# The Logics: Infinity – Valued Logic

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 4. December 1952

This is the second half of the evening lecture December the 4th and we're going to cover now something which some of you have seen before but which becomes far far more valuable than anything it uh… ever had as an evaluation before. Much more valuable now, and that is the logics six and seven as they were written.

Logic six says absolutes are unobtainable. That is just a forthright uh… effort in this universe to try to step on and stop somewhere along its track the terrific idea of absolutes.

Absolute good, absolute evil, absolute right and absolute wrong, why are they absolute? Because they're by arbitrary definition only. A girl is good who pays her dues to the church or whatever they pay to churches. A fellow is evil if he does not properly work at his job and so on. There's this whole series of control definition… agreements have… have really nothing to do with any high level of… of operational information.

Now let's take a look at this universe and find out how this applies. I think it's uh… what is absolute zero, minus 173, or 273, what is that? 273?

„273."

273, minus 273 centigrade, isn't it? And uh… uh… nobody's ever gotten down there. They… they get down down down down, to Kelvin zero, that's right and they get down there and uh… they claim theoretically that all motion stops there. Well, of course, they're trying to stop motion to get down there. That's very interesting because you could mock up a minus 273 degrees below zero with great ease.

All you do is go out here about three, four thousand miles out and where you don't get any… any radio RF or anything like that… no RF or anything like that and… and just mock up some space and say if there's no heat or cold in it. And there's nothing in it. And if you mock up some space and say there's nothing in it, then you have no motion in it. And if minus 273 degrees below zero is defined as no motion… Now when we say absolutes are unobtainable we find out theta-wise they're obtainable by postulate. But that is by the introduction of an arbitrary, isn't it?

Postulate – you just simply say bow bow, and that's that. But as a practical matter in this universe when you take MEST and start to reduce it down, and reduce its heat down and reduce its mass down and reduce it down and reduce it down you get to, I don't know how low they've gotten, maybe 270, I mean I don't think they've gotten that low.

Oh, they haven't. They've now got within a tenth of a degree; they'll never get there. Same way, we go up the other way and we talk about a pure metal. Talk about a pure metal, and it's always… it's always at least uh… 2,000ths of a percent or something like that impure.

They don't even obtain a pure metal; it's always 99.99 or something like that. pure. Uh… that's… that's… it'd be an absolute so as soon as we start in on this we… we just don't get an absolute for this universe. This universe could be destroyed the moment it ran into an absolute wrong, or it could run, into an absolute right; the universe would be destroyed.

I'll tell you why that is. That's… again, it's a theoretical statement but it works out, works out very nicely. And mostly it works out in processing. You never get an absolute anything in processing. You don't get absolute reductions, complete states, and so on. Why? This universe and most universes favor a gradient scale and it's a gradient scale of data or space or action or objects. It's always a gradient scale.

That's logic seven: gradient scales are necessary to the evaluation of problems and their data. It's worse than that. It's… it's even worse than that. The universe is conducted on a gradient scale and the reason the gradient scale is so very very interesting here and why it works so very well in creative processing, is because it was a gradient scale of agreement that brought the person here. And it was a gradient scale that made the universe. A gradient scale of agreement – if you agree to a little bit you can agree to a lot. If you don't agree to a tiny little bit you can't agree to anything. That tells you something in argumentation.

When you are arguing with somebody and they're yak yaking around, get something; a lot of people do this, you'll hear this being done all the time but it's not done adroitly. You want to be very smooth and completely deadly in an argument, get them to agree so lightly that they agree without friction and then hold that tone level as the agreements progress. That's deadly. Because the guy will follow more or less right straight through and arrive at your tone band.

He'll arrive at your tone band level with an agreement on which there's no stress and no strain. You're not fighting then to get an agreement. That is the wrong way to get an agreement. The agreement just sort of slides in gradually and if any agreement slides in gradually it can wind up with something as, evidently, as big and as solid and as real as the MEST universe.

Agreement itself… when we knew more about agreements, I said in 1950, we'll be able to crack cases faster and do more in processing than we've… ever before been done. Yes, and that's so true because reality was apparently an agreement. It was so obviously an agreement that we couldn't call anything real unless we'd agreed to it. And again, there was not an absolute agreement. But it wasn't required as an absolute agreement.

The fellow walks in the room, he sees… he sees a… a… a big tiger. The tiger's standing over there on the top rim of the venetian blind. The tiger's twelve feet long and the venetian blind is only about three feet, uh… three… two uh… and he walks in and says, „There's a twelve-foot tiger standing on top of the venetian blind and I wonder that you people aren't frightened to death."

And this tiger's completely real to him and he is so rough that uh… rough in the wits, that he doesn't know how to put this tiger over on you. He merely says it's there, and that's all there is to that. And you will all say, „Well, there is no tiger there."

Now if he did this he might get away with that here. He… he'd get a laugh and a nice mock-up but uh… if we went down to the Kiwanis Club… if he went down to the Kiwanis Club and he walked in and he said, „You should be afraid of that tiger that's up there on that venetian blind, because he's liable to jump on you." And they'd say, „Well that's all right, now take it quiet, oh yeah, that's good and that's good. Have a drink of coffee, sit down for a moment. Let's talk it over." Talk it over? Get the cops!

