

5404C06

Number 7 of „*Universes and the War between Theta and Mest*“ cassettes.

UNIVERSES

A lecture given on 6 April 1954

And this is April the 6th, 1954. A lecture.

The basic material of Scientology is actually available in a very orderly form, really, because over the period of years there have been various writings appear which carried the science up to that level to which it advanced. Furthermore, there are a great many lectures on this subject, each one topping off all former work. Thus there is an orderly record of the progress.

However, the very, very early material on the thing, where it was written down, was never organized. A good reason is it costs a great deal of money to organize things, and as a consequence the very earliest days of Scientology are not recorded and are not available in any other form than *Scientology: A New Science* which was written in 1947.

Now, anybody caring to follow the track of development all the way along and actually study the subject probably should start in by reading *Scientology: A New Science* in Issue (I think) 28-G of the *Journal of Scientology* where it's published in full. It has appeared before. It's been sent out across the world by individuals. It was published once a long time ago in a mimeographed form, it was republished in hectograph form, it was republished in just plain carbon copies, so on. People would get a hold of a copy of it and they would write it up and send it to some friends. So that book really got around. But that's, for all public purposes and so forth, the first writing that is available.

There is an earlier writing than this. There's a book called *Excalibur* which was written in 1938. That book is about 125 thousand words and is the theoretical top level of

philosophic principles which we're still using. But it had no connecting link with anything like therapy. It had no connecting link, really, with beingness or something of this sort. It just took off in... ten thousand feet up and climbed. Nothing connected to Earth about it. Some of its principles are quite interesting. One of them is „*A man is as sane as he feels dangerous to his environment.*“ That's a very interesting line out of it, because as the years have gone along that has proven to be more and more an accurate statement when you consider a man as that composite of a thetan plus a body, Homo sapiens. He feels dangerous to his environment, he's all right. When he feels that the environment is dangerous to him he's all wrong.

The word survive and the first principle of existence also appear in Excalibur and are run down to a considerable extent. There is a great many electronic manifestations outlined, and several new laws there. There is considerable about the somethingness and nothingness of existence, and there's a big examination of why. Why are we living? This is something that bothers people every once in a while and there's a dissertation in there on it.

But none of this material, as far as you're concerned, is particularly relevant. The first writing then on Scientology which you would find of great use is the 1947 thesis, *Scientology: A New Science*. This, by the way, was released from time to time from 1947 on; was once in a published form called *The Original Thesis*.

It is a fascinating thing that no time along this track has any major principle been changed. The viewpoint of the material has shifted, but the material itself has not changed. And the viewpoint has had to shift primarily in order to communicate the information.

That's what's most important: the communication of the information.

Now, we have published to date, or there is available to date, most of the work on Scientology. Some of it appears under the name of Dianetics. The reason this is, is because in 1947 it seemed that a public presentation of this material was in order and an effort was made to present it to the American Medical Association and the American Psychiatric Association. And the material was prepared and was titled, for their work, „*Dianetics*.“ It came on a little bit later, 1950, the material was again presented under *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, published by Hermitage House in New York City on May the 9th, 1950.

This book was actually a pilot project in the face of the fact that the American Medical Association and the American Psychiatric Association didn't want anything to do with Dianetics. They found that in order to know something about it they had to read, and they were too busy with their patients, and had far too many patients (they informed me at every turn) to investigate or read or pick up any information about how you did something for a patient. And they pointed this out quite frankly. I pointed out to them that it might be economical, in terms of their own time, to do a little study on it. And they said, yes, this was undoubtedly true, but you see they didn't have enough time to be economical.

I didn't realize at the time that I was fighting straight up against a complete identification that wasn't doing any thinking, and I... at the time I had felt a little bit revengeful about it. I thought, here's all this work that has gone forward and the people who really should be using this work are not even interested enough to look at it, although they admittedly have no organization of the whole field of psychosomatic medicine and psychotherapy.

There is no organization of psychosomatic medicine and psychotherapy in existence today except for Scientology and these books under the title of Dianetics - which is also Scientology. I don't make that as an empty statement; I am simply quoting the Freudian Institute of Vienna. I'm also quoting one of the leading - probably the last of Freud's students, Dr. Osterkamp. He looked at the Logics and Axioms and .. which were brought out in 19... late 1950, and he said these-1951, pardon me-and he said, „*These are the first organization of psychotherapy.*“ And the Freudian Institute is in thorough agreement with this.

Well, just the fact that somebody had organized their material should have been of interest, and I was stupid enough to be a little bit miffed, so I published it as a popular work, but I didn't think that it would sell more than about six thousand copies. I don't specialize in bad prophecies, but one should be allowed a bad prophecy once in a while, and this was a bad prophecy: „*Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health will sell six thousand copies.*“ Oh-Oh. It sold a hundred thousand and it's still selling years later.

