

## **BE, DO, HAVE STRAIGHTWIRE**

A lecture given on  
4 May 1954

This is the 4th of May.

The procedure which I am going to tell you about this morning is the interweaving procedure with Viewpoint Straightwire. Now, it might appear to you when you first test or try to do Viewpoint Straightwire that there isn't anything else than that that you could do. I mean, it would just seem that you've pretty well filled up everything in all classifications, and so forth.

Well, there's one thing you haven't filled up. And you will notice this on a case as you go along. Now, you could take just viewpoint Straightwire, you know, and carry along with it very nicely without too much difficulty. As a good auditor, looking for other things in the case that might possibly be speeded up or something like that all of a sudden a demon steps out in front of the fellow or something of the sort and this alarms him a great deal. And he's so alarmed that he doesn't go on processing easily. He keeps thinking about this. Well, you'd have sense enough, of course, being a professional auditor, to duplicate the demon several times.

You see, by duplication of this same thing several times you actually raise his tolerance in viewing it. Which again is immediately on the goal of this process, which is to raise the tolerance of the individual.

You see, it's far more frightening to view fifteen or twenty demons than one, actually, and you've just raised his tolerance from one demon up to fifteen or twenty. So that's right along the goal of processing - duplication of such sudden automaticities, particularly frightening ones.

All right. Let's take the process itself, and there is a very complete process here. But remember that this process is inside space, since it's talking about a viewpoint. You recognize that.

Actually, it gives the person tremendous tolerance of space so as to go up into knowingness. But it is inside space, most of this process, and you're getting him to tolerate things one after the other.

Now, there is a consideration which goes along with anything and everything that we are doing which must be taken into account. And that is the dynamic principle of existence as announced in 1947. The dynamic principle of existence is "Survive." Life is surviving. Those things which we know of as life forms are, each and every one of them, trying to survive. Whatever else they're trying to do, they're trying to survive.

All right. What limitation does this have? Well, it doesn't have any limitation at all when applied to life forms. 1947 dynamic principle of existence is just as true today as it was in '47, as it was when the first book was issued and now.

What happens is, the enlargement of beingness when it exceeds the life form unfolds into a fan, you might say, which gives you that curve - create, survive, destroy. But when you have assumed that curve, you have stepped off the dynamic principle of existence of a life form. You are now dealing with something else.

Now, it'd be very, very easy to get poetic and call this something like a god form. It would be truer than poetic, actually. But when an individual's attention comes away from executing the business of existence twenty-four hours a day as a life form, it starts to come away from survive. And only then comes away from survive, and develops, then, into the curve of which survive is a part.

Now, the cycle of action of the MEST universe is the curve, create-survive-destroy. However, a life form is at the point "survive." That is all it is concentrated on. Persist. It knows nothing else; there is no further reason for it whatsoever. It has no additional rationale.

Now, how would we take this factor - being such a powerful and embracive factor - how would we take this factor into account with a process which was yet a very easy process?

Well, it would require that we had already understood the human experience equivalence of space, energy and matter. The equivalence in terms of human experience of space, energy and matter are, in that order, be, have and do. I refer you to Scientology 8-8008 which actually today is the book which has more technical information in it than any other single book. That book, 8-8008, is the book which contains all the information accurately. And it contains a great deal about be, have and do and universes, and so forth. And it is a book that an auditor should have and should understand entirely. Because I'm not going to cover this morning why, in all of its ramifications, space in human experience becomes beingness, why doingness in human experience becomes energy, or energy in human experience becomes doingness, and why time becomes havingness. And yet that is the case. Be, do, have. You could... at first glance you would say this is obviously space, energy and matter.

Actually, in human experience we then get a sufficient factor added to matter, you see, to get this thing called time. And so you can just put it down for your everyday use - it's just as true today as it ever was - that when you talk about beingness in human experience (beingness), we translate that over into the form of mechanics (universes) as space. And if we want to solve a problem in space, we solve a problem in beingness.

Of course, it's very easy to see how energy becomes doingness, but it would be just a little more difficult to see how time becomes havingness. And yet it does. We have the old phenomenon of a case stuck on the time track. If you want to unstick a case on the time track, all you have to do is increase his havingness and you will unstick him on the time track and that's that. It's very simple.