And naturally select out of that environment a fellow who insisted on seeing tigers on the top of venetian blinds. The sole test of sanity administered by a psychiatrist, and wouldn't you know it, the sole test is „Is he in agreement with the MEST universe? Well, if he's in agreement with the MEST universe, why, it's all right."

Might be in apathy; we can put him there if he isn't, but uh… is he in thorough agreement? All right, he is. Then he is sane. The guy's strictly a fruitcake. All right, where do we get this… this thing about agreement?

It's a gradient scale of agreement. You might start it out this way. You'd say at the beginning of the track, there you were. And maybe you decided that you'd like a universe. Well, now something had to happen – you had to agree to something before you could have a universe or you and a couple of guys or something of the sort… And you've decided to fix this stuff up and so on. A… and something had to happen before you did that.

You had to have something occur, either initiate natively or have it initiated upon you, that it was desirable to obtain something called a universe. And have some action and so forth and uh… so on. And uh… uh… you should notice I have never defined the word „universe." Because if I defined the word universe as such you would say, „Uh-huh, that means parallels to the MEST universe," and universes are very much not necessarily parallels to the MEST universe at all. Some of them don't even have action in them. Uh… they have something else. It's very interesting.

Now, when these fellows set this up, whatever they set up, they had to agree that – amongst themselves at least – that it was desirable to have this thing. And then they got to agreeing about a bunch of other things so that they could get some sort of a uh… group effort on the thing or even to agree on something.

One side would say this is desirable and the other side say this is undesirable, and they'd have a game. You see, it took this sort of thing.

You have to agree, by the way, to disagree. That sounds like uh… one of those circular statements but uh… unless you and your arguing opponent are thoroughly agreed upon something, you can never fight.

And one of the best ways to pull the bottom out of an argument in which you find yourself engaged is suddenly find that you are sweepingly in agreement. Only make him discover that he is sweepingly in agreement with you. Now, when these… these fellows, this universe… now a lot of things could have happened. The MEST universe simply could have

overlapped, bing. The universe built in this direction and then the one day, it had a lot of agreements native to it which were native to the MEST universe.

Or the MEST universe says somebody who has… came in there and here was a bridge sort of built over of agreement. And the next thing you know, the fellow'd agreed that something was terribly desirable or in some cases there was just a sudden big boom.

And their universe caved in, which is a very startling thing to have happen. Somebody could pick up its wave length, its chain of agreements, find out what its laws were and blow it up. There's nothing to that.

Now that was normal and usual. Practically everyone here can get a lot of nice big bops on an E-Meter. And it's a peculiar kind of bops. Somebody was just mentioning it to me. Uh… it's… it's a big theta bop; little theta bops about so little wobble uh… back and forth, back and forth, back and forth, but a theta bop which insists on running ten or twenty points on the scale wide, it just jumps way back about maybe a third of the dial back and forth or half of the dial back and forth, something like that, that's a bop on the loss of and still trying to hold on to the home universe.

See all that kind of a bop is trying to hold on to? Still trying to hold on to that. And you'll run this as an explosion sometime or sometimes you'll run it as a persuasion, but always you will run it as something that shouldn't have happened.

That's regretted and the poor fellow's still staying with it. All right, that bridge, then, led over into the MEST universe and the fellow suddenly found himself agreeing that this was a flock of space which had its origin at point unknown and he is part of that organization now, and he has volunteered. And the next thing you know, you'll find out he has agreed. How is all this done? It's done by hypnosis; it's done in various other ways.

Hypnosis is just a sudden agreement. And uh… it's done in various ways and then he comes down this whole long scale of agreement and things get more and more in agreement and they are probably more and more actually to his personal discredit and uh… antipathetic to his best beingness, habit he's still going down the line, and goes down the line further, and further, end further, and further.

He's gotten into the game called the MEST universe which is set up to need a lot of recruits. And he gets all these recruits. Now the essence of untangling the MEST universe was nothing very special, except this: it was the… it was the uh… difficulties of discovering what had been agreed to from a point in the universe where that agreement was a reality and where the rules had been hidden.

There's no anatomy of this agreement really, was there, at all? See, now you had to look around and find out everything had been agreed to in the universe and then you could trace back and then you could actually pull somebody out of the universe. That's about all you could do about it or you could turn around and… and set it up so somebody else who wanted it could actually turn around and master the universe.

In order to do anything about this, you had to know what this anatomy was. Well, it's the anatomy of agreement and that anatomy of agreement is always a gradient scale.

You can test this agreement with a hypnotized subject very easily. Now the reason why it's… it's a… it's an interesting thing for you to study in Scientology is this: you've got uh… you… you're on a level of agreement on a certain series of data but what is the data? The data is on a level of agreement of how we disagree with the MEST universe. How can you turn it backwards?