It reached out into the public and said to them, bluntly, „*There is some thing that can be done about the human mind.*“ That was its main message. Said something could be done about it. Other books on the subject, other works on the subject, don't carry this message. They say nothing can be done about the human mind - apathy, apathy, apathy - and if you did do anything about it, it would only be after, oh, eighty or ninety years of very close-packed memorizing what the philosophers have said, and this of course is impossible and you're dead, you're dead, you're dead, all is apathy. And the field of psychology is a companion in this sin.

So this book said something could be done about the mind. It said some thing else which was quite interesting. It says, „*You're not responsible.*“ Very cute. Now, as long as I was willing to say, „*You are not responsible for what you are doing*“ why, the American public was very happy to buy the book, and they're still happy to buy it. And this keynote is of great interest to an auditor, because by the time I had brought out a book called Advanced Procedures and Axioms, I had discovered that postulates were the basic, and that they were senior to all mechanical manifestations. And if postulates were the basic, then of course there was only one person who was responsible for his own condition, and that was the individual making the postulates.

That's curious, isn't it. Because it said you are totally responsible. Advanced Procedures and Axioms and its companion book The Handbook for Preclears are the biggest drug on the market that you could imagine. They have not sold any hundreds of thousands of copies. They have been offered, they have practically been given away, and the main thing they say is „*You are responsible.*“

For instance, *Advanced Procedures and Axioms* carries the theory of responsibility forward, analyzes it and presents it. It's too much. The second that you told people they were responsible, they didn't want anything to do with you. Well, the truth of the matter is they are responsible. You can trace almost any accident back to the postulate that the accident would occur. Almost any accident can be traced back in this wise. Fascinating. The fellow does it himself.

But do you know people go around and use this as a total accusation all the time. People say to people, „*Well, you're to blame, you're responsible and you've done it,*“ and so on and so on and so on. See? So as a result, why, everybody resents the idea of being told they're responsible. But do you know they can't get well until they get responsible. In other words, everybody resents being responsible. And the biggest condemnation the society uses is to tell somebody he's responsible. And so the society resents it. So this adds up to the fact that the society resents getting well.

And there is actually, in essence, the main trouble you will have with a preclear. He will apparently want to get well, but the second you start to really make him well, he'll balk. Why will he balk? Because he's being asked to be responsible. The only route out is the route of taking responsibility.

Well, if everyone then stays in a total agreement that we must resent any possible activity which will try to fix upon us the responsibility for our own condition, of course nobody's going to get well. Everything will just keep going downhill beautifully, everything will get more automatic, more machines; shame, blame and regret will become the chronic emotions of the society; one day some messiah will leap forth and say, „*The kingdom of Cactus is at hand,*“ or something of the sort, „*And all you have to do now is lie down and pound your heads on the pavements and you will be saved.*“ You see, you can't save yourself; you have to be saved by some other agency.

Well, you'll find this condition of no responsibility will deteriorate to a point where the society practically will do that. They'll pound their heads on the pavement and commit suicide.

Well, that's all very well, but those who have a slight vested interest in the society and who like to see mock-ups put up and taken down and an orderly progress going on have a tendency to resent the idea of everything going out through the bottom. It doesn't seem to be a very logical thing to go on this way and then have everything go to pieces into an apathy.

You see, it would be all right if it just went to pieces in a boom. But please not a billion year apathy. That's a little too long.

So the public at large, then, bought Scientology under the guise of Dianetics as long as Scientology apparently told them that they did not have any responsibility. They missed the point entirely. If you read the first book again you will find out that the individual clears out of his track the reasons why he can't be responsible and self-determined for his own destiny. Now, there is the essence of it. They just said, „*Well, look, we're not responsible and it doesn't matter what we do, and we're just victims of engrams, and here we go.*“ And then they, of course, hewed to this.

Now, you'll find many people who studied Scientology under the name of Dianetics many years ago are still in Dianetics. Well, this is why they're in Dianetics. You can't budge them out of it. You could give them faster results and everything else, but to take any kind of a faster process would necessitate that they would accept this proposition: that a man has some control over his own destiny. They'd have to accept the proposition that a man can to some degree control his own destiny. If they can't accept that then they have to go on saying, „*Well, we're all the victims of engrams. We're the victim.*“ Any preclear who comes in and sits down in an auditing chair could have hung over his head in letters of fire as the motto of his existence, „*I am the victim.*“

That's the trouble with him, if you want to single out single troubles and so forth. He thinks of himself as a victim, therefore he is not any longer dangerous to his environment, the environment is dangerous to him. You have to get him over this. You have to get him up to a point where he can be dangerous to the environment too.

Well, of course, the society has this line booby-trapped. It says, „*Now, if you get too dangerous to this environment, you destroy any property, if you push anybody around, if you make your weight felt in any particular direction, we're going to arrest you, throw you in jail, throw you into electric chairs, excommunicate you, fire you,*“ any one of a various billion guises of nonsurvival and destruction, and the end of you - if you become dangerous to your environment.

