

# THE UNKNOWN DATUM – A MEST SHAKING LECTURE

A lecture given on 14 September 1955

You look at this Ability that I finished writing at 8:30 this morning and it says, "How to Start a Practice," and it's something we have had under trial here and it works. And it's the most workable darned idea you ever saw in your life. And it's going to be so workable, about the only thing that makes it fall down is the incapability of the individual attempting to execute it. And he, of course, could be sufficiently bunglesome, every time he answered the phone, he could say, "What the hell do you want now," you know.

Well, that's not within the program. But we know now that an auditor can start a practice and continue on along this line, outside the field of psychotherapy.

It's simply an ad that says – you run in the paper – says "Personal Relations." Ad – run it in the personals column. Of course, you have to run it quite often and long – couple of weeks before you'll get your first call probably because people'll think it's a code message. It says, "Personal Relations." They see it's there time and time again. They finally decide, "Well, he means business. I'll call him up." "Personal Relations: I will talk to anyone for you about anything." Now, you've heard of that around here, heard a rumor about it. But you didn't know how well it was going. It was going two and three calls a day in spite of the fact the phone wasn't manned except between four and six.

Okay. Now, I want to talk to you about something far, far more important than what I've been talking to you about, as if anything could be more important than that.

I want to talk to you about the dissemination of a subject called Scientology which has just become impossible.

With the arrival of the concept that the highest knowingness that you can reach is not to know about anything, we have crossroaded with all of the philosophies of the East and have gone beyond. We just left the human race.

This idiotic secret was the secret that held this universe together. And the day when you found yourself in it and were blinking around and saying, "Hey, what happened? How did I get here?" and the first time you decided that you'd rather get out of it, this thing was the secret which held you in it.

This was why you stayed in it and why you didn't leave, because you had to know something and you didn't know what it was! And you know why you didn't know what it was, this thing you had to know? It's because the thing you had to know was "not to know." The little squirrels run around in their cage; the giraffe stands up in the zoo; the acorns drop from

the tree, all because they don't know that they mustn't know. And that's why they go on being squirrels and giraffes and acorns. But the moment that you no longer are held by this fact, when it becomes a very positive and complete fact to you, when your cognition on this is very sharp, things cease to be a trap. They can no longer be a trap of any kind.

That's an interesting thing to know because if a man knows how to walk out of the door, he ceases to be a prisoner of that jail, even though he still can walk around in the jail.

Compulsive and obsessive knowing, inhibited knowing – that's the trap.

It's very interesting, isn't it, that a child is easy to exteriorize. A child is very easy to exteriorize and an adult is rather difficult to exteriorize. Who has been educated? Well, that's about all there is to it.

Now, the only excuse, and I've told people this many, many times, the only excuse we have in Dianetics and Scientology to educate anyone is because we're teaching them how to undo what they know. That's the only reason – excuse we have to call this education at all. But you will still find, here and there, that a person who has studied long and continuously at Dianetics and Scientology, is harder to process than a person you grab in off the street.

Why?

Now, here is a great oddity and something which shows up the fallaciousness of believing that your total out is to be totally ignorant. That's fallacious – to be totally escaped you must be totally ignorant; that statement is fallacious.

In other words, your desire should be total not-knowingness. You see at once that the *reductio ad absurdum* of this would be that the ideal state for a thetan would be to be completely unconscious. That'd be the ideal state, wouldn't it? Flat on his back, completely unconscious, ten thousand feet up; that's ideal. Never know anything from there on. That's what that statement says and that statement is not true. See, it isn't the most ideal state in the world.

All right now, if that is the case, however, that this whole theory of not knowing about knowing has a bug in it – if that is true that it has a bug in it someplace – the bug is simply this: People have worked hard enough on knowingness, on forcing you to know and forcing you not to know, that the subject has gone beyond your own self-determinism so that you are no longer able to control at will what you know and don't know, and you get knowingness classified as bad and good.

To forget and remember selectively at once is an ideal state for a thetan.

He can forget anything he wants to. He can remember anything he wants to.

See, that's a nice state of beingness, and yet, this has become identified and jammed and messed up, one way or the other, by cross-experiences, until an individual begins actually to believe that the most desirable thing is unconsciousness and the best thing you could possibly be is unconscious and you'll have many a preclear begging you to give them drugs. They know how they ought to be: unconscious.