We're in agreement on an anatomy of agreement so that the anatomy of agreement can be reversed or handled in any other fashion. Or even by the way that you can continue on and de pen the agreement in same quarters. I can show you ways and means of getting somebody to agree even much better with that MEST universe.

I haven't left the data out because I haven't talked to any psychiatrist for a long time. But uh… the data is… is… is quite… quite ordinary, uh… hypnotists, uh… you get uh… you go around and prove the reality to them. You… you coax them into facing reality, uh… narcosynthesis, electric shock, all of these things are methods of getting somebody to agree with the MEST universe.

And uh… I've been meaning to tell psychiatry about this because I'm sure they haven't thought of using any of these things, but these are practically the only methods of really reducing somebody by getting him to agree. And the hypnosis, narcosynthesis, I want you to take a list of this hypnosis, electric shock, uh… dope, uh… the uh… phenobarbital, uh… there are other methods: telling a person how tired they are and they have to have a rest, uh… uh… telling people that they'd better… better look to their souls and so forth, these are all methods – these are all methods which psychiatry ought to have because I know they'd be completely original to psychiatry.

They deepen one's agreement with the MEST universe. You just tell these people to face reality now. Now I'll tell you what's wrong with you, you just have not faced reality. Now you must face the reality of your problem.

The day you face the reality of this problem you will then be able – then you will be able at last to be better off. And this fellow goes into apathy and he goes further and further and further. And of course, he goes more and more under control and I am sure that the fee has nothing to do with it whatsoever.

You can get a much better fee – I tell you as auditors quite frankly – it… it's much easier to get a great deal of money out of somebody who's on a down spiral into becoming MEST that it is to get money out of somebody who is going on an up spiral toward becoming theta.

Just give you that word of warning. They… they've been working themselves out… they've been working themselves out of… of uh… preclears uh… in various parts of the world uh… too rapidly. They… they clean up a practice. Fellow takes a couple of weeks and all of a sudden he looks around and he doesn't have any patients any more and of course the truth of the matter is, he… he then starts getting a flood of patients sooner or later.

But he's cleaning up the rate of one normal psychoanalytic practice every fortnight, and… and this is a rate of speed which has exceeded, of course, exceeded the desirable feed-

in of cannon fodder. So go very cautious about this, I mean, slow down, hold motion, and you will be able to get a lot of MEST.

Now, now the gradient scale of agreement is mirrored, OF COURSE, in the gradient scales which you find in existence all through matter. Just look at matter. Look at liquids, solids, gases and right there uh… you have gases, liquids, solids. It's a gradient scale. That's interesting, isn't it?

You have flows first of one kind or another. And then there's a little bridge in there; you've got a ridge sort of a situation, a couple of other things and… it's very interesting, that formative state. Uh… examine that and you'll find out that they go into gases and then 'the gases go on a gradient scale and they're heavier and heavier gases. And then all of a sudden you've got liquids. And uh… that goes into a gradient scale of liquids and they're soupier and soupier liquids, and then you've got solids. And you go on down the line of solids and then you get to a solid that's what? You get the whole tone scale repeated again between – uh… you get a tone scale repeat, by the way, from uh… enthusiasm, which is a gas. This is of a much… much lower harmonic than… than 4.0, but you get enthusiasm as a gas down to a conservative gas, sort of inert and so on. And uh… it's conservative, then a real inert gas would be just bored. And you go down below that and you start to get into the antagonistic gases and then you get into those that are… that are good and angry and you're right into between 2.0 and 1.5, you're in a liquid band really. Now you go on down from there, you're in solids, and you go on down the band of solids little by little by little and you would get down to what? One point zero; one point zero is a dispersal.

Now we go from 1.0 on south from that. A dispersal, plutonium. Plutonium is so solid and it is so determined to be scarce – at that level you see, MEST has got to be scarce. You'll find the haves. There's a harmonic scale of have on the metals, on the elements. It's ever so often you'll find the elements as they Go down, very-even numbered, I mean as they go down, they're very nice and regular, not even-numbered, very nice and regular.

They go right on down, have me, have me, have me. See the metals go uh… liquids and so on, they say have not and then have me and then don't have me and have me and don't have me and have me. It… it's sort of divided up into that idiotic scale. You can take the periodic chart and look it up and add that up – a little mental exercise for you. Uh… anyway – not even vaguely important at this time – it might help the field of metallurgy but that's… to the dickens with that.

Uh… gold for instance is a have me. And uh… plutonium is so scarce at such a terrific don't – it's a… all mixed up. It's a don't have me and a have me. And it's a wonderful maybe and it gets right down there and it's so scarce and it's so determined but it doesn't know what it's doing, that it is a dispersal, and you start putting any plutonium together and it goes Ka-poom! – won't hold together – and that's the way a preclear is.

You put him together at a certain level and boy does he disperse like mad. So you see there's an echo in the material universe itself. And in each one of these substances there's no such thing as an absolute purity or an absolute state of it. Or anything else absolute – I mean, that's just typical of this universe that it follows down.