Time in human experience becomes havingness. That's really all there is to it. And for further details on this and a great deal more discussion, and so forth, as I say, I refer you to Scientology 8-8008 which is the area where all this material was developed and which, by the way, we're still leaning on and working from. Scientology 8-8008 is not something which has been developed and then abandoned or bypassed or overridden. It is the mass of data which we are using and we are depending on it consistently and continually.

Well, all right. It means, then, that in this process which you have called Viewpoint Straightwire you are not immediately handling time if you are handling viewpoints. Now, there are other Straightwires that you could use which would more clumsily represent havingness than the one I'm going to give you. You could go out on the basis of a very complicated basis, let me assure you, making space with speech. You know, "Give me somebody you wouldn't mind making a universe with speech," or something like that. I mean, there are many ways it could be handled but they're all relatively clumsy.

So let's go over onto a much more intimate and direct problem here and find that we can use these principles of be, do and have. So this is Be, Do and Have Straightwire - Be, Do, Have Straightwire.

Now, survive translates easily into approval. Now, you will say that's quite a gap there. It's not much of a gap. An individual in this society survives in ratio to the amount of approval he obtains. And he declines to the degree of the amount of disapproval which comes his way, or the amount he is ignored. If you think you could live as a body in this society without approval or disapproval, try it sometime. It's not possible.

Attention itself is the factor here which you can see fits very easily into this. In other words, attention. An individual survives actually as well as he is able to maintain attention - you know, is able to give attention, receive attention.

Well, instead of attention let's say approval as a condition of attention. And therefore we get this wisecrack which you hear auditors making every once in a while, and that is a license to survive. Every once in a while the HAS hears this in the light of certificates. It's a very peculiar thing, although auditors joke about these certificates, and so forth, they themselves being somewhat more enlightened - considerably more enlightened than the public at large, you see - look at these things and they say, "Why, good heavens. I mean, all of this paper. Heaven sakes. All of these certificates from these various organizations with which the HAS has understandings, and so forth. I mean, good heavens, what could you do with all this paper?"

Just go out and show it to the society. Try and do something without it being plastered on the wall. That's all. That's the answer.

For instance, a member of the Church had a small card printed and, having already obtained his ordination and so forth, thought no more about it, and the other day went through a fire line. He went through a fire line, just like that, and gave some emergency auditing to somebody who had been suffocated in the fire and brought him out of it and knocked out the trauma.

He just simply pulled a calling card out of his pocket which said on it that he was a doctor of divinity. And the firemen just opened up that fire line. Well, by golly, I don't think they'd open up a fire line to a mayor! The one thing they always let inside a fire line is a priest, a chaplain, a minister. Or a newspaper reporter. We don't have any particular cards on this, but if you want to become a special correspondent sometime to the Journal of Scientology, you're...

Now, being fairly well enlightened as a group and fairly well liberated from many of these prejudices, it is often a case whereby you have gapped away from the society. You have left a bit of a chasm of understanding between you and the society. Just because you yourself no longer find certain things necessary, you sometimes are prone to assume in the field of agreement that the society no longer finds these things necessary.

Well, if you're going to do anything in this society or for this society, you'll find out that it demands licenses to survive. It demands them. And they better be good, accurate ones, and easily checked back and founded on fact, and all that sort of thing.

It probably means, in processing a preclear, the difference between fifteen minutes of Opening Procedure, and ten or twelve hours of "slug and apology" - just having a piece of paper up on the wall which is beautifully engraved and says you know your business. Somebody's granted you, evidently, a license to survive. The preclear sees this, and he says, "Why, this fellow knows his business. Of course, I'm as good as well already."

You see, it's not an artificial thing. It is part of the woof and warp of existence itself in the society, these licenses to survive.

Well, all right. Survival translates - when we hit into the field of attention strongly - translates into approval and disapproval. And so we get a key phrase which applies to any of the dynamics and which applies to be, have and do. It's more euphonic to say be, have and do but it's not the accurate scale because energy condenses into matter, you see?

There is this bridge there where, then, you will be able to have a time sequence in a Straightwire process simply by using this key phrase. Now, a model using part of the phrase - or using the phrase itself - would go something like this: "Give me something they will let you have. Now tell me something or think of something that you will let them have. Now something that people will let people have." That's on time, and that's a direct process of time.