They completely miss a certain point here: the person who troubles the society is the criminal. And the criminal has become so convinced that the environment is dangerous to him that he irrationally strikes back. One of the first things that the criminal will be found to have as a common denominator is the fact that he can't work. He cannot put out effort, he can't really thrust his way into the society directly, so he has to carve his way into the society very covertly. When you talk to a criminal you talk to a man who is in a neurotic or worse state. He's really bad off.

Well, now when you take the average Homo sapiens who is not a criminal at all and you push him back on up the line, you'll find out that he'll start to get dangerous to his environment; you bet he will. And he's liable to go around and growl at people and snarl at people and be discourteous for a few days. And then he'll push on up for it, and for the first time he has the freedom to be courteous.

There's two causes for courtesy. One is to be in such apathy that you can't do anything else, and the other one is to be sufficiently strong so that you can afford the luxury of it. And until people can afford the luxury of it, you never see anything like courtesy. Instead of that you see 1.1 on the Tone Scale.

Well, we then see that an effort on the part of a science to return to people some of their responsibility would also be an effort on the part of a science to return to people some of their ability to destroy. Well, you can't return to an individual some of his ability to destroy without returning to him some of his ability to create. And you can't return to him some of his ability to create without returning some of his ability to destroy. This is unfortunate. But the end goal of a police state is a flock of pebbles, with a big rock with a star on it.

Well now, this may appeal - this may appeal - to certain people, but the main difference between those people and me is that I don't agree with them. It isn't necessary that they are wrong; it's just that I don't agree with them. And actually when you've examined the numbers of aches and pains which turn up anywhere below 2.0 on the Tone Scale - as a person goes on down into apathy, less and less responsibility - you're not in favor of it either because psychosomatic illness sets in when responsibility sets out. Responsibility sets out when a person is no longer capable of free action in the society.

A society is only progressive, productive so long as some freedom exists in the society for the individual. When that freedom deteriorates, vanishes, its point of vanishment is marked by a total apathy.

Now, when this material, as I say, was released as Dianetics became very popular and a great many people thought that this was a good way to make some money or something of the sort. Not auditors - they didn't particularly think of it in terms of money. It was business men who hung around the fringes of this. And anytime you sell that many books, there's a great deal of money involved on the thing. People who were not even vaguely interested in the subject of course moved in sideways on the subject with a ninth dynamic, „*the buck*.“ And they played hob with the central goals of it.

But this was not quite unpredicted. It seemed fairly obvious as soon as the book sales began to ride up at the top of the best-seller column where they stayed for many months; the point of people raiding the subject and so forth seemed to be rather obvious. But that was why it was put out under the name of Dianetics.

Now, in 1952 and certainly of the pilot projects of this, the various growing pains were more or less experienced and over and done with, and we had this data: We found out that the medical doctor had neither interest in nor any responsibility for psychosomatic medicine. He does not consider himself to be responsible for psychosomatic medicine, and he really has no great interest in psychosomatic medicine. Only so far as the curing of psychosomatic ills by drugs. If he could cure them by drugs, he would be interested in them. But if he cannot cure them by drugs he is not interested in them. This became very apparent and will bear out even today. Medical doctors don't change very fast.

So this rules out the medical doctor as any custodian of material which deals with psychosomatic medicine. The medical doctor obviously - having no interest in it, not taking any responsibility for it - of course, can't be forced to take responsibility for it. And so it just means that somebody else has to pick up right there.

Leaving the medical doctor where he operates very successfully and where he definitely belongs which is in the field of emergency surgery, orthopedics - setting of bones - definite work of that character and in the field of obstetrics. And in the administration perhaps of drugs and policing their use, which of course would include policing the use of antibiotics. Perfectly logical to find a man sitting there doing that because where he is effective, that is what he is doing. But let's stop thinking of the medical doctor as anything active in the line of psychosomatic medicine. He is not active in this line, he has no real interest in it.

In view of the fact that at least 70 percent of man's ills are psychosomatic, this sort of means that man's ills are not being cared for to the tune of 70 percent. So that's a pretty big hole to find in a society isn't it? At least 70 percent of what's wrong with the society, medically, not being cared for.

Well, so the medical doctor, of course, as the years go on he will realize this, and he will fall away from it fairly naturally because he has no interest in it. There is no reason to fight medicine; just leave medicine holding what it's holding.

It is, of course, rather embarrassing that medicine tries to... the medical doctors' association - which is ... doesn't, by the way, represent really the opinion of medical doctors; the AMA - that this organization would attempt to set itself up as a police of such things as psychology, and so forth. Having no interest in it how they would set themselves up as a police of psychosomatic medicine, one finds it difficult to discover unless they too are interested in the ninth dynamic, „*the buck*.“

All right. There is a field, then, that apparently you think should be interested in psychosomatic medicine which is the field of psychiatry. Psychiatry, that's the mind - psychosomatic medicine. No, these are not connected. Psychiatry is only interested in the very, very neurotic and the insane to the point where these individuals who are in that condition, should be incarcerated. The psychiatrist is almost totally interested in the sanitarium case. He is no further than that. He is a sort of a police force which uses force against those who would become dangerous to the society by reason of their insanity or their incapability. Their incapability is such that they can't walk or they can't hold anything on their stomachs - psychotically, you know; I mean they go throw up all over everything or... and scream and set fire to things and so forth.