Now let's look at the chart of the gradient scale of survive and don't survive and let's take a look first at uh… the corollary: any datum has only relative truth and corollary: truth is relative to environments, experience, and truth. And we look at that. Let's go down from there and say: in logic eight, a datum can be evaluated only by a datum of comparable magnitude. And a datum is as valuable as it has been evaluated, oh, it's quite important. Because the form, the network, with which you are operating in creative processing and which is your main high road to a good thorough theta clear…

A cleared theta clear, this is the high road to it. It's a gradient scale and it would run datum of comparable magnitude. Everything is… is… is to be compared in this universe by a datum of comparable magnitude.

All right. Uh… let's take the first datum of comparable magnitude which was attained in this. And let's take uh… survival and uh… succumb. Two data of comparable magnitude. Now there… there we have a dichotomy which is right up there. One can be evaluated to some slight degree by the other and you can extrapolate from these experience. And you can take a terrific amount of experience out of these data.

Well now, is survive an absolute scale? No, it sure isn't and in the first book we have a graph here, it looks something like this. We had a track of this, a track this way and so on. And this was plotted against time, plotted against objects, and this was plotted against uh… immortality and there was a dynamic survive here and that showed that… that arrow over there, survive, showed the potential of survival.

How long would this individual survive and so we… we have that there as a… an extremely valuable breakdown as far as our thinking and processing was concerned; now you could break that one down, you could break that thing down into eight dynamics. That was how many things were surviving when any individual was surviving in this universe.

You had him paying attention to all eight dynamics. Now, you have this plotted against time and we got our tone scale and you'll find the first tone scale in the first book. It just isn't numbered. It even tells you it's got a gradient scale, it's got geometric progression, all sorts of things.

But anyhow, then let's look this over. Down here at the bottom here was succumb. And this thing was all plotted out against time and it showed that the impulse of the organism, the life organism in particular, was an effort to persist as long as possible in a living state.

In as good a state as possible and as long as possible for all eight dynamics and that was survival. We had the opposite to it was the impulse to succumb. Well, now what was right and what was wrong? A little bit later got to figuring out right and wrong, and I got this: That… that which led to the maximal survival for the maximal number of dynamics could be considered to be right. And that which was minimal survival for the minimal number for the maximal number of dynamics, whichever way you want to look at it, uh… was wrong.

And you could adjudicate then right and wrong. You could actually sit down and figure out and get a good working frame of reference then as to what was right and wrong and how did it compare?

Well, it compared well enough so that a bar association of one state in this union reconvened their rules of evidence… committee on the rules of evidence, and started to work. The reports are not in on that yet, but they are working over the rules of evidence because they've obviously got to be changed.

We had a working… working material on right and wrong. Well, what's right and wrong? Right and wrong would be yes and no. Now, some of your engineers will tell you that they're working on three-valued logic. They aren't but Boolean algebra depends on yes greater than no and no greater than yes. It's just a two-value that way; in other words, it's plotting yes, no and maybe. And uh… uh… one of your big switchboards, whenever you pick up a phone down here, is running a switchboard which operates on Boolean algebra.

Last time I looked they were… yes, greater than no, no greater than yes, hunt hunt hunt hunt hunt, well, the yes on this is greater than no, plug. Hunt hunt hunt hunt hunt, well, the no is greater than yes, plug. Hunt hunt hunt hunt hunt, no greater than yes, plug. And uh… some engineers that work on that, by the way, practically work it in their sleep after a while.

Boolean algebra, it works things out yes greater than no, no greater than yes. Well, they're… they're not really working on two or even three-valued logic, although many of them will tell you, „I'm working on three-valued logic." Yes, maybe and no. They're not.

I had a very interesting argument with one of the chaps who builds some of the more interesting electronic brains, a friend of mine. One… one afternoon we had a good time. We went down, and I finally managed to drive home and pound down this datum that there was actually not three-valued logic which he claimed he was using, but there was actually twelve-valued logic.

And twelve-valued logic consisted of the yes greater than no is greater than yeses and so on and the modifications thereof. There was maybe and there was more yes than no maybes, and rare no than yes maybes and those… there was nothing was less maybe and more maybe. And we had a good argument about it and he finally bought this and so forth and then I of course did the horrible thing of demonstrating to him that it was an infinity-valued logic and he'd bought a pig in a poke.

We'll call this an infinity of lines here. And we'll call this thing here in the middle maybe. Now all that means is neither no nor yes. So that's the definition of maybe… neither no nor yes. And the only time a problem is in abeyance is when you can't get a greater factor on weight on the yes or the no.

I should have done it, I shouldn't have done it. What do you find in a fellow who's worried about it? Worried means he is unable to unbalance the balance between yes and no which puts him on a maybe. The anatomy of maybes as you heard in technique 88 was never more valid than it is right now. The anatomy of the maybe – how do you resolve indecisions.

What is an indecision? How do engrams come into suspension. MEST itself is a flock of indecision. It's a big chaotic confusion and you have to pour some positive and negative MEST together to get a stable MEST. You have to get it stable – if you want it stable you've actually got to hang it in the maybe, otherwise it will flow off and go in some other direction.