If you went ahead on viewpoints exclusively and tried to use this other unwieldy concept of; well, making viewpoints with effort, and so forth, you would find that you were losing a little time in the case. You were losing a little time because you were not very directly processing time.

So we interlard Viewpoint Straightwire with Be, Have and Do Straightwire, and at no time do we ever confuse these two processes. They are cousins. They're not brother and sister. They're not the same process. They're cousins. Because in Be, Have and Do Straightwire we get immediately this factor of survival, approval. And we directly process approval, just like that. And when we have processed approval, we also process time. And we've gotten about the highest echelon bridge there that you could build between a free mind and a thoroughly condensed and mired down society.

Well, that is - and should be - the bridge between the auditor and the preclear. He is somebody with a free view and a very high tolerance level, communicating with somebody who is, without his assistance, about to become a rock.

As you run this process, those individuals which are sold on the idea of fame, who are sold on the idea of "endure forever in the present form," when we process somebody who is working on the computation "I mustn't change my mind because any change at all would be a lessening of survival," we find that the case has a tendency to break in half and then into small pieces by the introduction of this particular Straightwire - Be, Do, Have Straightwire. I don't care which one you call it - Be, Have and Do; Be, Do and Have. It is really Beingness Processing, Action Processing and Time Processing all codified together into one process. So let's not lose sight of this process or its antecedents or the causes which lie within it and simply decide to (quote) "remedy havingness" while we are doing Viewpoint Straightwire. We're not doing the same thing at all. We are omitting - when we remedy this havingness - we are omitting the most significant point in Be, Have and Do Straightwire, which is of course survive, approval and attention connected to time.

All right. A full rundown on this process would be as follows. Now, you notice that I am going to give you this process as though Have came first and Do came second and Be came last. And I'm doing that because that's the order you had better run them on the case. Runs like this:

All right, you say to the preclear - you've asked him, now, questions, and so forth, you've used a little bit of Viewpoint Straightwire on him, and maybe you've handled four or five types of questions. Then you run this other process in on him. You say, "Well, now what would..." And here we can put the whole series of dynamics. I mean, it gets big as far as a scheme, as the German... Oh, how a German would love this - schema. Oh, gorgeous. "Now, what would (dynamic; any one of the eight dynamics) let you have? Okay, now what would you let (any one of the dynamics) have?" That would be the formula for the whole series.

And the practical purpose - the first question which you would put to the preclear for practical purposes is, "Well, what would they let you have?" This is murder. It's a murderous question. And he's liable to pick up a time lag on it that is something like the round trip from here to the next galaxy.

Now, remember to ask him right after that - let's not let him get one - sided about this - "Now what would you let them have?" And just processing in a very highly loose, general fashion, those are really the first two questions you would ask him. "Now, what'll they let you have?" You see that nebulous, supernebulous "they." Well, that's a real good case entrance for him. And "What would you let them have?"

Now, of course we just go down the line. "What would you let yourself have?" "What would yourself let you have?"

"What would you let women have?" if he's a man. "What would you let men have?" if he's a woman. "What would you let groups have? What would groups let you have? What would

mankind let you have? What would you let mankind have? What would animals let you have? What would you let animals have?" And then, of course, "What would space let you have?" Of course, the answer to that is nothing, the doggone stuff. And so on, up through the parts of the dynamic. And then, "What would spirits let you have? What would you let spirits have?" And, of course, "What would the Devil let you have?" That, by the way, is a very artificial thing, to introduce God and the Devil every time we say eighth dynamic. You know, the eighth dynamic does not mean God and the Devil? Do you know that the eighth dynamic is infinity turned upright. And all the eighth dynamic is, is infinity. It's just the from-here-on-out aspect.

After we've finished up havingness, at the moment (that is to say, got him over to a point where he's at least stuttering, you see - I mean, you get him up that high; don't leave him at a point where he's speechless), you would go into, if you cared to - not necessary for you to do this at this time - but the complete process is "What will (any dynamic) let you do? What will you let (any dynamic) do?"

And of course, that works out, the first nebulous question, "Well, what will they let you do? And what will you let them do?" would be the first two questions you'd ask.