Well, these are dangerous people to the society at large and society has given into the hands of a few medical doctors who have also been trained in the handling of psychosis, which is to say: Where do you put the straitjacket? Do you tie it on back or do you tie it on front? Where do you connect the electrodes to the skull in order to give them enough jolt to quiet them down. This is the type of study this is. Well, that's the field of psychiatry.

Now, I'm not overestimating this. I mean, I'm not being funny about this. I'm not making cracks. This is actually the... a summation of the field of the mind. Now, these boys would also like you to believe that they did something about psychosomatic medicine. But they're, of course, just interested in that ninth dynamic out there. It means more business, they can't do anything about it, they're not really interested. If there's any money connected with it they'd do something about it, but they don't.

And we have a small corps of people who were originally trained by Sigmund Freud as the next group, and these are the psychoanalysts. Pathetically enough, there are practically no psychoanalysts left in the world. This is an extinct species. There's the American Psychoanalytic Association. You can read literature about it. You can go into a town like New York and you can find some psychoanalysts. You can, definitely. You go into San Francisco, you could find some psychoanalysts around someplace or another. But these people have absolutely no agreement on what they're doing. From

one psychoanalyst to another, they are not practicing psychoanalysis. There is no such thing as a practice or process called psychoanalysis.

In other words, what we have here are a bunch of isolated little outposts that are sitting around trying to do something about the human mind. Well, they're not really interested in psychosomatic medicine either, because they've discovered over the years that they can't do anything about it. They really have. They would think a number of times before they took on a case to do his sinusitis up. They would trace this to something else, and trace that to something else, and try to get the guy to volunteer to be cured of lung fever or something. They would shift this around one way or the other, trying to avoid the ill.

These people are not numerous. The main reason for this is there was never a fully authorized organization in the United States which was dedicated to the promulgation of the materials of Freud.

Well, so psychosomatic medicine or psychosomatic ills and the processes of the mind and so forth don't seem to find any harbor there, because they specialize almost totally in the neurotic, and almost totally in sexual malpractice. And this is their main interest.

Well, when we get into neurosis - all right, so they're a bunch of people that are taking over neurosis. But we've still not covered psychosomatic medicine, and we still haven't covered such interesting problems as reaction time and things like that. Or how do we make an individual a better driver, or how do we rule out all the accident prones there are in the city of Los Angeles. How do we set up an examination so that the people going in for a driver's license would immediately disclose themselves as accident prones, and thus cut the accident rate of the city down to maybe 1 or 2 percent of what it is now. You see, that would be very worthwhile and is quite a visible goal, but there isn't anybody dedicated to this proposition.

Now, you think I'm leaving out psychology. Psychology was something, as near as I can find out, that was invented... It's a very difficult thing to trace psychology. It doesn't have a finite route like Freudian analysis. But as near as I can trace it's probably...What threw it into view was William James and his work on the subject.

Now, psychology is not a process dedicated to the cure of anything. It's not a process and it's not dedicated to the cure or eradication of anything. It is the scientific manifestation of the scientific method. It's a methodology by which individuals have sought to observe and tabulate data concerning the mind and behavior. Now, that doesn't say it has a process, it doesn't say it's going to do anything about it. It says it's going to study and amass data about the mind and behavior. That's all they do.

The word has gotten into the language so that people talk - „*Well, I'll use psychology on him.*“ Well, they might as well say, „*Well, I'll outsmart him.*“ There is no such thing as a finite psychology which runs on this and that. It just means the modus operandi of the mind. It's a Greek and a Latin word combined. We're, by the way, criticized for that in Scientology because it's a Greek and a Latin word, and yet what about geology

and... Oh, my goodness nearly all of the „ologies“ including psychology are also similar splits.

Now, it's funny that everybody studies this in universities. You'd say it's very funny that everybody would study this thing called psychology. If psychology does not have a goal of either freeing man or curing man then why would everybody study psychology? Well, that's... you've missed the point there. That's a total identification. Psychology is something you study because psychology is a study because psychology and study are the same thing.

It's too simple to try to put across really. Of course, it would be something that you sat and listened through in a university for years and years and years. Because it is a study; it isn't a subject. It's the accumulation and amassing and testing of data related to behavior in the mind. That's all. I mean, let's not go on any further than that, we... not toward a goal, not toward a process. We're not trying to find out something. Our aim is not the end product of what makes man tick. It's just let's study.

And so they study. That's been going on now for half a century. People have been studying. They amass data, more data, more data and more data. They don't even have any theories in psychology. There's nothing.