On a ship for instance they have a terrible time with this. There… there's so many, so many elements that say more yes than no and so many elements that say more no than yes that the whole bottom of the boiler or the boiler tubes or the propellers or even the steel itself in the hulls is liable to flow right away into the water. And you call this electrolysis.

The potentials are slightly different in the MEST they're using and they can't get a decent balance on it and they have an awful time with it.

I saw a ship one time that had just eaten up her third set of boiler tubes in a month. They couldn't get the… they couldn't get the positive – negative terminals. This is one of the big problems of marine engineering, by the way.

If you were able to go in and solve this just bop, you would be worth your weight in, I don't know, you couldn't be worth your weight in theta, you already got that. Well, it would be a valuable contribution.

All right, now again here, survive then would be yes. Toward good for the dynamics. Survive and that would be good. And that would go out here toward infinity. A theoretical infinity of good.

Maximum number of dynamics – now you could draw one of these darn things for every single dynamic, you could draw one for the first dynamic, and the second dynamic, for the third dynamic, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth dynamic. You could draw one for each one or you can draw this as just a composite of this arrow which was in the first book – the impulses toward survival.

And it would be: value of assistance toward survival, would walk over here toward good. And we will call that, just for the heck of it, yes.

All right, it'd walk over here toward good and an infinity of good would be the theoretical goal, but absolutes are unobtainable, so there couldn't be an infinity of good. Something would happen if you had an infinity of good, probably the whole universe'd – it wouldn't necessarily blow up but it would probably be just… just stopped.

Because there'd be no differences of potentials anywhere along the line. Now let's look over to the other side, here, and say this is no. And we get here, succumb. And we get with it uh… evil. So we've got that, good and evil, just arbitrary values. We have another word that goes over here, right. Another word that goes over here, wrong.

An infinity of evil would cause a complete succumbing of the entire universe, theoretically. Because you have only one… one terminal. Now maybe you'd call this plus, call that minus. You've got the same thing, you've got… you've got orders of experience here. The plus, the minus, yes, no, survive, succumb, good, evil, infinity here, and infinity there, and right and wrong. So plus, yes, survive, good, infinity, and right are datums which interrelate and which evaluate each other. And there's a gradient scale of each and anytime you find the point for one of those on that gradient scale – you'll find the rest of them at the same more or less point on that gradient scale.

How right is something, how much is it going to assist the survival of something? How wrong is something? How much is it going to make something succumb? How evil is

something? Well, it's as evil as it is wrong and wrong is succumb. And how much of it's evil? It causes succumb, therefore is uh… uh… complete sexual freedom evil? Now, instead of just going in and reading Plato and other Christian uh… authorities on the thing, let's look this thing over and uh… we'll find that uh… that we have an actual way to evaluate this. We have a way to evaluate it here and then we've got a way to evaluate that column against this column. Why, what do you know? We're working out here a system of ethics.

System of ethics, that system of ethics will hold for a lot of universes. But more importantly, for this universe particularly, it holds for logic and that probably holds for most universes too, just the way it is there. Something which is right or it's wrong, that's no action, no action at all.

You don't take any action either. You've got to throw something onto this. Now you could actually throw onto a preclear enough new data in order to unbalance his bullpen of maybes. You could theoretically just give him enough data and he would go from that data into a state of decision just by learning more about a situation. But that isn't too much so.

Now how much of a gradient scale is this gradient scale? Well, that's quite a gradient scale. There's an infinity of lines from here to here and another infinity of lines from there to there. And right in here there's an infinity of lines, and right there there's an infinity of lines.

That's a wonderful number, infinity. Somebody thought it up and it simply means the mostest. It means a never-ending mostestness. And so let's look this thing over and of course 'we can say it's an… I can say very soberly: Now I wanted you to note in particular that there is one half an infinity between here and here.

Now absolutes are unobtainable, now you could theoretically… you have an infinity of evil. You don't have an infinity of evil. Uh… let's have… let's put something in here which is uh… a little more interesting, and let's have a zero, huh? Well, it's not a zero, couldn't be, couldn't he – and let's draw a curve from here across to here, like that. Just for the… the heck of it and then let's put the number 40.0 here, just for the heck of it. And uh… by the way, this number 40.0 had better be just about over here or somebody will get that into a… a spin or something of the sort. And uh… let's put as an unbalanced uh… maybe of some sort, here uh… but let's put around here someplace, 20.0, and over here we've got a 0.0. Now those are just tone scale arbitraries.

They're just tone scale arbitraries. Why I thought we didn't have any action here on… on maybes. No action at all unless you take a… unless you take a no responsibility. A no responsibility for it – we've already investigated and 20.0 should be right about there. And that's about… a lot of action involved in that.

Or, let's see, let's work this out a little bit better. Let's put 20.0 there. You got a conservatism there, maximum action. All right, now all I've done here is make an approximation of the cycle of action. And the cycle of action runs on this line, to some degree. It can be plotted on this gradient scale to some degree, but it is not, again, an absolute plot. So you have this thing which is running here, not as part of the graph, but it's standing out three-dimensionally from the graph as a cycle of action.

