ANGLO-SAXON THOUGHT

A lecture given on
12 January 1956

I want to talk to you tonight about the practicality of Scientology, and although you may consider this a rather odd subject at this stage and time, at the same time it may straighten out several items that you may have wandered off into one way or the other, and put you a bit back on the road. It might clarify a viewpoint for you, regarding Scientology.

We might say Scientology is a great many things, but it is primarily the study of knowing how to know. It is a designed science, very arduously exact in its composition, with regard to axioms. There are only fifty-five axioms in Scientology, as differentiated from Dianetics, which contains two hundred and lord knows what - almost three hundred axioms.

The materials of Scientology are essentially practical materials. Many people are prone to believe that Scientology is a theoretical science. We have about 18,876,942.8 too many theoretical sciences. It's just too damn many for man's frail back to understand or stand up to.

Somebody comes charging in and he says, "Now," he says, "this is a theoretical science: quantum mechanics. It's theoretical. We make atom bombs with it."

"Oh, do you? Do you make atom bombs with it, really?" I ask my fellow classmates these days.

Hah. "Zut," as the French would comment. They don't. The manufacture of atom bombs is an empirical activity. Now the difference between theoretical and empirical is a considerable difference, much bigger difference than the spelling of two big words. Theoretical means an intuitive (and to hell with whether or not it applies to anything) construction of a bunch of guff which added up, lets you figure-figure. That's, for my money - is a theoretical science.

They have uses. Remember, they do have uses, but they are not necessarily substantiated by any real phenomena to be found in your universe, the physical universe or the other fellow's.

Mathematics just loves these things. It's just enamored with the whole idea of the abstract. Did you ever know a mathematician? If this society has any cancer in it, it's mathematics. The mathematician has sailed forth from the untruths of arithmetic, which he imbibed undoubtedly at the age of five, six or seven; and has sailed forth from that unreality that all. twos plus all twos equal all fours (which isn't true either, you know); and has gone in for it left and right to a point where he can prove anything is anything anywhere; and he has set a fashion which is directly contrary to the spirit of the word science itself.

The German has often proved warlike. Every now and then we have to go over and punch him to keep from getting knocked flat. Every now and then somebody has to do something because Germany is erupting in war. Germany is exhibiting some sort of a strange madness, it's spinning in circles like a large whirling dervish, and it's going to eat up everybody and knock everybody flat and do all sorts of interesting things. And we have to do something about it.

Well, what drives them mad? There must be something in the German nation drives them mad.

Now let's just neglect the language, and let's look at what they call "logic" in Germany. Have you ever had to study German logic? Well, Germany, a few decades ago, was the leader in new sciences, new chemical developments and so on. The world leader - must have been acknowledged so, or my professors in engineering school wouldn't have insisted that I understand German so I could read all the latest scientific work, and yet they did insist that.

I used to tell them, “What are you talking about? The stuff will be translated into English sooner or later if there is anything to it.”

But they wouldn’t have anything of this. They said, “Germany is the great leader in scientific thought.”

Well, if Germany is the leader of scientific thought, we had certainly better look at what happened to science after Germany became the leader. We can even look further than that. We can look back to the days of Kant, the great Chinaman of Königsberg, who, in one fell gulp, destroyed the entire field and activity and game of philosophy. Because there’s been no significant philosophy before Kant - I mean, after Kant, and before Kant there were some philosophers around. So one assumes that something happened there. And we read very recently that, fortunately, Kantian philosophy has been on the ebb for a long time in England and is almost extinct here. And from these ashes new thought and conquest in the field of thought is arising.

Now it’s quite esoteric a subject to bring up here, but it’s not really ungermane because we are dealing with the thought and knowledge of man. So let’s take a look at the thought and knowledge of man, just as such, because we are dealing with a science which is a study of his knowledge. And we discover that some time back about 1790 this fellow Kant discovered an innate moral sense and - begin to criticize pure reason and a bunch of other things. Wonderful stuff.

Have you ever read Kant? Even in English, have you ever looked over any lines of Kant? Most fascinating stuff you ever read in your life. You know how German reads anyhow: Throw the cow over the fence some hay. Well, he modifies all adjectival clauses with adverbial clauses, which are modified in their turn by adjectival phrases, and by the time you’ve disentangled a paragraph of Kant, you’ve lost interest in the whole subject.

So I can’t really discover how he possibly could have corrupted English reason and philosophy since it’s impossible to envision anybody ever read him, except for this one fact: He must have been so impressive that everybody else found himself powerless to make nothing out of him and so, therefore, said, “He wins.”