Dr. Moss there in Washington, DC, invented a series of ten laws which demonstrated that the more juice you put across a mouse line, why, the less the mouse would go down the line. But - he tabulated this. But he was unfortunate in tabulating it because I went around and I said, „*Why are you doing this?*“

And he said, „*Well, this is the way you study such things.*“ And I said, „*Well, what are you studying?*“

„*Well, we're studying rats.*“

„*No, no, no. What are you... what's your goal? Why are you making these experiments?*“

„*Well, the behavior of rats, the behavior of life.*“

„*Okay. Okay. Well, where's your experimental records here?*“

„*Oh, they're here; they're fine. There was a rat named Oscar. And we put a female in the other cage and we starved Oscar for five days, and finally after we'd starved him for five days he was no longer interested in the female - he was dead,*“ and so forth and he gave me all these figures.

And I said, „*Well, where's your data?*“ I was getting sort of impatient by this time. „*Where is your tabulated experimental setup? How many ohms of resistance? How many microamps? How many volts? For what period of time? For what age of rat?*“ A whole new horizon had just opened for Mr. Moss - Dr. Moss. After that I'm sure he had little columns over there that he wrote ohms in. Of course he didn't know an ohm from a gnome.

But here we have this enormous amount of work going forward. Now, I'm not belittling these people; I'm just wiping them out. Of all of the wasted time which man has engaged in this capped the deal. A subject which had no real goal.

Now, somebody came along not too long ago and invented something called clinical psychology, and this was supposed to be a practice on people. But again, this is not a process and it does not have a goal. It's „*Let's treat people.*“ Now, that is just a gesture - if an empty gesture, it's still a gesture in the direction of psychosomatic medicine. But there's nobody gotten there yet. Now, we've taken all available branches of existence and we aren't there yet, except one, religion.

Two thousand years ago they had a few miracles. They didn't keep good case histories and so we don't know quite how they were produced. Everybody has been trying since to try to change people's minds that fast. We don't even know that it was done swiftly because as I say we have no case history. The experimental record was not maintained. If we knew how many minutes Christ held his hands over somebody's head we might have some kind of a vague idea of how to go about it. Furthermore, did he hold the right hand or the left hand? And was he standing up or sitting down. Furthermore, how many ohms or amperes came out of his fingers. I mean, experimental record.

Everybody goes around and says, „*Well, now, you just have faith in it.*“ And I won't have any faith in an experimental record unless I can read it. I'm just instructed funny. I'm a perverse sort of a fellow in this respect. If everybody keeps telling me, „*Now, you've got to believe. You got to believe it and you got to have faith in it. You got to have faith in it,*“ I'm apt to say about that time, „*In what?*“

„*Well, it!*“

„*What?*“

„*Well, in God.*“

„*Where? I'll have faith in him, where is he?*“ And people look at me and say I'm an atheist. I say, „*Oh, no. You're the atheist. You think you have to produce evidence of God simply by bludgeoning people around until they believe in him. Well, I can make you believe in kangaroos - that kangaroos are following you up and down the street at all times of the day simply by hounding you and telling you to believe in the kangaroos.*“ So it doesn't look to me like we've proven anything about God. It looks to me like we've proven that people can convince other people of things with duress.

This again is not an experimental record and has nothing whatsoever to do with psychosomatic medicine. Hasn't anything to do with human behavior or improving reaction time. In other words, it hasn't been any... everybody evidently has just been avoiding this terribly. Modern times, Mary Baker Eddy came forward and produced a most significant work on this subject in an effort to establish, without any clinical record - a very brave attempt, by the way - trying to establish how did Christ bring about these healings. And she, however, did not ask with that divine doubt which every experimentalist must contain within himself... He must always be ready to doubt, not the other fellow's data, his own. When a fellow is no longer willing to doubt, he stops investigating. He already believes in something, he... or he has the answer.

And without any divine doubt, which is to say, „*Let's go in and just pummel our way through,*“ we got a subject known as Christian Science. Well, it's an interesting subject. There's no doubt about Christian Science being an interesting subject. Because as far as I know it's the only attempt - I mean, broad attempt - to unravel this problem of faith healing. Which is to say, still the problem of healing. Whether it's faith healing or antibiotic healing, we're still on the subject of healing. Somebody's trying to study this.

But they're also studying, if they say healing, sickness, and so that's still a modification. It's better if you just say, „*How do we make life better or more able or better, functionally?*“

Well, she studied this and in the absence of a great deal of material, of course, had considerable difficulty. Now, the biggest difficulties she had were oddly enough very, very specific. They were in the field of the mind and physics. And she walked in where Michael the Archangel himself wouldn't tread. And in the first prayer - get this - that Christian Science opens every service with, you have the most colossal error you ever saw which would of necessity bring about an apathetic and unhealthy mental condition in its people. Perforce it contains the words „*All is infinite space, infinite mind.*“

Now, running a preclear or two you will discover that as long as an individual believes a trap to have infinite boundaries, he believes he cannot escape it. He's finished. The second he finds out it has finite boundaries the trap loses. In other words, if you thought you could never get out of Phoenix because Phoenix went on forever in all directions you would certainly become convinced that you were just bogged down in Phoenix wouldn't you. Would you? You never could get out of it because no matter how far you traveled in all directions you still could not beat the barrier called space. You'd still find Phoenix. Therefore, you could never get out of Phoenix. Therefore, Phoenix was the all and everything of all and everything.