By the way, you'd ask each one of these questions over and over and over. "What would you let them do? And something else you'd let them do? And something else you'd let them do? And something else you'd let them do? Now, what would they let you do? And something else they'd let you do. And something else." Every time he comes up with the answer. And certainty interweaves in this too, you know - this fellow's got to be certain they'd let him do that.

On havingness, for instance, I ran one preclear and found out the only possible thing that they - this nebulous they - would let him have was a runny nose. That's the only thing he could be certain they would let him have.

Well, anyway, we get the next bracket on this particular type of Straightwire, and it, of course, is "What would they let you be? What would you let them be?" The formula being, "What would (any dynamic) let you be? What would you let (any dynamic) be?"

And so we have there covered human experience. The most important of these as the interweaving factor which is used with Viewpoint Straightwire is, of course, havingness. You see, beingness is an equivalent of space and you're already processing with Viewpoint Straightwire a great deal of space - space, space, space, space, space, space. So the missing factor as you process this Straightwire would naturally be havingness, which would be time. And we're processing that in conjunction with the idea of approval. We're processing time and approval with the same question. That's why this acts like a bomb on a case. It is a terrible process. I mean, this process is a terrible process rather than otherwise. You can change the havingness level of a person, though, with this process faster than any other process with which I have any acquaintance. The havingness level. His acceptance level. Because we have established a new thing in his approval level. You have acceptance level, and you know all about that. Well, now just have approval level, and you will see what I mean about it.

This in terms of havingness, of course, would be a donor level. "What would you give away?" Now, let's take that up for a moment. Do you realize that every case that you run into that's having a rough time can't give anything up? He can't give up a single aberration, he can't give up anything. And if you get a case that's in terrible condition, they will sit in your auditing room - a girl, for instance, gripping her purse, gripping her shoes, actually, with curled toes. Try and remove her coat so that she can be more comfortable. Oh, no you don't. Try and remove her hat. Get her to set her purse down alongside of the couch.

Now, I processed such a person once and was - oh, many, many, many years ago - and was very struck by a single factor which for years lingered as a little element in all the computations that had to be accounted for. I persuaded this girl to put her purse on my desk over eight feet from her. I found out that was the one thing she couldn't do, so I thought, "That's as good an entrance point as any other. She's completely out of communication. We're having an awful

time here. There isn't anything we can process on her." She couldn't run an engram or a lock or remember anything of her past. "That purse is going to sit over here on this desk." I just willed it as such, and that's what's going to happen.

And I finally persuaded her, inch by inch, to get that purse out of her perimeter of reach until she got it over on the desk and went back. This is a very remarkable case history. It's one of those that made a milestone. When she got that purse over on the desk, and went back and sat down on the couch, she all of a sudden broke down and cried. Just heartbrokenly, bitterly, sobbed, became angry, became very antagonistic, took a look at me and talked to me as a normal human being.

And I looked at this as one of the most stunning exhibitions of a broken psychosis I could imagine. So I carefully observed everything which had taken place in the session so that no wild factor was sitting there, and just racked it up for future reference. Something in that room at that time had made this girl well. I was not willing at that time to assume it is a purse or anything of the sort. Maybe the way I communicated to her, maybe the factor that she felt she had finally succumbed to a man, if we granted Freud any latitude; you know, she'd done something a man told her to do. Many of these things could have been the point.

Well, that can be repeated today in the form of Straightwire or in Opening Procedure to get the preclear to give something up. Let somebody else have something, though, rather than throw something away. Now, as soon as I understood that finally, that it was not just throwing something away that made a person well, it was giving somebody something. She had finally been able to give into somebody else's keeping something of her own. And this was what broke the back of the case.

There are many interesting cases, but we're here not to hear about those fabulous cases which Hubbard has done, times when Hubbard has sat cross-legged trying to look comfortable alongside of a fakir who was being very comfortable on a bed of spikes, whereas Hubbard couldn't even be comfortable on pavement with his legs crossed - Americans don't sit well that way, you know. And we're not here to reminisce and chew up a lot of theory and to make something out of a theory. That, by the way, is part of the scientific method. You always make something out of a theory. We're not here to do any of those things. We're simply here to learn and examine what appear to be the basic fundamentals of existence and apply them as directly as possible as processes.