Now, here - here we have an imported German philosophy of a long, long time ago - 150 years - this came across the channel. A hundred years ago something else came across the channel, it was called “psychology.” lt was dreamed up by a gent named Wundt - the only Wundt. Professor Wundt,

University of Leipzig, 1879, dreamed up, coined, patented and Germanicated the world of thought with something called “psychology.”

It’s quite interesting, quite interesting that these two things, Kantian philosophy, with the innate moral sense, and a little bit later (half a century later, or more - almost a century, by the way, eighty years) we found psychology coming from these same precincts. And we also find that the German idea of logic is to be found in both of these (quote) great works (unquote) - the German idea of logic.

Now, I can see right away that you’re not terribly interested or fascinated with the idea of the German logic, and you think I’m just upbraiding the entire subject of psychology. I’m not. It ruined itself years ago. It’s passé. It’s like a lot of French words that came over - they died. Anyhow ...

Here, however, is something that is very germane and intimate to us. When we inherited these various Germanic types of thought, we inherited at the same time the laborious effort of the German to think, and it hurts a German to think. It’s a terrible thing to see the writhing that goes on with a German wrestling with a thought. And that’s what drives him out beyond his borders and makes him conquer the rest of the world every now and then.

For instance, logic to a German would be a very curious thing if you yourself wanted to examine it. I call to your attention several books on the subject of Germanic logic. It has been inspected many times by English writers, always with some amazement. For instance, the German is not beyond doing this: He said, "There are twenty factors here. Nineteen of them are untrue. Therefore, the true twentieth we take."

You say, "Ah-ah-ah, wait a minute!"

No, the German doesn't wait a minute. He takes that twentieth factor and plunges in. If all factors are proved untrue and he has one left, he will use it as a fact. It should be very interesting to you because it shows you there's a certain fallaciousness then in this type of thinking. There's a name for this type of logic; the German calls it a deductive type of logic with a large German name, but it's a fact that it has been used. It is not without success - not without success. If you've - carefully proved a lot of factors untrue, you have reduced the possibility of the remaining factors being untrue, but the funny part of it is, they all might be untrue.

And so it was in the field of thought and philosophy. The Germans never did have, evidently, a true principle. But they'd knock out all these principles as untrue and then they'd say that one is true. And it kind of messed things up a little bit. It's almost a totally theoretical type of science.

Now, German mathematics is horrible to behold. Did you ever study topology? Well, I doubt you have because it's a rather recent mathematics, it's only about a quarter of a century old and it has some usages to an engineer. But a study of topology - you get headaches, you know - because it's all theoretically inclined, whereby you take a small subject or a small section of any problem (this is one of the operations), and then you consider that the whole problem is represented by the small section - solve the small section and you do other things.

Newton was doing something like this with calculus, but that's one of the minor principles of topology. I'm not trying to teach you topology. I'm just talking to you about theoretical sciences.

And here's this fascinating thing then, of a series of mathematics which are now and then useful, but which have begun - have been made to look more and more like sciences. They've begun to look more and more like precision things. They're not precise. They're about as solid as walking on skim ice on the millpond. You know, you go splash, if you trusted them all the way through, because they are unexamined premises. The Germanic reasoning would soar into so many unexamined premises, and that he would come up with so many right answers, testifies that he is inexhaustibly thorough in applying what he does know. But it doesn't mean that any of the things that he invented in philosophy or science are true. It's an interesting thing. It just doesn't mean that any of these things are very, very workable.

Since the world cut loose from German chemistry, the English and the American chemist and biochemist have gone by the German chemist as though he was in full reverse. The number of chemical developments since Germany was debunked from her ascendancy in chemistry are more numerous than in the whole remainder of the century when Germany was in charge. Just because we all of a sudden said, "Look, we too can think. Our chemists can be subsidized. It isn't necessary to import Professor Weeniewurst from the depths of the Baloney Woods in order to make stinks in this laboratory. Let's get some chap down here who's been at work with Cornell and Wood, huh, you know, and let's give him the same salary and see what he does."