See? Infinite space, huh! That's the only thing that keeps anybody trapped in the MEST universe. They look around and it apparently is so big that they claim it is infinite. But even your better mathematicians today are talking about the expanding universe. Say look if anything can expand it is not yet infinite.

If there's anything true, it's certainly this: the MEST universe has finite dimensions. Well, „*Infinite space and infinite mind.*“ So, they went up on a rock, which they need never have gone up on. I suppose somebody merely wrote this in, or she wrote this in just as a wonderful sweep of the hand or a flourish of the pen or a nice word. Utterly untrue and calculated to booby-trap any science, any effort. Maybe if they'd just left that out of Christian Science, why, Christian Science all by itself would have succeeded, if they hadn't hung everybody with „*infinite space and infinite mind.*“

You see how that could be, how that could ruin all concerned? Let's tell somebody that he's in an infinite engram. He's got to keep on running it, and he'll never be finished with it, and he's in it. Boy, he'll start worshiping that engram won't he. It won. Well, there's no reason to make the MEST universe win. It is doing all right with no help.

All right. And yet where are we today in the field of reason? - you might say the healing of reason. Where would you go to in the society? Let's take conditions as they ex-

isted in 1945. Where would John Doe have gone in the society to have had something happen to his reason to better it? Let's say he'd been through a long and arduous war. Let's say he'd been many - two years, maybe, a prisoner of the enemy. He'd been starved; he was upset. He found out that every time he heard something drop in the middle of the night, or he heard an automobile horn at some far distance, he would be shattered, he'd lie there and shake. He'd find out that halfway through the night he might awaken in a terribly nervous state, sweating, be unable to do anything but walk around the block several times, something like this and so on. And having to... that would be all right if he didn't have anything else to do but sort of look at these symptoms. But he had to go on living too.

Now, what would that man do? Who would he turn to in the society? Who would he turn to? Would he turn to the medical doctor? The medical doctor, turned to, would say, „*Well, I don't know. These B1 shots that we're giving you are not too bad, you...*“

The fellow say, „*Yes, I feel fine for an hour,*“ he says, „*but what about the rest of the twenty-three hours?*“

„Well, have you ever been to church?“ I'm not being funny now. This was the reply of medical doctors in the services and outside the services to service men.

Hm! This is funny isn't it? That man's asking what can we do about this. Therefore, he must know inherently that the condition is something that can have something done for it. Just by the fact that he would seek help tells you that he is postulating that there is a remedy. And where would he go for this remedy? I say, the medical doctor - „*B1. Go to church. Why don't you go see somebody or other?*“

The psychologists, the clinical psychologists, who were on duty with the service or outside the service when approached were only evasive, very evasive. They were men full of great security which they never produced. They would say to the individual, „*Well... well, if we work for several years at this we probably can do...*“ This is psychoanalysts, also. „*If we work at this for a year I'll tell you whether or not you can do something about it.*“

The serviceman would say, 'All right. We'll work at it for a year.' He's willing.

Well, all right. Now... now we spend the first hour with the psychoanalyst or clinical psychologist - we're trying to find out where he's going to get the money to pay for four one-hour periods per week at fifteen to twenty-five dollars a period. That's sixty dollars a week minimum, to go on for a year just to discover if something can be done for him. Sixty a week? Well, I tell you, a fellow in that condition can't earn sixty a week. He's doing darn well if he can earn thirty.

You say the government will do something for these boys. Ha-ha! The government didn't do anything for them. The government couldn't and told them it couldn't. Well, in the society or in the service, they received a dead-end answer from psychology. In the field of analysis many doctors had taken up what they called narcosynthesis. If you knock them out deep enough and make them relive an experience, why, sometime something happens. They neglect to tell you that 85 or 90 percent of the time they drive a guy completely off his rockers with narcosynthesis.

One doctor told me... had the nerve to tell me in a meeting one time, „*You've said that something occurs which is not for the best in the field of narcosynthesis. Well, let me inform you that I've now been using it on servicemen for two years, and I have yet to know the derogatory or bad result.*“

And I said, „*Why, doctor, you need glasses.*“ And his colleagues laughed a little bit. And I said, „*Where are your clinical records? I'll be down tomorrow to see them,*“ as though I were a police force or something.