Any one of these definitions, such as the definition for communication, is a process.

Anything of the Chart of Attitudes, top and bottom scale, could be made into a process. The thing for you to know is definitions.

But we're not even really here to learn definitions. We're here to make it possible for you to produce a new being. We are not here for you to overhaul and patch up an old one. The goal of Scientology today doesn't have anything to do with repair crews.

That is a fine way, however, of attracting attention. And it is one of the steps of liberation. An individual's superiority to a machine or any object is demonstrated by the fact that he can change its state. If he can change its state for better or for worse, he's demonstrated his superiority. This is so hard to do on a constructive, creative side that man rather uniformly changes the state of things by blowing them up. If you were to leave a house unguarded some distance from other houses, and so forth, you would come back sooner or later, maybe in one month, maybe in two or three, but certainly sometime, you would find that it had had its windows burst in and its boards torn up, and so forth.

Nobody has come along and planted a new rose arbor. This would be unheard of. In order to be fully conversant with the business of existence, you have to assume a state of mind where you at once could either plant a rose arbor around a vacant house or knock the windows in. Matter of

free choice, just willingness to do so. If you went compulsively out on either line, you would violate the most primary definition which we have.

Now, I'm going to talk to you about that primary definition for a moment, since we've just talked about survive as what life is doing. There's a theory called the theta-MEST theory. And this theory...

Oh, I just remembered something. The original statement of the theta- MEST theory was never published, never even put down in notes. But the original statement of it - and which I think I used later on once in a while - the first statement of it was a no-motion is impinged upon an all-motion. And these two things coming together combine into medium, erratic or controlled motions. That's the theta-MEST theory. Theta is the Greek word for thought, and it was necessary to define what thought was, since there were no real definitions for it.

And when we said MEST we were referring mainly to the physical universe, which is a universe and was conceived at that time to be chaos. Some very interesting subtheories developed out of this. There's such a thing as enMEST, which is MEST which has been organized and which has then been enturbulated.

And then there's something called entheta. Now, you still hear that word surviving. It is thought which was once organized but which has been enturbulated - enturbulated thought. And that means entheta. Just coined words.

But the original theory, theta-MEST theory, was actually a no-motion acting upon an all-motion. And this was a better dynamic description of what was going on than others, and so it became very workable.

Now, this became refined sooner or later to a very exact definition of this thing called theta.

Theta is, of course, just a letter in the Greek alphabet which traditionally for the Greeks stood for thought. And a further examination of this actually discovered that something of this character, such an item as this, could be best described as having no wavelength, having no mass, having no location in space, and having no position in the past, present or future. And that is a definition of a static.

And that is the first definition of a static which is known to the field of physics. Now, that definition is not yet known very widely to physics. Physicists here and there pick it up and look at it and gag slightly because the first thing they will tell you is "Why, of course there's such a thing as a static. All a static is, is something held in an equilibrium of forces." Oh, no, it's not.

You can disprove this to them immediately. You can say, "All right. Set up a problem whereby something is in an equilibrium of forces."

And they say, "Well, that ball sitting there on the table, that's an equilibrium of forces. The table is pushing up and the ball is pushing down, and so it's in an equi..."

You say, "Yes, and it happens to be moving at one thousand miles an hour, just by reason of being on the surface of the earth." Because any spot on the surface of the earth is moving at a thousand miles an hour. There's seven other directions that that 'static' which you have just pointed out as being in an equilibrium of forces - seven other directions it's traveling incident to its being part of a solar system." That's all.

There blows up the physicist's static. And the actual static has to be moved in under it. As soon as this is done, by the way, the science of physics begins to clarify, and clarifies enormously the second you define space.

Space is a viewpoint of dimension. And as soon as you say that, why, the science of physics begins to be a science. I don't mean to be snide and say the boys have been working without a

science, because they have had something which worked finitely when applied within very rigid limits - like fulcrums, balances, that sort of thing.

But they rode on out there toward an atom bomb and they came to the end of their tether. They ran out of definitions. Before they invented the atom bomb, somebody should have taken a slight glance at the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which in 1885 said that physics would make its greatest advances when at last it had a definition for space and a definition for time and, furthermore, that these definitions were in the province of psychology and did not properly belong in the field of physics, and said that physics was waiting upon psychology in order to do something.