The fact of the case is that about the most wasted thing that you could possibly do at this time would be to study German to read new German chemical developments. Not because the German chemical industry is flat on its back, they're still developing, they're still doing wonderful things, but now that the chemical industry of the world is separated from the German, boy, have we got some chemistry. Terrific! I mean, some of the things they're doing with - odd things that you have to do with every day paint. You get into a shop, something is wrapped in

paper, and just a few years ago that paper probably would have deteriorated. A couple of raindrops and it'd have a hole in it or something like that; the bleaches, for instance, that made that paper that paper and so on. You'd buy some cheap writing paper, you'd write a letter, by the time it got through the post to your friend, why, it was yellow. These are interesting things. The bleaches on them, in other words, discolored. They don't do that these days. And you know that's happened within your memory.

Well, I don't see any reason for a Germanic type of reasoning to continue to dominate the field of thought. And I wouldn't talk to you about this any other way than - if I thought a few of you weren't still being dominated by some of these Germanic reasonings. If I thought that we were all clean and clear of this Aryan heresy, or whatever it is, be all right. Well, we've been educated, most of us, in a period when the school itself was dominated by the German attitude.

Since the German considers himself the world's greatest educator, he will tell you at once that there is no system like the German system for educating everybody. I don't know what they do with their boys, but I'm sure they're well educated. I know I got drunk with several of them; they couldn't hold their liquor. I don't think much of their educational system. University of Virginia could give them hands down - hold more liquor than that.

So, we are, actually, very markedly coming out of a sort of a dark age of philosophy. And we're coming out by another route than we had just a few years ago. Scientology may be a peculiar phenomenon in the whole world of philosophy, but actually it is not a peculiar phenomenon when one understands that the entire Anglo-Saxon ability to write, to reason, to experiment has beenall the years of its civilization - suppressed either by the Roman or the German schools of thought. Actually, for the first time an Anglo-Saxon is thinking a thought. He isn't being overpowered by the magnificent laws and so forth of somebody else. You get the idea? We sort of climbed sideways a little bit and took a look around and said, "You know, we don't have to reason a priori or 'ass posteriori.' " (I always suspected reasoning like that. I thought that it had something to do with the second dynamic for years. Awfully bad joke, but ...)

We look around - we look around and we see, on every hand, a domination in the field of thought, and we ourselves are only being alarming, where we are being alarming, to the savants in their universities and so forth, where we are apparently being free of a standard line of thought, in some fashion.

What we say - I suppose it'd go home the same way to a Chinese or a Malay or a German - but what we say is, to them, short-circuitedly plain. It's awfully, bluntly plain, you know. I mean, you say, "Well, there's a mental image picture." Comes up, the thing can react - it can activate against the individual. Body made it, it can affect the body in its turn. You have an operation, you get a mental image picture - knocks hell out of you. And we don't say, "The boop-didap of the lu-a-wha as told by Professor Wop-wop and examined in the earlier yop-yop of the school of-and to be found in the library at Alexandria under references of Cicero and so forth. Blob, blob, blob, blob, blob."

"No," we say, "There is a thing and it does this, and this you can do about it - bang, bang, bang."

Let me call to your attention that that is essentially Anglo-Saxon in its approach, awfully Anglo-Saxon. "There it is, what are we going to do about it? Bang," see. Terribly direct, not circuitous. We don't sneak up on anything. We say, "What do you know?" Rap. Bang. Thoughtwise that is normally the way we operate.

The lack of - actual lack of popularity, to the guy in the street, of the mental (quote) sciences (unquote) - they are unpopular with him, you know, if you haven't examined him. We're not, but the idea of psychiatry and that sort of thing (no cracks against psychiatry) - he's just confused. He doesn't know what that's all about. You get the idea? You talk to him and he doesn't quite grasp this thing. Boy, he has the idea of someone with a pair of spectacles, you

know, and a long, black ribbon, and he's got a peculiar notion about this. Why? Why does he have this peculiar notion?

Obviously if he has a peculiar notion in it, it must be outside of his framework of thought. And he's almost been educated to believe, then, that anything in the field of the mind or that has anything to do with his own thinkingness, is outside of his own grasp. How could it possibly be outside of his own grasp? Now you see where we've come? I'm not damning any of these sciences. I am merely saying that we have done something new and startling. It is startling to the German, believe me. Wow! You ought to talk to some of these Germans about Scientolijakagika, or whatever the hell they call it. You ought to - they're startled!

But they're walking around it in about the slowest circumnavigation that you have ever witnessed. Do you know that a body of auditors has sat in Berlin for five years (did you know this?) and they're still examining the subject. And they've never audited anybody! I think this is wonderful. But this is a typical Germanic approach and it's not the way we do things.