But unconsciousness, when you get along the level of Homo sapiens, just opens the door to further aberration as we know very well from Dianetics. So unconsciousness is simply a lower harmonic of not-knowingness, that's all it is. So the hooker here is: not-knowingness through space and energy is bad, but knowingness by consideration, or not-knowingness by consideration, is ideal.

So we have the same old time-worn difference: The thetan who depends upon space and energy for his awareness, his alertness and his knowingness and his not-knowingness and so forth, is in bad shape. He has a dependency that should be overcome and when you start to not-know in terms of energy: trrrrrrr, screens, huge spaces, castles, dungeons, reactive banks and an individual at last begins to forget things – things by keeping around a store of not-knowingness; and simply by consulting whether or not this not-knowingness matches another not-knowingness, he can put engrams into restimulation.

Doesn't that look weird to you?

So we see that what an individual knows about a situation isn't upsetting at all unless it is accompanied by a store of automatic not-knowingness which enforces the knowingness upon him. So it is only true that not-knowingness is bad when it exists in such a form as to force knowingness upon you. In other words, I have to know about this situation because I – it contains so much not-knowingness; and then we get the engram, the reactive bank and all the other manifestations that we know people are fighting.

There was an old process, 1963, which gave people the right to be nothing.

"Just get the idea you have the right to be nothing," in most elementary form.

And the individual would invariably, sooner or later, if we could run it at all, cognite, heave a sigh of relief and say, "You mean I have a right to be nothing.

You mean – you mean I don't have to answer up to all the ambitions of my parents and my wife and my business and sssss..." And right away that individual would start to be effective and amount to something. It had been returned to his free choice. But that he had to amount to something, which was not in the field of his free choice, was in itself, compulsive and aberrative.

Now, let's just take a look at knowingness and not-knowingness and we see that an individual finds not-knowingness bad or confusing or upsetting, simply under those conditions where he has to know. And there not-knowingness is real bad. "Who is shooting at me?" "I don't know." Oh, no! No! This is a bum situation, see? But the individual, oddly enough, will hang on to the not-knowingness.

Why?

Well, he's got it all worked out in terms of quantity. He has to have so much not-knowingness in order to have so much knowingness until he'll hold anything into him which has a sufficient quantity of not-knowingness connected with it. Hence, you get the Rosicrucians saying, "Secrets. Just write in here and we'll give you the answer to a lot of secrets. We're all very secret." And people say, "Gee, a store of not-knowingness. Hah!" And they write in and they get back a bigger store of not-knowingness than they bargained for.

Now, the bag called the reactive mind always has a little feather or tag sticking out of it. Here's this huge amount of not-knowingness called the reactive mind and it's got this little tag sticking out of it saying, "Known," and you pull this tag a little bit further and it says, "Known," and you pull the tag a little bit further out and it says, right there in Sanskrit: "You're hooked, brother!" Now, the oddity is that every reactive bank that I ever investigated had a clear-view tag that the individual knew was there and all he wanted you to do as an auditor was pull it a little bit further, and in Sanskrit it would eventually say, "There." What was holding that not-knowingness there? Nothing.

What was holding the knowingness there? The not-knowingness. The not-knowingness, in this case, is the dynamic impulse and the knowingness is simply fixed because it is backed by the first postulate. The activity the individual undertook to discover what he didn't know backs up and gives force to what he finds out.

I could give you a demonstration of this very easily if we were fascist in inclination and didn't care what we did to human beings. You know, in other words, a psychiatric experimental approach, human vivisection or something of this sort, very easily, by setting up a problem wherein an individual was made utterly frantic by numbers of people telling him that he had had a phone call but they didn't know whether it was a man or a woman or what it was about or where it was from. But everybody the individual encounters tells him: phone call. If we carry this on for just a little while and then let the individual answer the phone call – you know, he'd run around and finally find a phone, find out who it was that called him and so forth. And that -this didn't go on very long and then he called up and it was the laundry and the laundry was saying to him, "Your clothes are ready," the thing would blow! The thing would blow.

But I remember a story written by Kenneth Brown Collings, an old war correspondent, in Liberty magazine. He was covering the Ethiopian war and I think he wrote this little story in Liberty.

A war correspondent sitting out in the middle of Ethiopia somewhere sent for a bottle of whiskey and a father and his ten sons went after this bottle of whiskey clear up to Addis Ababa and it was an enormous distance and the arduous of obtaining that bottle of whiskey and bringing it back took the lives of nine of those sons, see, and the fellow sat there and he couldn't drink the whiskey. That was just too expensive a bottle of whiskey.

