." Anyone is certainly entitled to have opinions and ideas and cognitions – so long as these do not bar the route out for self and others.
Scientology is a workable system. It white tapes the road out of the labyrinth. If there were no white tapes marking the right tunnels, Man would just go on wandering around and around the way he has for eons, darting off on wrong roads, going in circles, ending up in the sticky dark, alone.

Scientology, exactly and correctly followed, takes the person up and out of the mess.

So when you see somebody having a ball getting everyone to take peyote because it restimulates prenatals, know he is pulling people off the route. Realize he is squirreling. He isn't following the route.

Scientology is a new thing – it is a road out. There has not been one. Not all the salesmanship in the world can make a bad route a proper route. And an awful lot of bad routes are being sold. Their end product is further slavery, more darkness, more misery.

Scientology is the only workable system Man has. It has already taken people toward higher IQ, better lives and all that. No other system has. So realize that it has no competitor.

Scientology is a workable system. It has the route taped. The search is done. Now the route only needs to be walked.

So put the feet of students and preclears on that route. Don't let them off of it no matter how fascinating the side roads seem to them. And move them on up and out.

Squirreling is today destructive of a workable system.

Don't let your party down. By whatever means, keep them on the route. And they'll be free. If you don't, they won't.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.jp.rd
COURSE COMPLETION

STUDENT INDICATORS

When a student has finished a course, he should want the next course in training. If not, out Tech or out Ethics or both. Just as a PC's good indicators should be in wanting next level of auditing, so should a student's good indicators be in wanting next level of training. If this is not the case something missed by the supervisor or student or both the supervisor and the student.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nf ei rd
STUDY SLOWNESS

If your course is not progressing rapidly for the class, it is highly probable that the training rules and policies laid down in the Course Supervisor's Course (HDG) are not being followed exactly.

If your own progress is too slow to suit you or if even on retrain you do not feel you are making it, consult with your supervisor and specifically ask him to make sure that all his Course Supervisor data is being applied. Slowness could only happen if you are passing over words without understanding them, or if you are letting other students or people interpret data for you rather than taking exactly what it says on the bulletins. Or it may be you do not have your own materials or you need a Scientology Review and what they call a "Remedy A" or a "Remedy B" to clean up the subject of study.

Dianetics and Scientology were entered into a world where the technology of study itself was poor and had to be developed in order to teach a precision subject. The study tech is vital and valid.

In one mass experiment the following, given for illustration here, occurred.

A class of 15 on Dianetics, taught with all Course Supervisor policy fully applied, the students not pre-selected for aptitude, 7 had attained full HDG with all auditing well dones and very well dones in just under three weeks.

The remainder were mixed with a part-time Dianetics class (31/2 hours of study a day) of over a hundred people. In the following three months only two had graduated. Most of the remainder were only on their first time through at the end of three months.

A vigorous survey of this class was made and it was found that all the things given as vital to be done regarding study were not being done and all the things that were not supposed to be done were being done.

A qualified Course Supervisor and staff were placed in charge and the large course began to graduate three a day almost at once.

From this you can see that there is a great deal of value in the Study technology of Dianetics and Scientology.

Do not let your class or yourself get slowed by an out-policy course.
Good luck.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rs.ldm.ei.rd
THE "HIDDEN DATA LINE"

Some students have believed there was a "hidden data line" of tech in Scientology, a line on which Scientology tech was given out by me but not made known to students.

This started me looking. For there is no such line.

I wondered if it was a "missed withhold of nothing". There can be one of these, you know. There is nothing there, yet the auditor tries to get it and the pc ARC breaks. This is "cleaning a clean" with an E-Meter.

One pc I cleaned up very nicely had been harassed for years about "an incident that happened when she was five". A lot of people had tried to "get it". The pc was in a pitiful condition. I found there was nothing there. No incident at all! The meter read came from the charge on previous auditing. I think probably she must have sneezed or her finger slipped on the cans when first asked about "an incident when you were five".

An auditor who "sees a read" when there is no charge makes a "missed withhold of nothing".

This is the other side of the ARC break – the gone something, the non-existence of something. No food. No money. These things ARC break people.

So it is with a "missed withhold of nothing".

Take Johannesburg. Some years ago the field there was upset by three rabble rousers who alleged all manner of wild things about the Scientology org there. They held wild field meetings and all that. Truth was these three people had done a vicious thing and screamed to high heaven when I sought to query them.

They made a "missed withhold of nothing" in the field in that area! There was exactly nothing wrong with Scientology there or us. There was something wrong with those three people. They had been stealing from the org.

The field kept looking for what was wrong with the org or us. Nothing was. So it couldn't be cleaned up because there was nothing to clean. There were three thieves who had run off with org property and defied orders to give it back. How this made something wrong with us is quite a puzzle. They are still "cleaning up this ARC Break" in Johannesburg! For it is not cleanable, not being there to be cleaned! Unless you realize there was nothing there at all! It's a missed withhold of nothing. The basic org and staff and we at Saint Hill were just doing our jobs in ordinary routine!
Governments looking for evil in Scientology orgs will go mad (I trust) as they are seeking a non-existent thing. They are easily defeated because their statements are so crazy even their own legal systems can't help but see it. So it's easily won.

The only person who goes mad on a missed withhold of nothing is the person who thinks there is something there that isn't.