Psychiatry, here and there, shook free from this type of approach, and where it did, it made marked progress in England. But it still had not divorced itself entirely, you understand. So that psychiatry is, in England today, two sciences. It is the English psychiatrist, thinking the way he thinks in order to make people well, and the German Continental tradition. And all the textbooks are written in the German Continental tradition and very few of the textbooks in the English tradition. And where does that put psychiatry as a gain?

Do you realize that if all the people, all the psychiatrists who had an English or American viewpoint, who are trying to be practical, who are trying to be direct, all got together and said, "Let's knock our experience into some kind of shape here and codify it and call this Western psychiatry or something of the sort. Do you know that they'd be awfully successful, and do you know that this guy in the street wouldn't be worried about the subject of insanity? He wouldn't be worried about it.

The government itself wouldn't have any difficulty hiring flight surgeons. But right now they're saying, "Let's see, what do we do? We know it's not very effective."

What do they mean by "it"? They mean two things: "it" when they say, "it" - psychiatry, you see. And they immediately get across and split on this horse of "it." Psychiatry isn't an "it"; it's two-headed, today. But maybe it itself ("it") doesn't entirely recognize this fact. If it did entirely recognize this fact, there was new thought being injected every time the clock ticked into the mental sciences in the United States and Great Britain and in France. If it recognized that, and if it recognized that that material was now bounteous enough to codify, we'd have a fight on our hands. But the funny part of it is, that we'd probably join up or make them join us, you see. It would be less of a fight because we are still in protest against something which isn't entirely psychiatry, you see. We're still in protest against something that isn't entirely mathematics; something that isn't entirely philosophy. It is where these subjects came from.

Now I don't say that German thinking is bad. It's merely torturous. It's not particularly fitted. The German is circuitous. He has done wonderful things - over what period of time? God help us all.

But times have changed. We no longer have to be dominated by that. And we have, as the first symptom of this revolt, which makes us startling, an entire philosophical and scientific concept, complete - lock, stock and barrelin Scientology, simply because, probably, I was the first American or Anglo-Saxon engineer that ever dabbled around in the field of the mind and couldn't make any sense out of it.

Had to know something about it, do you understand? Had to know something about it, needed the information, started digging it up, found out there wasn't anything there, went putting together various observations in a highly direct, brutally direct fashion. So much so that the chair of physics (and you know physics is a pretty direct science) at Columbia University once

admonished his class that there were other things beyond the sciences, there must be, because of the diabolical accuracy of that fellow Hubbard. He called it "diabolical accuracy," a physicist who is accustomed to accuracy.

Well, what am I being accurate in? I'm being engineeringly accurate, that's all, in a field which was really never before truly invaded by the Anglo-Saxon. He always felt too much reverence. Well, of course, we've gunned them down twice in my lifetime; I don't know why I should be reverent to these boys. I mean, let's put it up in terms of force; the German understands that well. I've swapped shots with him - and he missed. I didn't.

We have something new here. We have something new here. But we don't have an isolated gimmick called Scientology which suddenly and sporadically arises - we don't know how - in this society. We have something entirely different. We have a fortuitous application of Anglo-Saxon logic to the field of the mind. First time it's done, so it's startling. It's being done rather thoroughly, so it probably won't be done again. But nevertheless, this is something new that has happened and this is what has happened. And it isn't a guy named Hubbard, it's a guy that was born and raised in the Anglo-Saxon frame of reference: You've got to get the answer, you got to be direct, you got to get right in there and get the job done, you know, that sort of thing.

Well, you can sit in the parlor if you want to and discuss the moral aspects of the square root of ninety, but I happen to have the answer right here and now. And if you aren't going to tell me what the answer is this very minute, why, I'm going to figure it out, that's all. And you can go on discussing the square root of ninety, as you have since the turn of two millennia ago, but that isn't suiting our purpose.

So that's the first and foremost thing which Scientology is, is a direct and deliberate revolt, not against a science, but against a type of thinking which is foreign to getting the job done. It's a direct revolt against a domination of Anglo-Saxon thought by Italian, Roman and German philosophers and scientists. And is something which would naturally conclude from a nation having been disgraced twice in the fields of Mars. 1 don't feel the faintest reverence for any Roman philosopher or Germanic philosopher or any German scientist or any early Italian scientist. This is just, "So what?"

I read Gibbon with amusement; I'd just as soon read Cicero or somebody. It's perfectly all right. I also read science fiction. Get the idea? I'd just as soon use topology or something somebody at MIT invented, you know. We've gotten away from a domination of our thinkingness, of our scientific procedures, of exactly how often we shake the mixer above the test tube before we add the bichloride of mercury, you know. We've gotten away from all that. We're making stuff in a test tube, and the way we do it is our business, you know.