And we got some character by the name of Wundt who in 1876 applied - or some such date - applied the scientific method, he said, to human behavior. Even William James remarks on this factor that time and space are mental conditions and problems. Every psychologist of note anywhere along the line has remarked upon this factor, and every psychologist of note or no note has completely ignored his chief responsibility. And every physicist, every single physicist, including Newton, and all the rest of the boys, have fallen flat on their faces by not establishing the basic conditions of what they were dealing with. They have started from an unreasonable assumption. They've assumed that somebody knew what space was, and have gone on from there. And they've decided that somebody knew what a static was, and they've gone on from there.

And of course they'd wind us up in trouble sooner or later with a thing like an atom bomb. Naturally, they'd wind us up in trouble because they didn't know where they were proceeding. This is not an indictment, you understand, of science at large. It's just hoping it will perish soon. Because if this is the scientific method, to start with unreasonable assumptions and never discover what your definitions are before you proceed into a problem, then we want nothing to do with a scientific method. And you actually are then not following the scientific method, because that is the scientific method.

You're really not dealing, then, in the field of science if the field of science is what we have had in psychology and physics. Because then we are not dealing with this. Because we do this, and there are a new set of principles established here. And the only thing you could call them, I guess, would be a Scientological method, as unhandy as Scientology becomes when you start to add suffixes to it. That is, you make no assumptions without definitions. You use no terms which are not defined. You relate all theory to human experience or living experience. Relate all theory to living experience. And if it doesn't add up in the world of livingness, blow it up, throw it away. It's no good.

And it does not permit a definition to be defined in terms of its own parts. It doesn't permit, then, a definition to be a number of descriptive words which are defined by each other. It never permits a definition to be so established.

So let's look at that, let's look that over as the conditions of a new methodology rather than an old thinkingness. We are not dealing with anything called logic. Logic is something that came up in the days of Aristotle. It was codified very heavily in his day. We are not dealing with this, as we know it, logic. We are dealing with gradient scales of related facts. If that's logic, all right, but we have had to redefine logic to use logic. Gradient scales of related facts. And we are subjecting ourselves, here, to a discipline so much more arduous than the discipline of physics that if a physicist were to examine it he would at first be rather appalled. He would try to throw it back in your face, he would try to run away, he would try to scoff at it, he'd probably try to say there... it didn't come out of Cornell or something in order to get rid of it. But he would never quite be able to sit down to his drawing board or his test tube, or whatever a physicist does these days, or his bicarbonate of soda. Come to think about it, the physicist dealing with the government probably sits down to his bicarbonate of soda three times a day. That's probably what he does.



He'd never be able to get this... shake loose from these assumptions. Now, I'm not talking now about our definitions of things. I'm just talking about the discipline of thinkingness in which Scientology exists. And believe me, that is rarefied air.

That lays down a discipline which is superior to the discipline of physics, vastly superior to the discipline of chemistry and so different from anything related in the past to the field of psychology that you can't relate the two subjects. You cannot relate psychology and Scientology. Somebody will come along and he'll say, "Well, uh ... oh, yes. Well, the psychologists have known that for a long time." You just be real perky. Just say, "Well, what have psychologists known all this time?"

"Oh, uh... let's see. What did you just say?"

And you'll say, "Well, go ahead. What did psychologists know all this time?"

"Well," he said, "just like you said a moment ago." Don't echo it for him. Just leave him hanging there looking embarrassed. Because this is their standard trick. And you say, "Well, the mind" - let's get very basic, 1947 - "The mind is composed to resolve problems for the organism relating to survival. Now, that would be the function of what we call a brain," and anything..."

"Oh," he would say, "why, psychology has known that for a long time."

Don't forget to do this trick to him. Don't let yourself get plowed under and lose an argument in that fashion. Just make nothing out of him fast. And you say, "All right. What has psychology known for a long time?"

He'll say, "Oh, that."

And you say, "What did I just say?"

"Duuuh."

Because that is the psychological method. Just echo everything. That's all. If you read a fact in this place, then multiply it into that place. And then collect it in another place, and if somebody else has said it, then you put it in another place, but then you cross-relate it in another index and you file it somewhere else.