This cycle of action here is a cycle of logic. That's what we're plotting. See that? And down here we've got something that we call approximate cycle of action. Now why should we put anything like that? Our tone scale actually doesn't work like that. Or does it?

Your tone scale theoretically would work with bars up to here, something like that. No, we turn this tone scale on edge and we've taken a viewpoint. We've taken a viewpoint of what is good and what is right and what is survival for us. And we've plotted it over against logic and so actually that cycle of action isn't really logic, but that cycle of action put on there is how we apply the gradient scale called logic to our problem in our cycle of action. So I put a problem on this to see how the problem works out by gradient scales. Now you just set this problem 20.0, 40.0, 0.0 over here. Now how does it work out?

You find that – by golly we sure are right before we make any postulates. A lot of people won't act for fear they'll be wrong. That's a low level action. Now you find out that there's a sort of an increase down as we go along here; there's an increase from this uh… forty point zero right through to a conservation.

When you get down here to a maybe we want to conserve things and then we get a stop down here. So we have up here start at right; at maybe we have change – it would be in this area here someplace. But actually, there is an inner cycle here before you get to the maybe from 40.0 down the scale, there would be change and then you would get the conservatism of no-change and then you would get the change again. First you would get the change as you came over here from forty. You would get the change which you would call uh… uh… you would call this change before it got in there: increase or growth, increase or growth, and it got over here into the center. Growth has stopped and decrease has not yet begun. So we have conservatism there, maybe.

We… we'd better not go any further there, you see. I mean uh… we better not make too many changes, we're here at an optimum state. This is a guy maybe in middle life. All right, now decay sets in and we get another change.

It's the change of decay and it goes over here to wrong and that would be death. Survive, succumb. This could be creation, growth, conservation, doing things in life and so forth, then decay and death on that cycle of action.

Or this could be considered over here at 40.0. We'll cover all this material very much more thoroughly later. But at 40.0 we could have… up above 40.0 we start something at somewhere before we reach 20… before we reach that maybe we have 20.0 and that's where we get optimum action about the thing. A heavy action, actually, a maybe is plus and minus opposed in some fashion or another so that you… you've got those things. You're trying to maintain a balance and believe me you get plenty of action when you're trying to maintain a balance on anything.

And so you get over here and then you would get uh… your stop when we got down here. All right, now those two things compare. Now, if we're going… if we're going to work this problem out, we're going to find we work it out by gradient scales.

Well, gradient scales, the best way I know and the best way I know to apply this in processing – your preclear is obviously wrong. He is obviously wrong. How wrong can you

get? Human. You go into ARC with homo sapiens, practically 90% of the things you have to do to stay in ARC with homo sapiens are wrong. It's just automatically.

Look at the code of honor processing and try to make it stick. That's a good survival code, but boy, homo sapiens kind of objects when you run it in there.

That's a good survival code, if a lot of people were using it it'd be all right. So, you've got to back him up from way down here before just wrong. You've got to back him clear on up to the top.

Well, how do you… how do you do it? You have to pick him up someplace on a gradient scale toward that wrongness and back him up the scale and get him up tone scale to a place where he can better act and where he can get more right than he is wrong.

You're not ever trying to get to a point where he'll be absolutely right. Theoretically, that's unobtainable. All right, that's an application of a gradient scale. But there's the basic gradient scale then. And a problem on it.

Now, let's look at gradient scales just a little bit more here. Let's look at a gradient scale which simply comes like this. Let's look at the gradient scale of any part of a gradient scale; now this is a gradient scale of destruction.

This gradient scale of destruction would start in. Here, here is your… your destruction. We'll draw as down and here's your gradients of destruction and here is uh… a gradient scale of volume. And this is small, large, small, large, volume of destruction.

Now we just walk the preclear into this. We've found a lot of things on the E-Meter. Now we found he couldn't destroy a lot of things. So we take the smallest part of them – small volume of them. At a small volume destruction of a small number of what he can't destroy and we get a mock-up.

And we get a slightly larger volume of what he can't destroy and we get a mock-up of that. Get him to execute that. If we can't get him to execute that, get a smaller margin that he can execute and go up in the leaps and bounds that he can do it.

So he does that successfully, that means he can do this successfully. Now he can do that successfully, he can do this successfully. That successfully, he can do this successfully and finally he can do a large volume of destruction on it and he can get very close to an ultimate destruction in his mock-ups. And when he can do that on that subject, that means he's rid of an awful lot of aberration.

He can mock up then in excess of any facsimile he has on the subject. It just puts the MEST universe to shame. The MEST universe quits. It just quits right there. Is… its hold is so slight on an individual. You think it's heavy.

But it's actually just very airy, when you go at it like this; you have to be careful because you're liable to find your preclear sort of nnneeeaa. Don't work too fast with this – be careful of it.