In view of the fact that the universities of the Anglo-Saxon world are still at this time dominated almost entirely by the Scholastic - it's fantastic enough, it still is - the Scholastic type of teaching and thinking actually more or less disappeared in around 15 - 1600. But the tradition of it has kept on. And we are still dominated in our universities by Roman, Greek and German thinking and philosophy.

If you were to go down here to London University and enroll in the School of Philosophy, you'd sit there, god help you, studying Hegel and Kant and philosophy, philosophy. And you'd find out that the early English philosopher, for the most part, was so dominated by the German and Roman philosophy that he himself never got out from underneath it and never produced an Anglo-Saxon philosophy just as such. Bang! You know? Hume, Locke struck in there in that direction, but nevertheless they were writing right straight out of the textbooks of the Greek and the Roman and the German.

Now, why would you have any trouble with formal education, hm? Now we start to get very precise. Why would you have any trouble with formal educational systems and boards? It's because you're a revolutionary against something they have not yet recognized as something they are revolting against, too. Everywhere in the field of education we hear new thought inabout

how to educate, and where is that thought coming from? Is it coming from Berlin and Der Storsmuf Kindergarten? No, it's not. It's springing up in English schools, in American schools, in New York, in California and London, Cambridge. These places there's - where educators are being educated, they're thinking new thoughts on this subject. A whole generation will go by before they throw over that type of thinking in which they have labored all these centuries and which has held them back in their cultural progress.

And you go up to a professor (I don't care a professor of what) and you say, "I am a Scientologist. I can do something about the IQ of your class." He's liable to look over your textbook and find out it is not in Kantian English, and at once will say, "Heresy has risen!" But where has the heresy arisen, for god's sakes? In whose camp? In the German camp. That's where the heresy is. The heresy is against Germanic and Roman thought, not against Anglo-Saxon thought. Something important for you to recognize because if you know these few facts, you can make mincemeat out of these guys.

Say, "Well, it's all very well to support the Latin philosopher. We're more at home, you know, in English. It's all very well to know how to get a Greek over psychosis, but we happen to be dealing with Englishmen, you know." You can be nasty if you know this, because what I'm telling you is true. If you don't believe that it's true, go and talk to a few of these boys. And you will find out that they consider the type of thought entirely bred and born from the type of English used, which must be as nearly as possible a translation of the style which is called "scientific style" in Latin and German, and which isn't much of a style at all. It's beautiful mud.

Now, let me call to your attention that there are several very clean, clear sciences in existence. One of them is navigation. Navigation is one of the darnedest things man ever started to do. It's a fantastic thing, navigation, how you get from one point of the world to another. Well, you would be amazed, but it's an English science. You probably don't know that, but it is. A great seafaring nation had to know how to get from one point of land to another across a wilderness of ocean, and they managed it. They had to build a chronometer to do it and all this sort of thing. People were around issuing huge prizes for anybody that'd build an accurate clock that would run for a while.

But Anglo-Saxon thinking has gone on further than this, and do you know how a navigator gets there today? You probably don't even know this; it's very well established though. He turns on a gadget up on the bridge that tells him his longitude and latitude. The German didn't have a single thing to do with that; it's called Loran, it's called long-range navigation. It's strictly Anglo-Saxon electronics. You have various stations situated in various parts of the world, and where those stations are, the distance they are away and the angle to the station, is registered in a small box on the bridge which goes whir-click and it says you're at latitude so-and-so, longitude so-and-so. That's how we navigate today. We don't run down icebergs anymore. It's gone out of style.

Now that's Loran. Aircraft navigates itself similarly. Of course, it's because we build a very fine bubble octant. German bubble octant is something you pick up in two grips. We build a little eight-ounce gadget. You look up through the turret - the navigational turret of an aircraft, and you go zing and zing and zing, take the average of your sight and compute it out and it tells us where our aircraft is. That's why we don't keep getting airliners lost anymore. That's a very precise thing, this thing called navigation. It's how to get from here to there. If you were still going on Germanic navigation, every once in a while you'd come up with this answer: you can't get there from here!