Then you conduct an experiment where you have presupposed the result, tabulate the fact that you have found the result, forget to put the result down and call it a scientific method. You think I'm being sarcastic now. I don't happen to be sarcastic. I'm being absolutely, factually truthful.

This statement on the part of Mr. Wundt was a very, very good statement. He said, "Now, I'm going to apply the scientific method to the field of human behavior." But get how different his discipline was from the discipline under which you operate. Get how different these two disciplines are.

He did not impose upon himself, now, the necessity to establish, define and state the scientific method. See? He says, "I'm now going to apply the scientific method to the field of human mind and behavior." Now, our discipline would immediately necessitate that if we were going to do this we'd have to look it over now and find everything undefined in the problem, everything undefined, and we'd define it. We'd find there was a word down there at the end of one of the sentences, and we didn't know what the hell it was. That would immediately, then, check us from jumping off from that point until we'd established that word. You see that?

Now, it was perfectly all right in the sloppy discipline of 1876 and 1955 - wherever psychology is operating - to simply say, "Well, we apply the scientific method." The first definition in print

on the scientific method is long after Professor Wundt. And it is long, long after people had used it threadbare and is not an accurate or correct statement.

The scientific method which is used today was discussed with the engineers at Bell Laboratories - Ma Bell - at lunch hours, until they had finally decided what they were doing. Here we let somebody decide what he was doing instead of deciding what was so. And we found out that the scientific method, in their understanding, was so-and-so and so-and-so. But in discussing it for a few lunch hours they had established a brand-new scientific method. They had made a better definition out of it than had existed before. And that scientific method which they then defined ran this way:

They take a theory or a datum which predicts where new data will be found, which when looked for will be found to exist in fact. In other words, scientific method is a system of prediction used by entering on this basis: Well, something may be so. Now let's see if any data exists to demonstrate it. Why, then, this theory has some validity and possibly will predict some more data. Now we'll go look for that new data and find out if it exists anyplace, and if that exists this theory is getting pretty good. And we'll see if it predicts some more data. And if it predicts some more data, by golly, that's getting pretty good. And if it doesn't predict all the data that we did find, then there's something wrong with the theory, so we get a new theory. See. And we refine the theory and go ahead from there.

Now, that actually is a refined statement of the scientific method as of 1950. And if any invention is connected with it, it is the engineers at Bell Labs. Now, you'll find people who every once in a while will tell you, why, the scientific method is all written up in - oh, there's a big mention of it or something. You go look at that publication. Yes, yes, yeah. It's written up. Says "the scientific method," and then skips it.

In other words, the discipline in this field called science did not match the word called science. The discipline did not match the word called science. Because science means truth. It is taken from the word scio - s-c-i-o - which is "knowing in the fullest sense of the word." That's quote-unquote. Scio means "knowing in the fullest sense of the word."

And so there you have, of course - in knowingness - you have at once the combination of truth and knowledge. And if science then was interested in truth and knowledge fully, they never would have shilly-shallied up the line anyplace and excused themselves one way or another lamely by saying what? That the problem of the human mind was too complex to solve. And you'll find that statement repeated over and over, book after book, year after year, clear back to 1876. Any unit which operates on the basis that its goal cannot be achieved must be operating in an apathy.

Let's get that clearly, that any organization which operates on the basis that its problem is unsolvable or its goal cannot be achieved must perforce be operating in an apathy. They assumed, before they ever started to solve the problem, the problem could not be solved. And so we get to the first and foremost discipline which we have in Scientology, which was the first postulate on the track of Dianetics and Scientology. And a very early postulate - 1932.

This whole work was done succeeding the postulate "The problem of the human mind is sufficiently simple to be solved." Now, that's the basic postulate on the line. Now get this clearly: Of what importance in a preclear is this thing called a basic postulate? You can see that, that a preclear attaches enormous importance to the postulates he makes. Isn't that true?

Well, get the whole field of psychology operating on the postulate that they couldn't solve their problem. And now do you want to classify Scientology and psychology?

The whole field of physics was operating on the postulate that it couldn't solve its problems until psychology had solved the problem. What kind of an apathy is this that follows in succession to another apathy? So where was this thing called the scientific method and where was science?