All right, now, small to large, now that's what we mean by a gradient scale of mock-up. Now you could actually have a gradient scale that would take in first… the first dynamic,

then it would take in the first and second dynamic. Then it would – see your volume of magnitude, first, second and third dynamic would be the next mock-up, a next series.

Next series of mock-ups would be the first, second, third and fourth dynamics. Next series of mock-ups would be the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth dynamics. All right, now listen, mock up the scenery. All right, now let's put some animals into it and now let's blow that up. Or make it decay, or make it get old – do something with it.

Now, put the MEST universe in there and away we go. Now, anybody is trying to infer in any way that I am just trying to blow up the MEST universe, I… I wish he'd… he'd stop on that because, uh… truth of the matter is, I am. Anyway…

We've got here then a gradient scale which would go like this. Let's take a gradient scale of color. And this gradient scale would go something like this. And it would merely mean brightness of color. And it would run from none to brilliant. No color. All right.

Now let's work it on a no-color basis. The fellow has possibly black and white or possibly grey and not-so-grey, something on that order. All you would do would get him to contrast one and then contrast the other one. Anything that you could run.

Get a little bit of each and so on…' small spots, and then move in time, space and location and handle him yesterday, handle him tomorrow. Now, let's get a little bit bigger bit of color, and it doesn't mean, uh… that means color. Uh… well get something a little, a little brighter grey this time.

And mock that up here, there, everywhere – on top of the roof, under the house, in the basement, uh… below your feet, above your head, behind your back – all right.

Now put it in yesterday, put it in tomorrow, now put it in next week, okay, now let's get… let's get something that's s… quite a lot brighter than that. Let's see if you can get any white. Well, very possibly he can get some white, but maybe it's still grey, or maybe this time he can get some good dark black.

So you get this good dark black and you put it here and you put it there and you put it back and forth and you put it in front of the guy and you put it under his head, put it under his arm, put in tomorrow, and put it in next week, and put it in the year 1202, and – all right.

Now what we're heading for is to turn on his color, so let's ask him what his favorite color is and then let's go on the theory that he couldn't possibly get anything that was pleasing to him. Ask him what his favorite color is. Now, if he couldn't get anything pleasing, if he could only get that much color, he couldn't get anything pleasing to him, so let's get something that's rather displeasing to him.

And you say, „Well, all right, what's your favorite color", and he says, „Oh, green I think. Green is my favorite color." You say, „Get some very bilious green." Well, he's perfectly willing to get that much bilious green because he wouldn't be able to please himself to the degree of getting any nice bright good-looking green. So he'll try to get some bilious green and he'll say, „Well, it's still kind of grey." And you say, „That's all right, now let's get it grey. Now let's get it green again, bilious green, sickly green, got that? All right, get it grey, and so on."

And you just go on that way, back and forth, back and forth, and you put it in front of him, put it behind him, put it up to the right, and to the left, and under your head and in the next room. And over in the next lot and on a ship at sea and uh… then in tomorrow and then in the year 2897 and then in the year 610 B.C. and uh… all right. Next, you see.

And in such fashion we would come right on down the line and if we just kept that up and kept that up as drill drill drill drill, something would happen along the line that would make his colors brighter, and brighter, and brighter, and something would suddenly trigger. Something would trigger and he would suddenly say, „Well, the devil with it. I can get colors of anything I want to. Of course that's nonsense, I've been getting them here for minutes. I mean everything is all right." Okay.

The uh… great oddity this… this thing on a gradient scale. You wouldn't believe it when you first start in on a preclear. This… this preclear's saying neeoooww and ooohhh and all last night and then so on and he… the… and „it's bad thetan and… the… and they can't and… and every time I… holy God! I never want to have another night like that."

What do you do? You say, „Well, all right, now let's see, what do you say that was happening to you?" And he tells you, he says, „Well, it was so and so and so and so and so and so and so and so and so." And you say, „Well, all right now, where… where did it happen?" „At home."

Well, you know you're not going to get him into a nightmare that fast and you say, „By the way, uh… take the house across the street." „Yeah, yeah, yeah, what's that got to do with it?" „Well, take the house across the street and turn it Around on its foundations. Get a mock-up, turn it around on its foundations. All right. Now turn it back again. Now turn it a little pink."

„Now turn it blue, now put it about ten feet up in the air, and make it turn around again. Now make it come down on the foundation, now send it up into the air, now turn it around and bring it down to the foundation. Now put it behind your back. Okay, now let's put it back on the foundations again. Now, let's put it over in the next state and uh… let's put it in last week."

„Okay, now let's reach into the house just next to it and pick up a bedroom."

„Ohhoo oroor."

„Now just a minute, pick up the living room."

„Okay, I got the living room."

„Now rearrange all the furniture in it, now shake it up like a dice box, now put it behind your head. Now put it under your feet. Now put it up on the roof. Now put it down in the firehouse. Now put it over on the Eiffel Tower. Okay, now put it on Mars, now put it on Venus, now throw it into the sun so it will burn up. Okay, you got that? Now burn the sun up. Okay, you got that? All right. Now, let's take a bedroom." „Da da da da da." „Now let's… I said, let's take a kitchen."