Now, similarly, if we had this fellow who was going to answer the phone call climbing cliffs, going through thud and blunder, dragging it out, mystery building up about this phone call long enough – actually the person on the other end of the line could say, "Your laundry is ready," and the lock wouldn't blow, wouldn't blow at all. The fellow would now come around and tell you, convincingly, that laundry is a pretty damned important thing. Just like this war correspondent was telling you that whiskey was an awfully important thing, too important to drink.

Laundry would, thereafter, become a sufficiently important object to the individual to drive him practically daffy on the subject. But you understand the volume of action he would have had to have gone into to have finally gotten this phone call.

Up to a certain point, it simply would have blown as a lock. But backed by more and more and more action, unknownness, worry, concern – all unknownness – it would eventually have amounted to a point of where he'd no longer have been rational on the subject of that phone call. It would have driven him mad.

It isn't how big a dam the knowingness is, the little block of knowingness there. Its size has nothing to do with it. Its size is made and created by the amount of unknownness which preceded it. And when you've learned that, why, you can see then that what you get to know isn't awfully important. What the preclear finally found out was not awfully important. But the amount and ferocity of unknownness preceding it established its greater or lesser importance.

The rationale of the datum, the known datum, its quality and bearing upon life, is established by the first postulate.

Do you realize that a person could spend all of his life trying to find out how many tail feathers there were on the end of a roc or an auk; and when he finally found out, you would have had the most impressive book: there were two tail feathers. But he would go on and he would write and write and write and write and write on this subject of two tail feathers given enough unknownness preceding it. He invents importances for the knownness to the degree that there's been unknownness.

So where aberration, and aberration only is concerned, we have this interesting fact: that the unknownness is the establishing and monitoring factor, not the knownness.

The evaluation is not the datum that is known; It is the amount of unknownness which preceded it, and that's the evaluating function, and that's reactive, you understand. That's the reactive mind at work.

So we have this airplane pilot who flies – you'll understand this much more clearly in just a second – this airplane pilot who becomes an airplane pilot because of one engramic phrase: "You're no earthly good." We can see this man. He started a garage. He did this, he did that and he failed, failed, failed, failed, failed at all these things and eventually took up flying and succeeded but always was unhappy after he landed at the airport.

Now look, it isn't the phrase, "You're no earthly good." It must have been the turmoil, the unknownness, in other words, the not-knownness of the area in which this phrase rested which gave that phrase that much violence. And so, this phrase then, by token of that much unknowingness in his vicinity, becomes the monitoring, guiding principle of his life.

All right now, let's look at an engram. An engram isn't very serious if somebody walks up and steps on your toes and says, "You skunk." That's not very serious. Fellow simply walked up to you and stepped on your toes and said you're a skunk, because there's not very much chaos there into which to put a stable datum.

But if this individual walked up to you from behind, slugged you over the head, kicked you in the ribs, wound you up in the hospital, but somewhere in the midst of all of this he said, "You're a skunk," you'd probably start to smell like one. Do you see how this could be,

hm? The amount of pain and unconsciousness, it said in Dianetics, established the effectiveness of the engram. Never truer than today.

It was not the wittiness or "double-entendreness" of the phrase; it was the amount of pain and unconsciousness. And what's pain and unconsciousness but not-knowingness.

You know that you can give an individual enough switched not-knowingnesses so – so as to turn his body at length into a roaring furnace of pain? You don't even have to touch him. You could just confuse him and puzzle him enough so that he'd hurt! He'd hurt as bad as though he'd been shot by a bullet. And there's guys all over this town today that are dying because they don't know something.

If you look at the knowingness as the thin, pitifully thin little dam, that an individual puts up so as to hold back the enormous power of the unknown, we see at once what people are trying to do. We also see what hypnotism is and what this thing called a stable datum is.

Now, a stable datum is that datum, Axiom 53, on which other data can be aligned or on which other data aligns. A single datum is necessary for the alignment of other data.

Well, now we drop into an enormous chaos – one datum. The individual goes slurp. But it could be a very tiny datum, very inconsequential, even irrational. If he got a very irrational one, he was simply unlucky. If he got a very, very bright, smart one, he was lucky.

He's lying there, he's just been run over by a car. Somebody comes along and says, "That's the luckiest s – of a b – in the world." You know, they're always saying this: if he'd stepped off the curb one moment sooner, he'd been hit by the taxi and the truck.

So the individual, after the accident, is liable to have the feeling that his mother belongs in a kennel, but also that he is terribly lucky and he'll go around telling you, "You know, I'm awfully lucky, awfully lucky." He's using that piece of knowness to stem this great tide of the unknown: the stable datum.