We have another science - another science that's a very precise science, which is an Anglo-Saxon science. It's called physics - called physics. The Greek science is called natural philosophy and includes all sorts of bric-a-brac, the like of which is wonderful to behold. But the modern science of physics was born in England under the hands of Sir Isaac Newton and it couldn't be called, this natural philosophy, a science, until he came along and kicked it together. Furthermore, some of the more reliable higher mathematics were invented here in England

completely independent of Latin and German mathematics. Calculus is one of them, and everybody uses calculus these days. Isaac Newton went home one night and couldn't sleep and invented calculus.

So there have been other invasions, other revolts, but there's never been a revolt quite as intimate to the individual as this particular one. The Anglo-Saxon says, 'We've fooled around enough with this idea of the mind, we've fooled around enough with this. And now we're just going to directly do something about it; just bluntly, directly do something about it right there, and we're going to have to have a good result. You know, we're going to have a result which is acceptable to us."

Now, I don't think you would credit the fact that a mental result acceptable to a Russian is not the mental result acceptable to us. I think you'd really - even a Scientologist - kind of have to stretch his wits and look over acceptance level very carefully. But it's perfectly true that what is acceptable to us is not necessarily acceptable to other people. But the odd part of it is, is what is accepted to us is sooner or later bought by other people. I imagine in Red China right this minute if you went up to Peking and were introduced into the office of the Red commissar in charge of China, why, you'd probably find something - the stove was made in Manchester and the linoleum likewise and so on. It'd be quite amusing. It'll be American and British furniture. They make beautiful furniture in China, too. I never could understand this, but every time I'd see a rich merchant or anything like this in the Orient and so on, I was always running into all of the comforts of life having been fursnished - he could afford them, you see - having been furnished by the Anglo-Saxon races.

Now, where do we take up this whole dissertation? I'm talking to you right now possibly at a level that you don't quite see why the hell I'm talking to you this way, but the point is, that if you are in a revolt, you'd better know what you're revolting against. It's always a very good thing to do, see. And to know why you are occasionally being thrown back on your heels and defeated by some very learned company in some parlor or reception room. Who are you attacking and why do you occasionally fail to succeed in your attack? It's because you are living in a society which is indoctrinated thoroughly in a type of thinking which is foreign and antipathetic to its best interests. And you find all around you people who, without thinking about it, are slavishly going along with this type of thinking. You realize that?

The illogical answers given to you as a rebuttal against what you were saying in favor of Scientology are fascinating, since they're very illogical, but do you know they appear very logical to the people who are giving you this? They're very logical. They say, "But if you cleared a man - if you cleared a man, uh - what would that do to his - uh - what would that do to his - uhuh - grades in grammar school?"

And you say, "He went there a long time ago," so on.

He says, "But if you cleared a man would that be moral as far as his wife is concerned?"

And you say, "What do you mean?"

"Well, would it be?"

And you just try to follow this train of logic and you just don't follow it, that's all, because it doesn't go anyplace. It isn't the illogic of man you're talking to, you're talking to people who were educated to be illogical under the title "German Logic." That's a fact. These people were educated to be logical in this fashion - non sequitur, terrific rationale because of it.

And all you have to know about all this is that another philosophy long since engulfed the Anglo-Saxon races, and this philosophy was generated by Greece, went through the Latin and was complicated and compounded by the German. And that philosophy lies like a blanket over the thinkingness of the Anglo-Saxon world. Its processes of thought as advertised are not its

processes of thought. The Anglo-Saxon doesn't think the way he is supposed to think therefore various things don't work on him. He requires a level of precision.

He doesn't want to get around and fool with this thing forever, he wants to do something about it, you see. He doesn't want an indefiniteness, he wants a definiteness.

Now whatever he wants, he is, nevertheless, the second he understands it, very thoroughly back of such a motion as he finds engaged here in Scientology, very thoroughly back of it. He says, "You know, that's a good thing. You know, I can fit that in my frame of reference. Well." And he kind of gets the idea of trying to drive a bargain with a Florentine merchant as opposed to trying to arrive at some sort of an agreement with somebody down here on the Strand. Have you any idea how circuitous it is to strike a bargain with somebody down in southern Europe? Hm? It's fantastic. Fantastic, the way the circumlocutions, you know, how everything goes this way and doesn't add up that way. The number of connections you have to have that have nothing to do with the connections you want. You go down here to some of the larger British firms and you say, "We want ten thousand suits of woolen underwear."

And the fellow says, "Well, all right. Have a cup of tea." (He does inject that.) "I'll have my girl bring in the order forms and we'll write them out."