And the question can well be asked - not perfunctorily or pompously, or anything of the sort - but for your own orientation, the question could be asked, Was there any science in this society? Or was it simply a system of trial and error which had been dignified into a pomposity called science? Now, that is something you can actually use to split apart an enormous amount of preconceived information. If you will just look at "What was psychology? What's physics? What have they done with these things? Have they reached any zenith? Is their methodology something which I am using?"... If you can answer those questions, just by answering them, just by seeing it clearly - not just emotionally, but just by knowing this material, by looking around in the world and seeing there's some truth in this you immediately are higher up and further out on a road that leads somewhere. And on that road there may be a point called civilization. But no civilization can exist in the absence of science.

No civilization can exist in the absence of a science of mind, no civilization can exist in the absence of a science of the physical universe. Both of which must be based, to exist, upon reasonable, fully defined assumptions. You can't go wandering around in the dark and arrive at any civilization.

No, you arrive somewhere else when you start - let's be colloquial about it - when you start kidding the society, when you start kidding yourself and kidding the society, that it has solved a great many things when it hasn't, that it possesses an enormous amount of technology which it doesn't. You wind up a society at the only place you can wind it up - the end of the cycle of action of the MEST universe: Destruction. And there is where the society stops. And it stops without ever really having gotten started.

Because what is, what would a society be which was totally dependent on other-determinism to consistently and continually create its beingness - in other words, dependent on just the whim of fate whether it lived or died. You'd say that was a society which was in the field of superstition. "Maybe luck will get us through." So we must have been living in the dark ages of superstition all the way along the line. And only believing that we weren't simply because people said so loudly we weren't.

This has been called an enlightened age. And it is an age which has found, born in this society, the tools of its destruction. And if we in Scientology were entirely muzzled, it would never have grasped the tools of creation. Never.

This is the sole forward push on the field of creation. That makes a sort of a sad "lonely one" sort of a complex, doesn't it, for all of us? And nevertheless it's quite true that this push is not something to make people's minds better. It's not something that just makes people hopeful or patches up some decayed or decrepit bodies. That isn't what this business of Scientology is all about.

We have a bear by the tail, whether we like it or not. This is the sole forward motion in the direction of a creative beginning cycle of action for a society. Launched in the teeth of a society which has as its highest accomplishment the invention of its suicide weapon - the atom bomb. Its highest accomplishment was the development of a gun with which to blow out its brains.

Now, if you looked at a preclear and saw him in that state, you would say, "Good heavens, what on Earth do we have here?"

Now, if we are true to what we are trying to do, and if we gaze broadly at our goals, we find out that our goal is not, then, a well preclear. That isn't our goal. Our goal is broader than that, and well preclears and startling results simply serve to attract a sufficient attention on the part of a society to slam home the data which they are missing and which they need desperately to put themselves back together again.

If we can make the society alert to the existence of a body of knowledge which can keep its wheels turning by making people well, well, we'll make people well. But this is not a basic goal.

And any practitioner in Scientology who gets pinned down to the belief that he is a practitioner in the field of healing had better not forget what he's a practitioner in the field of healing of. He's a practitioner in the field of healing of a society.

And this is an awfully big chunk of responsibility. It's real big. And it's not easily won, because if you've ever tried to hold down somebody who's trying to take poison, or a snake in his death throes, you'll get the idea of how you can get kicked around by an organism whose self-destruction you're trying to interrupt. You can get kicked around violently. You don't have to expect to get kicked around, but if you don't predict that you're sooner or later, now and then, going to be booted around some, that you're going to look like you lose as well as look like you win, you're not predicting accurately.

The mission of a Scientologist is the application of the definitions which he knows to the problems of civilization as they may appear to him. The reason I talked to you about that this last half hour is very, very important, actually, to you. Because these two processes - Viewpoint Straightwire; Be, Do and Have Straightwire - break the back of any case that they're laid into. If they're done as they're done, and if you have sufficient discipline in yourself to recognize how much technology lies behind this and what that technology is good for. And if you know that, these processes will work for you very easily.

Therapeutic Scientology, on this May the 4th, 1954, is a solved problem. Now, you find that out, and then you'll know why I talked to you about you having to practice the role of healer to a society, because a preclear is too easy.

Thank you.

(end of lecture)