„*Oh, well,*“ he said, „*these ... uh, hmm.*“ he said, „*these have all been shipped back to the government.*“

I said, „Well, I'm sure we can get them back again. If you've never had a derogatory comment on the subject of narcosynthesis, I think that maybe we ought to review your cases or something.“

„*Oh, they're dispersed all over the place.*“

„*Oh, you mean there's no way to check back against your word... we have to take your word that there's no harm in narcosynthesis. You don't have a single clinical record, then, that backs this up.*“

„*Well, no, of course not.*“

„*Why don't you sit down and we'll get on with the lecture.*“

Naturally the fellow had known it time and time again but he said „*Here's a gimmick, here's some way I can probe into the mind somehow or another and dramatize that attempted abortion which I've been carrying around all these years, and nobody's going to take this dramatization away from me.*“ But it didn't do anything for the serviceman. What would you have done as a serviceman in 1945 in this society to receive any relief for nervousness, anxiety or anything of the sort? The answer is nothing. There was no profession in 1945 which produced any relief or any betterment in the field of psychosomatic illness, nervousness or the human mind.

Now, that's an awfully flat, blunt statement, and I am not really given to making statements that can't be backed up. That's the truth. There was none in 1945. It's 1954 now. We've just reversed those numbers, and there is one, and that's the Scientologist. You can go to a Scientologist.

And so if you wake up sweating in the middle of the night, the Scientologist can do something about it. He doesn't have to work with this character for 189 hours to do something about a symptom or a manifestation like that. This is a big broad symptom. The fellow says, I've got. .. my legs get so nervous, I get so tense, I can't see what I'm doing, I'm just about to go mad.“ The Scientologist has techniques which reduce this, almost immediately.

Interesting, isn't it? It looks like something must have happened here, then, in the last twenty-five years. There was nothing in 1945; there is something in 1954. Well, that's the difference. Let's look at the facts of the case, and let's not try to fight through, anymore, a bunch of fog and haze that is thrown up in front of people. What are the

facts of the case? And the facts of the case are there was nobody functioning in the society to bring about surcease from sorrow. Nobody.

A lot of people were talking about it and getting paid for it, but they weren't doing it. And now in Scientology we have people who are doing it.

Now, this investigation covered the whole field of the mind. It started out, actually, not in the field of nuclear physics, but started out, really, in the field of Freudian analysis. I was fortunate enough to be trained to some degree by Commander Thompson, who had himself studied with Sigmund Freud. And I was very young while this was going on. The first time I ran into Freudian analysis I was twelve years old. It's very amusing. But in banging around the world, I never had much time to go to school. I never went to high school. I took New York regents examinations and went immediately into engineering school in college.

There were many years in there when most boys are pinned down in classrooms when I wasn't. Well, I got quite interested when I was twelve, mostly because I was interested in Commander Thompson. And the years went along and I knew Thompson again here and there, and I read books that he sent me and so forth.

But in the interim I was in India, and I was struck with a horrible fact. India has all the data and none of the energy. The West has all the energy and none of the data. Freud was a... being sort of in the Oriental Europe, you might say, was more or less at a crossroads where the superstitions of the East would mingle with the force and efficiency of the West. He for the first time really decided to do something about this if he could, and that is what is remarkable about Freud. The decision to do something about it, and the teaching that something could be done about it was not introduced by Scientology, not by a long way. It was introduced by Sigmund Freud. And if he only introduced that fact, no matter how funny some of his solutions may seem to us, remember that this was a new and startling fact in a world which was totally unsympathetic.

He was a medical doctor. He gave up his entire medical career. He was thrown out of medicine, bodily, for daring to say that something could be done about the mind. Up to that time the mind was something that belonged to the priests and the witches. And Freud said it doesn't have to belong to the priests and witches, it really should belong to the field of medicine. And medicine sixty years after still had refused to accept the responsibility for the mind.

So obviously they don't want it. Freud tried to put into the field his own corps of practitioners. Unfortunately, they would not even adhere to what he was doing. But if they simply carried forward the message „*Look, something can be done about the human mind,*“ they were doing their bit, weren't they. They were paving the way. It was a long and arduous way, and it was arduously paved.

But that was all that was accomplished in the first half of the twentieth century. A number of people who kept saying, „*Look something can be done about the human mind. There are buried inhibitions and so forth, and man isn't acting quite right. And he, a... this material*

can be unburdened and then a person will be free. “ They never unburdened it; nobody ever got free.

The usual number - 22 percent of people who get well on anything, got well. And in spite of this tremendous discouragement and so forth which must have been Freud's, and which were his own people's discouragements... You see, they left him because he didn't have anything, really, to give them - beyond that message.

The fact remains that it was still a big open door in the society. That's the first time it happened in this cycle of progress here on Earth when somebody said, „*Look, we can do something about human behavior, the social order can be altered.*“

They were saying this without proof and without foundation, but they were saying it loud. And they were saying it very literarily. Enlisted on Freud's side are practically all of the writers of the first half of the twentieth century. Sooner or later all of them came around using as characterization mechanisms Freud's stream of consciousness and other things. Freud has been tremendously widely publicized by writers in literature. Therefore, the message has gone forward into the Western world repeatedly over and over and driven home many times, „*The human mind is something that can be understood. It's possible to understand the human mind.*“

The public has been left up in the air to this degree: Yes, they now realize that it's now possible for an expert with enough letters after his name and enough authority to do something about the mind. They've been totally sold on this fact. But there hasn't been anybody doing anything about the mind until now.