The Florentine or Roman would have had fits over this kind of an activity. He just would have had fits. He just wouldn't have known what had happened to him. He'd thought he'd received the rudest, most uncouth and barbarian treatment imaginable. He'd gone in and he'd asked for ten thousand suits of underwear and he'd gotten them, just like that, you know. "Where do we send them?" And he wouldn't have understood this. He wouldn't even have understood why he went to ask for - the ten thousand suits of underwear either, you see.

Well, just as business methods and reactions are different, so are these other reactions quite different. You can get better results on a relatively uneducated preclear - you realize that? Because he isn't educated against his own methods of thinking. But if we take a chap who has a certain singular directness in thinking and then we educate him arduously into circuitous methods of thinking, we've got a mess. He sits there and says, "What wall!" And that's a fact. And that should serve to you as an example of it. It is not necessarily true at all, you know, that an educated person is necessarily a person - the harder to process, see, not at all.

Just because one has been to the university doesn't mean he has to be a black V. One would think so sometimes, in picking up pcs. One would think so. But he's been educated against the grain of his own nativeness in his culture, see. He lives in England or he lives in America and he's evidently educated in some scholastic setup back in the Dark Ages.

You know, you go in and an American says, "Well, let's see now, that's real good. I want to learn to be an architect. Fine, let's see, an architect builds buildings and so forth. I've got a class here now that teaches us how to build buildings." And he finds himself studying how nails get rusty - for three years. And he finally says, "Dahh! Bah!" It takes him years to get over it, so much so that the contractor in America doesn't place any faith in a college graduate, for years after he's gotten out of the university, and then begins to trust him in the vicinity of workmen.

Well, that's an oddity, because America is a tremendous construction-wise country for a thing like that to happen. And right here in England we're up against at this moment some of the most tremendously difficult structural problems in rehabilitating a nation which had to be geared up in one direction for war and now is being, regeared in the other way for peace. And a lot of the machinery is still lying crosswise, you know, a lot of places to be built around that haven't been built up again, and all kinds of things occurring this way. And we look around, and where's the architects? Where'd they study? What's the availability of these chaps? Where are the engineers?

And we look with astonishment to discover: Engineers? Well, a guy - I guess you must have learned a long time ago not to send an engineer to school, because there's really no such thing

as an engineering degree in England, when England at this moment could use some darn good engineers. Well, they're never going to learn engineering mouthing Latin and Greek at Cambridge, let me assure you. There's a missingness right there.

And the Labour - down here the Labour Ministry is kicking about, "The laborer is lazy and everything's going bad and everything's going to the devil." Why doesn't he look around and find himself some engineers who can lay out better production lines, huh? Well, they'd better get themselves an engineering school and get going. Something that teaches Anglo-Saxon engineering, not a bunch of German junk, hm? And that would make one fantastic difference in a recovery program.

Small points - small points along the line where Anglo-Saxon thought has been dominated by European thought, but nevertheless, they are all vital and important points. And one of the most vital ones is, "How do you make a man more able?" I don't know what a Latin considers greater ability to be. I'm not again the Latins. I like the Latins. But I don't think they consider being able to get a job done well, is being better or more able. I don't think this has any relationship to it at all. In fact, I never could find out what they would consider ability, because I've been introduced to some very able chaps and they were very able in various ways: they could play guitars and they could make love to your wife and do all sorts of very interesting things, but we didn't chalk any of these up as abilities up here, you know. These weren't abilities where we were - difference - difference of definitions. All right.

Where you sometimes may have trouble in grasping Scientology itself is that you yourself might be indoctrinated to expect far more there to grasp than there is there; and you're reaching for a thousand bushelbasketsful when it's one small cupful of wheat sitting right in front of you. And you're saying, "Where are all these thousands of bushelbaskets?" You know? You're saying, "Now, this subject of space - let me see, the subject of space, let me seewhere, where is all this material on space?" It's sitting right in front of you. The subject of space is embraced by "space is a viewpoint of dimension." Engineering world didn't know this. It's very useful to them, you know. There it is though.

But you keep reaching out here for all these esoteric sidelines. You yourself, then, if you're doing that, are still trying to follow along the pattern you have been taught to follow by Germanic, Latin and Greek reason, see? You're not following what your natural instinct would be, which is simply to find, "Oh no! There's ten thousand bushels of wheat here? Where is the proper cup? There must be the important thing on the subject of wheat in these ten thousand bushels. Let's get at it."