Now, you audit a preclear, let us say, and you carefully take out of the preclear every stable datum you can lay your hands on without removing one item or atom or wiggle of commotion, chaos, unknownness and the boy will leave the session and go out and somebody will say to him, "You are a goat," and hell go, "Mmaaaa." How does he manage this?

Well, what would you think of engineering, what would you think of engineering that cured the entire Mississippi flood condition by removing all the dams everywhere in the whole drainage basin of the Mississippi River?

You'd think that wasn't very good engineering, wouldn't you?

Well, we have to put it in quantitative forms just so you'll get a good look at this because not-knowingness is only aberrative in quantitative form.

Qualitative, simply changing your mind, and saying, "I don't know about that. I know about that. I don't know about that," see, no quantity, no motion, space, energy connected with it at all. Nothing wrong with this. You can get away with that. But here, you as an auditor, take a look at this Mississippi and it's in horrible flood. This Mississippi is saying to you, "I am the father of all waters. I made the Nile River, I got evidence. I made the Hwang

Po, the Ganges and my waters fall directly aver Zambezi Falls." And you'll say, "Oh, come now, you're kind of buttered all over the universe, aren't you?" "No, no this is a fact! I can prove it." And you say, "Well now, let's do something about this river because it's crazy." And so we take enough atomic fission and so forth, or dynamite or some such thing, and we go and blow up all of TVA like the Republicans are trying to do. We go and blow up every dam and every levee of the Mississippi.

We say, "There, we've solved the problem. Huh! Nothing to it, problem solved. And we're quite alarmed when the Mississippi starts to run out just south of Savannah, Georgia. Only now it's not the father of waters. Somebody has come along and told it, after you blew up all the dams, that it's god and this is all it says now, "I'm god and you better believe it or else." In other words, you could blow up a minor neurosis into a flaming psychosis by blowing up a few of these dams, couldn't you?

Now, don't ask me why psychoanalysis has never had a result in sixty years of presence. And if anybody says psychoanalysis has ever had a result, you'll know, by the simple test of what you know, that he must be lying.

Maybe the guy had a good night's sleep, but the chances are that psychoanalysis will turn a neurosis into a psychosis or a sane person into a neurotic.

By doing what?

By dredging up every stable datum they can lay their hands on and giving him a lot more about libido, gibido, bibido.

"You see, it's because you cast eyes like that on your little sister. That's why you're like this." They just plowed up the fact that he has decided his father was a dog because his father beat him and that's why he's like he is today, is because his father beat him, you see.

Now, that is a stable datum. How much violence is this holding back?

Might be quite a bit, quite a bit of unknownness in there, you see.

So we say, "Do you ever recall a time when your father beat you seriously?" And he says, "Well – um – um – yeah, one time. Yeah, one time." And you say, "Huh, can you recall any other times?" "No." "Well then, it wasn't true that your father was like this, was it? You actually were suffering from a mother complex, an Oedipus. You see, mother fixation caused the father jealousy to libido on the rip-rap, and you are sexually aberrated." See, right – we pull out this datum so he's got it all figured out – the reason he's like he is, see. He's got a stable datum. We pull this out of the road and quickly tell him that it's sexual.

I guess we put him on the Know to Sex Scale in a hurry, didn't we?

Cute trick, huh?

But listen, if the analyst was forcing an individual to know, to know, to know, to know, to know, to know and never giving him the slightest opportunity, ever, to not-know, as the years went along, as a complete analysis does, you sooner or later would have plowed your boy in with evaluation, evaluation, evaluation.

Now, we don't evaluate for people. We find out it drives them batty. But let me tell you, the only way it could drive somebody batty would be to pull up the stable datum on which he's been operating and then evaluate for him.

That would drive him batty. That would be the very process that would send him off of his rockers.

See how that would be? Let's run out the engramic phrase and then sit right there end say, "Oh, your mother wasn't so bad to you." Let's run out the engramic phrase in the prenatal and then say to him, instantly, "Your mother didn't try you so bad," and put that in as a supplanted stable datum to "My mother was horrible to me," and the guy can't accept it. He can't put this dam up in front of all that not-knownness, see. He's got no dam and he's engulfed.

And therefore, as you run preclears and see people improve on not-knowingness processes, you will very, very quickly fall to the idea that psychology and psychoanalysis and psychiatry, with their fixation on remember, force, chaos and confusion, have never worked and never will work. And we can only adjudicate then, they must be some kind of an operation. They must have something else in mind, because they don't work.