And after you've handled all that sort of thing, get a lawn chair out in the yard and handle that and tear it up and put dogs on it, and behind the back and over the head and under

and locate it in space, and put it in last year, and… and put his grandmother on it and then bury it in the old churchyard. And do all sorts of things with this thing and then say, „All right, now take a bed."

„Well, mmmm, all right."

„Okay, now put it behind your head, above your head, over your head, around your head, around… top of the railroad, top of the firehouse, now put your Uncle George in it. Now invent an uncle to put in it. Okay, now put a blonde in it, now put a brunette in it. Yeah, what did you say? No, that's all right, I said put a blonde in it. That's good. I said put two of them in. Okay, now put them down… down in the city hall."

„Now put them out in the middle of Grand Central Station. Now take Grand Central Station and turn it around. Now put your body in that bed in Grand Central Station. Now have eighty snakes jump on it."

Well he says, „To hell with it – sure." you say, „All right, get the snakes. Well, get them eating the body up. „Well, you don't know quite when you've passed over anything resembling snakes because his nightmare was all about snakes. This… it was something quite mysterious to you. Of course, you've got him in the middle of Grand Central Station, he knows that couldn't happen in Grand Central Station. That's a complete disagreement with reality and he thinks he can do it because it's because he knows it couldn't happen in Grand Central Station. As a matter of fact, you've got him back toward his own universe. You're restoring power into the thing. But if he said yow-yow-yow-yaw-yaw, you said, „Well I just said have this long tall snaky-looking porter come up and tuck your body in better. Okay now have him shuffle off and have him hiss at somebody."

„Yeah, all right." You just work it up that way. Finally you've got him in home in his bed at home and you've got the whole last 24 hours – you take the whole last 24 hours and you turn it right side up and you turn it left side down, and he says, „What are you doing?" And you say, „Well, just take this space which contained the last twenty-four hours and turn it right side up and upside down" and he of course does that, and so forth.

And he says, „What are you doing this for?" And you say, „How about that nightmare you had last night?" „What nightmare? Oh, the nightmare! Yeah, yeah, that nightmare, well, let's get down to some processing, something important."

Funny part of it is, the darn things stay keyed out. It… it's just like a bunch of liars out in the old West, the MEST universe is lying like mad to this preclear and he's lying to himself about perceiving it anyhow and what's happening in it and what he's scared about, and everything else. And you just keep talking it.

And by golly, after a while, his concentration on these points of agreement in the MEST universe will shift. This is really a problem in the centering of attention, the fixing and unfixing of attention units… is really this is a problem in to some slight degree. That's uh… not wholly true but to some slight degree it's fixed and unfixed. So you get that as a gradient scale.

Now your gradient scale could be these wide beams, one, two, three, four, five, that could be those wide beams or we could have a gradient scale that would go like this and there'd be one, two, three, four, five.

Get the idea? There could be a gradient scale within the gradient scale within the gradient scale. You can have the tiniest graduations imaginable. You're having trouble with this fellow, you… you… you're already starting in too heavy if you have any objections. You shouldn't hang him up on… on when he… watch him when he's processing and when he says, „Well, I… yeah, yeah, I can do that."

Watch him, he's holding his breath a little bit. „Yeah, yeah, I… I… I… I… I, yeah, I did that." Watch that; you're feeding it too heavy. Just look at your preclear – it's like reading a meter. If he says, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, yep, you're feeding it too… too slow. Get it somewhere in there where he's saying, „Yes, yes, yes, uh-huh, yes, umm yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, what are we doing this for?"

That's the way it operates with regard to him. So it's up to you to monitor the gradient scale according to how fast your preclear's taking it. And don't ever let any preclear kid you into this, that there is any aberration or an upset that is so powerful that he couldn't possibly mock up anything about it. NEVER let yourself be kidded that such a thing exists because it evidently doesn't exist.

There is always a gradient scale that he can attempt. There's always one. There's always a level where he can strike in with a mock-up and win. Never otherwise. It appears to you perhaps at this stage of training that a mock-up is really a very light and filmy thing to be working with. Do you know how powerful and deadly facsimiles can be and how preclears can agonize and how long it should take? And you wonder what happens to these facsimiles; you just walk off and leave these facsimiles, just play around with mock-ups all the time. And you say, „Well, we do that all the time", and so on. Well, we ought to do something too about the facsimiles.

You're doing something about the facsimiles when you do the mock-ups. The mock-ups kick those facsimiles out, they unload them. You're not converting energy, really, when you're doing mock-ups. You're not converting energy. You're putting new energy into a new field, handling it in a new way, and the facsimiles actually come loose, detach, and blow, and that is that.

And you won't have any trouble with any of that. That's something for you to… to look at as you work with this. You are working the most direct process to an amputectomy of a facsimilectomy… That's the most direct course through to that.

Now you see what this is all about. Gradient scales and how it formed out of the logics. It's actually a very interesting application of a piece of knowledge which has been with us for a long time.

Okay, let's call it an evening. Thank you.

(TAPE ENDS)