Now, that's interesting, isn't it? Now, if you went ahead as a practitioner and damned Freud and damned the doctors and damned this and caused a big war this way and that way, you would not be following forward into the inevitable consequence of this research and investigation. And that is the inheritance of all pioneering work which has been done in the direction of bettering the business of living. You would just divorce it. Don't forget that religion has bettered the business of living. Yes, it has. In a wild, cruel and barbaric atmosphere religion has often brought about a civilizing, rational hand. Whatever else it's done, however many billion men it's killed in the name of the Prince of Peace - we're not interested in this. We do recognize the factor that religion has been a continuing promise that something better could happen. It's been there all these years. No reason to kick it in the teeth. If you do you disconnect your communication line with the past. Your communication line with the past and your communication line with the public are identical. The public is in the past. Its total social culture, everything it has is a built-upon, derived, step-by-step procedure.

If you were to revolt, then, and choose out for your randomness, religion, you certainly would be denying an awful lot of people help wouldn't you. People know religion can help them. They would go to look for help along the cause and course of religion, wouldn't they? And where would religion drop them? It would drop them into the soup, of course. Well, it seems to be a very good joke that without fighting religion people go along the line of religion to be helped and they don't drop into the soup. They drop into a better state of beingness.

And people go in along the line that there's something there called Freudian analysis, and it can help people and it does remarkable things for people. There's no reason to take out Freudian analysis and use it for your randomness either because you're blocking a new communication line. So there's that communication line. Let them come to you for help from Freudian analysis, and get it. That's interesting. If they had come along for it ten years ago they would have dropped into the soup. Why let them fall in the soup?

And in the field of psychology they think somebody can do something for them, and so forth. Well, there wouldn't be any reason to fight psychology. Psychology was trying to make a scientific study of something toward - no goal, but people have an understanding that something like this was going along. Well, people that go into that direction for help include every student who ever enrolls in a psychology course. They go to the university and enroll in a psychology course normally because they or an immediate member of their family need help. And where do they get four years later? They drop into the soup, don't they? I think that something else ought to be taught there in the university - something that would give them that help maybe in the first few months they were in school. That would be an interesting thing wouldn't it? Well, why fight psychology?

Everywhere we look, as far as medicine is concerned, medicine isn't even reaching along this line. And people sometimes ask a doctor something about this, but not very seriously. They have no faith or hope in the doctor, as far as psychosomatic medicine is concerned. If you don't believe that go around and ask your neighbors. They'll say, „*Urr-yeah. Well, we're not going to have any more operations or anything like that. We've already bitten that one, we..*” so forth.

Now, that means that after twenty-five years of investigation we sit here with some answers. They're demonstrably answers; they produce results. Fantastic, but it does; we produce results.

But remember we don't just sit here after twenty-five years of investigation. We're sitting here after some forty-five hundred years of modern civilization. Remember that. Now, man has been going along that line the whole distance, trying to get to some finite end where he could be better off; where he could be free. You're now in a position to make him better off and make him free. So you better take ownership and responsibility for the whole line, and you will then achieve your goals and the goals of Scientology.

He wants to see a psychologist? Okay, you're a psychologist. He wants to see a psychoanalyst? Okay, you're a psychoanalyst. He wants to see a minister? You're the minister. And as far as the medical doctor is concerned, we will some day license those.

As far as this goes, though, man today has been led to believe something that isn't true: that these fields can help him. Therefore, we had better play the very, very dirty trick on those who didn't want to help him by letting the gates open and letting those fields help him.

The best way to do that is by being all fields related to psychosomatic medicine. We are the first answer, we're not the first communication line. Remember that. We're the first to have the answers, we're not the first to have the communication line. So we'll have to use past communication lines to apply our answers.

In the whole field of Scientology, a study of it from beginning to end would reveal to you that there is really nothing new in Scientology - really nothing new. There's an enormous simplification, and the true facts that apply have been sorted out from those that didn't apply. You will find any line of Scientology in almost any philosophy that was ever written. But there's a curve on them the way they were written. They didn't work.

Well, don't try to specialize in being new; just try to specialize in being effective. And in your studies of this, the most effective works as we come along the line are, of course, Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health as the first public book, the earliest book Scientology: A New Science and Science of Survival and Issue 16-G and Issue 24-G of the Journal of Scientology, as well as the PABs and then these innumerable lectures that are contained in the lecture libraries.

There is the information. We have that information. The most important parts of it are the writings which I have just named to you. You should be familiar with those. If you're familiar with those, you're actually familiar with twenty-five years of research and investigation. There isn't anything else or anything hidden or anything new or strange or peculiar that's going to hit you in the eye that isn't included in those works. It's there.

(end of lecture)