So it is with the "hidden data line" students sometimes feel must exist on courses.

There is no line.

But in this case there is an apparency of a line.

When instructors or seniors give out alter-ised technology or unusual solutions, the student feels they must have some inside track, some data line the student doesn't have.

The student looks for it and starts alter-ising in his turn pretending to have it when they become instructors.

It's a missed withhold of nothing.

The whole of technology is released in HCO Bulletins and HCO Policy Letters and tapes I do and release.

I don't tell people anything in some private way, not even instructors.

For instance, all the instructors I taught to handle R6 we taught by my lecturing or writing bulletins for them. Every one of these tapes is used to teach GPM data and handling to students on the Saint Hill Course.

Any new data I have given on it has been given to all these people.

The instructor then knows only to the degree he has studied and used the very same HCOBs and HCO Pol Ltrs and tapes the student is now using.

There is no "hidden data line". To believe there is makes an ARC Break.

The apparency is somebody's pretence to know from me more than is on the tapes and in books and mimeos, or, brutally, somebody's alter-is of materials. This looks like a "hidden data line". It surely isn't.

All the lower level materials are in the HCOBs, Pol Ltrs or on tapes.

All the GPM materials released are here waiting for the student when he reaches that level.

One could say there was one if one was way off the main data line. But it sure isn't hidden. It's on courses and in orgs.

I laughed one time at the top flight US Government White House entrusted psychologist. He looked over some startling IQ changes, said such a thing would revolutionize psychology overnight if known and added "no wonder you keep your technology secret!"

That is very funny when you look at how hard you and I work to make it known to all!

The data line isn't hidden. It's there for anyone to have. There's lots of it is possibly a source of trouble in releasing it. But it's all on courses in Academies or Saint Hill. You could
have a copy of everything in the tape library if you wanted. It might cost a lot, but you could have it.

There is no hidden data line.

There's a lot of data I haven't had time to write down and put on a line for sheer press of time. But I work hard to do it.

But even my closest staff and communicators when it hears of a new process or plan from me verbally, sees it in an HCOB or HCO Pol Ltr a few days later.

Don't for heaven's sake mistake alter-is by somebody as evidence of a hidden line.

In Scientology we say "If it isn't written it isn't true". That applies to orders. Somebody says "Ron said to . . ." and on a veteran staff you hear the rejoinder "Let's see it". I've had raw meat walk into an org and say "Ron said I was to have 25 hours of auditing". And in the raw meat days of orgs, they sometimes were given it. So we have learned the hard way – "If it isn't written it wasn't said".

And that applies to anybody's orders, not just mine.

And on tech and policy, it's equally true. If it isn't in an HCOB or an HCO Pol Ltr or recorded on a tape in my voice, it isn't tech or policy.

Next time you hear a pretended order or a squirrel process attributed to me, say "If it isn't written or recorded it isn't true".

And watch how tech results soar then in that area.
ALL STUDENTS

ALL COURSES

OUT TECH

If at any time a supervisor or other person in an org gives you interpretations of HCOBs, policy letters or tells you, "That's old. Read it but disregard it, that's just background data", or gives you a chit for following HCOBs or tapes or alters tech on you or personally cancels HCOBs or policy letters without being able to show you an HCOB or policy letter that cancels it, you must report the matter complete with names and any witnesses on direct lines to the international ethics officer at worldwide. If this is not immediately handled, report in the same way to your nearest Sea Org MAA.

The only ways you can fail to get results on a pc are:

1. Not study your HCOBs and my books and tapes.
2. Not apply what you studied.
3. Follow "advice" contrary to what you find on HCOBs and tapes.
4. Fail to obtain the HCOBs, books and tapes needed.

There is no hidden data line.

All of Dianetics and Scientology works. Some of it works faster.

The only real error auditors made over the years was to fail to stop a process the moment they saw a floating needle.

Recently the felony has been compounded by disclosure of the facts that data and tapes have been deleted from checksheets, data has been "relegated to background" and grades have not been in use fully to complete end phenomena as per the process column on the classification and gradation chart. This caused an almost complete unmock of the subject and its use. I am counting on you to see it is not allowed to happen ever again.

Any supervisor or executive who interprets, alters or cancels tech is liable to the assignment of a condition of enemy. All the data is in HCOBs or policy letters or on tape.

Failure to make this mimeo known to every student carries a $10 fine for every student from which it is withheld.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
HOW TO DEFEAT VERBAL TECH

1. If it isn't written it isn't true.

2. If it's written, read it.

3. If you can't understand it, clarify it.

4. If you can't clarify it, clear the Mis-Us.

5. If the Mis-Us won't clear, query it.

6. Get it validated as a written order.

7. Force others to read it.

If it can't be run through as above it's false!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dg.kc.ch.cib
(Also issued as HCO PL 15 Feb 79, same title.)

VERBAL TECH: PENALTIES

(Ref: HCOB/HCO PL 9 Feb 79.
HOW TO DEFEAT VERBAL TECH)

Any person found to be using verbal tech shall be subject to a court of ethics.

The charges are: Giving out data which is contrary to HCO Bulletins or Policy Letters, or obstructing their use or application, corrupting their intent, altering their content in any way, interpreting them verbally or otherwise for another, or pretending to quote them without showing the actual issue.

Any one of these categories constitutes verbal tech and is actionable per the above.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jk