Now, you'll know by experience that they don't work. You can't audit a half a dozen preclears in the direction of not-knowingness and watch them improve without becoming cognizant of the fact that something which went solely in the direction of "you've got to know," or in the direction of "more confusion," would be unworkable.

Well, isn't this interesting! From what eagle height can we now look down on the mice. Tells us much more than we bargained to know, right away. And the only reason I'm talking to you about this at all, is not to run down psychiatry or psychoanalysts – I dare say there has been an analyst or two, maybe Freud himself, who had some sincere desire to help somebody out. We don't know what the rest of them were doing, but they certainly weren't thinking and they couldn't have been observing. But we have no interest in running them down beyond demonstrating this to you. That was psychotherapy: to make a person know more or to give him more confusion or to give him more confusion and make him know more.

Here we take an insane person and we give him a tremendous confusion of electric shock and so forth. He's got to find another stable datum, hasn't he, to dam that up, he thinks. Another stable datum has got to be picked out of somewhere. So God knows where he'll pick it up or what it'll be but it sure won't be rational. And now we make his environment even more confused and he has to pick up another stable datum; and now we make his environment more confused, and he has to pick up another stable datum; and now we make his environment with a new shock more confused and he can't find one – he drowns. He drowns in chaos.

Not-knowingness in terms of space, energy and matter becomes unconsciousness where life is concerned. Not-knowingness to a thetan who is not quantitatively orientated is simply not-knowingness. See, there's nothing to it; the easiest thing in the world. It's – so he doesn't know.



Now, if you wanted to drive an interrogator mad, just keep telling him you don't know. And the funny part of it is you can probably hold out longer than he could hold out. You probably could. It's only when you start to tell him that you do know something that he can come off of it and get a little sane again because he's postulating all the time that there is a knowness here and you're saying, "Not known, not known, not known." He'll after a while begin to dramatize, "I must investigate." Not to get any answers, see, "I just must investigate." You'll find him crawling along the baseboards and you ask him, "Whatcha doing?" "I'm investigating." "What are you investigating?" "Huh, I'm investigating!" And he'll become very angry with you.

He has some sort of a datum that he is a personality that investigates.

That's the only stable datum he's had while interrogating criminals, or anybody else, if they consistently told him they didn't know.

The wrong thing to do is to tell him anything. If you could hold out against it long enough you'd just simply cave everybody in. Don't say, "Well you know, I was really at my apartment, you know, when all this happened," and so forth.

If you just kept saying, "I don't know anything about it. I know, but I don't know anything about it. Yes, that's all very well, but I don't know anything about it," the guy will eventually get mad at you, then finally go thzea.

Now, that's how you'd unmock somebody. Just get stupid but simply reiterate it, that you just don't know.

Don't pull this trick: "Well, I don't know, but..." and then get – tell him some data.

Just say, "Well, I don't know. I don't think that's knowable at all. I don't think there's anything connected with it which is knowable in any way, shape or form. The problems of the mind cannot be solved. The problems of the mind cannot be solved and just for variation, the problems of the mind cannot be solved." Of course, everybody's un – mind sooner or later's going to unmock because they're holding their mind up as a stable datum against the tremendous chaos of existence. Their mind is their one line of protection. Their mind is this stable datum: "I can always get a solution. I can recognize the problem and get a solution." Stable datum. When they have that completely unmocked, they're insane.

Follow me? So, it'd be quite an operation, wouldn't it? Be a lovely operation. Keep saying to people, "The problem of the mind cannot be solved. The problem of the mind cannot be solved. The problem of the mind cannot be solved. The problem of the mind cannot be solved. Nobody knows about that.

Nobody knows about the mind. We just do what we can. We electric shock and prefrontal lobotomy and so forth and do what we can. We're at least in action. We're doing something. But the problem of the mind cannot be solved.

Nobody knows, really." Or we represent entire chaos, complete, utter chaos, electric shock, prefrontal lobotomy, sanitariums falling in, caving in, everybody getting murdered in the sanitariums and nobody even investigating as to why – why the attendant killed this guy, and so on.

"Chaos! Chaos! Chaos," everybody says, running around in circles. "Chaos! Chaos! Chaos! Chaos!" Looks to me like the same operation gone into action as "The problem of the mind cannot be solved. The problem of the mind cannot be solved." Follow me?

Now, if that were done continually and were merely an operation, you would look for the most of the commotion which would occur in a society to come from the area of the problem of the mind. See, you'd look for most of the commotion -politically, economically, mechanically in the society – to come from the field of the mind, if that was the operation on which they'd already begun. It wasn't admired, was it? Nobody admired this "The problem of the mind cannot be solved," and those things which are not admired tend to persist and they also tend to get more and more bogged down. Until today, we have this dramatization going on, this gorgeous dramatization: electric shock, prefrontal lobotomy.

One sanitarium out in Arizona, they were sterilizing every woman who came in there.

Isn't this interesting.

Why?

Well, some of the psychiatrists had gotten some of the patients pregnant. I beg your pardon, that really wasn't the situation. That wasn't the situation. They weren't men enough.

Now, if we simply went out on a Gnostic line – interesting word, simply means we know that we know – and we kept saying, "The problem of the mind? We know about the problem of the mind," people would just hear that from you and they'd say, "Uh-huh," but then they would drift a little direction away from you and they would drift a few days away from you, you know, and all of a sudden they pick up the paper, there's more of this going on, they'd kind of feel wobbly again. They'd come around and see you again, just to hear you say that again, you know.

"Problem of the mind, yeah, we know about that." Gnostic approach. We know that we know, see.

Actually, that as an operation and totally in the absence of knowledge would unmock the other operation 100 percent, which is why you get this frantic defamation of any Scientologist who comes up around a hospital. And they're saying, "Well, what are you doing here?" "Uh – I don't know. I'm just – uh – looking these people over." "Why are you looking them over?" "Yeah, well, I know what's wrong with them." "Well, you know what's wrong with them! Well, the doctors don't know what's wrong with them! The psychiatrists don't know wha---- what do you mean? You don't know..." See, instant defamation. And if you simply said, "Well, that's all very true. I'm not trying to convince you of anything or them of anything. I just know what's wrong with them." And if you didn't do anything else but go to a particular hospital and pull this gag on one new person or another in that hospital every day or two, the place would blow up. You see, you just wouldn't tell anybody a thing beyond that.

"I know what's wrong with them. I didn't say I was going to do anything about it. I just know what's wrong with them." You see, you'd stand as the stable datum and don't think you wouldn't get cuffed around somewhat. You would. But it never hurt anybody to get cuffed around. Now – I'm a good example of that.

All right. Applying what you know about not-knowing is one thing, using it as an auditor is quite another thing and trying to impart it to the public is entirely something else.

What do you know in Scientology?

Well, we know that the highest order is not to know a thing.

I want to give you in this hour another way to express this – much simpler way to express this.

Scientology is a method by which an individual can not-know at will. He can know or not-know at will. Makes sense to everybody. They know there's a lot of things they'd love to not-know, but they've lost control of this ability and this would be about the highest ability there was in the face of all this confusion and chaos.

In order to solve a case, it is not necessary then to pull up all the stable data or to erase all of the chaos. It is only necessary to put the case into a condition where he does not consider himself to be part and parcel of all the energy in space and that he himself is not energy in space. Put him into a condition where he can change his mind about things. And as soon as you've done this, he will sooner or later begin to know about not-knowing and then not-know about not-knowing, at will.

Thus we have a condition of beingness which measures up to our pan-determinism, our self-determinism, the dynamics, all the other factors that we know, adding right on up.

Well, we've gone a little step higher and the Know to Mystery Scale has become the Not-Know to Mystery Scale which contains Know on its scale still.

So, it still depends on dragging the individual out of his combat with energy and confusion and getting him into a certain benignity and we find out that using not-knowingness is about the fastest route out because it's the first postulate and this runs off a great many second postulates. But sooner or later the individual, unless his self-determinism is very badly suppressed by breaches in the Auditor's Code and other things, we discover that the individual, at length, is able to think and be without being immediately and instantly influenced by space and energy and matter.

And when we've got him to a point of where his thinkingness no longer has to be influenced by these things, he naturally is a stable Theta Clear.

Get him three feet back of his head so he isn't dependent on the body to think for him and his engrams to react for him and you've made it.

And the processes which you know in the Six Basic Processes are those processes. All we're doing is leaning a little heavier on the first postulate which we have discovered to be, at long last, not-knowingness.

I wish to call one thing to your attention: a quarter of a century of work on this subject, all in the direction of knowingness, and five years with all of us intensely going in the direction of knowingness, have turned up the datum about not-knowingness.

This tells you at once that we are superior to either one.

Thank you.