Now you'll be going in the reverse, you see. You'll be trying to make far more out of a simplicity. Here's this little simplicity, and you want a great deal more of it. And do you know how bad this can get? It can get so bad that you don't make any cases well, that's how bad it can get. You keep looking for the deep, deep, deep - must be eight thousand fathoms by a Kelvin Fathometer - significance in the preclear. There's only one thing wrong with the chap, he can't see! And we look for deep significances. Is he trying desperately not to see because his father was once frightened by a snake? Or could it be that there is a very definite co-relationship between the twitters on his eyeballs? No, the trouble with the guy is he can't see. That's the totality of it, you know. And we could easily bypass this because we're used to some huge theoretical science, you see?

Now, I just keep writing in Scientology, but amazingly I like to write. Don't be misled by that. Dr. Stephens the other day was going over Scientology 8-8008, which was written and printed right here in England; he couldn't find anything new in our newer material. I think that's a joke. Quite a joke. Actually, we have a terrifically shifted emphasis here and there, but it's mostly in 8-8008, see. It's very simple. It's very simple, in essence. But if we are indoctrinated into one of these huge theoretical things like chemistry, which never adds up to anything anyhow (physicist speaking); and if we're indoctrinated into some sort of concatenation-by-the-side-road type of logiceven like quantum mechanics, which is the wildest thing anybody ever got into. And if an Anglo-Saxon wanted to clarify right now quantum mechanics, he would simply throw out the

constant c, which is what I've said several times, and that would then straighten out quantum mechanics and we could get on with the game. But as long as we have c as a constant in quantum mechanics we have to introduce what they call random factors, which are just dreamed up to make the equations balance. Something is in there making the equations not balance. What is it? Let's take a look at it.

Well the second we really take a look at it, we find it's c. The c is not a constant for these various particles, and as such, why, it imbalances quantum mechanics and makes a madhouse out of it. Cute. But a direct look says let's take something out of the thing, not put something new and arduous and horrible into the thing.

Now, has a great deal to do - although you probably, actually, basically, until you think it over you couldn't care less - has a great deal to do with your own personal viewpoint of a case: the degree to which you, yourself, are influenced by the complications of Germanic, Latin, Greek logic. You, yourself, may have been very deeply influenced by these things in any institution of higher education. See, we've got to have more to it, you know. It's got to be stated more arduously in some fashion or another, there's got to be more deviousness to embrace, the structural material must be so-and-so. But more important than that, you see a human being sitting in front of you. In Scientology, it says he has parts A, B, C and D, and you've got to straighten these out and separate them up and that's that. And you say, "But both eyelids of this particular case showed a definite magenta color which very definitely adds up to the fact that most people see red when they're angry." Tsk. See. You missed it, you missed it.

Let's just be more factual. He's A, B, C and D, and you do 1, 2, 3 and 4, got the idea? And we could just be riding past this madly, see. We could just be riding all around it and trying to find something of greater significance to do something about, in this case.

Now we've just done something fantastic. There have been new gains consistently, but they're all in gains of deeper understanding. We took a look at the body and we found out that the body itself was actually very hungry for motivators.

Wild! You mean it's hungry to get itself into accidents and get killed and so forth? Well, that's the bulk of bodies you see around, so naturally a thetan gets in trouble and he doesn't know which way he's going. So all we have here is, however, a new complexity or rationale about the same thing. What is havingness to the body? We know what it is to a thetan. Now we know a little bit more what it is to part B - the body. And knowing a little bit more about havingness, we can therefore handle havingness. And what do you know, we can straightaway now, knowing this and knowing that if you have an individual mock up blackness and shove it in ...

We have so many ways to handle havingness, that about the first thing we would do with a preclear today would be to repair and remedy his havingness, see. We know so much about this now. But how much do we know? It wouldn't take any time at all to tell you how much we know, see. But it's just terrific, the amount we do know, because there's no bric-a-brac lying around on it, you see. We do know what we know, and it's more important for an Anglo-Saxon to know what he knows than to know a great many, many, many, many things.

It's just a peculiarity which has brought him straight along into a mastery of the world and which will even yet shove him into one. He just wants to know things which are more important than other things and wants to know things that do things best. It's a peculiarity, almost - might say - a racial quirk, but nevertheless, that's the way it is.

Now then, the case which is fouling up in some fashion or another, today actually doesn't have any mystery involved in it. He's got a mystery about himself, but you shouldn't have any mystery about him. You really shouldn't have any mystery about him. You should know why he's fouling up. The chap - as soon as we take a look at the material on the thing, we say, "Well, this chap's - he's got a lot of ideas that he can't handle." That's simple, isn't it? Well, let's don't worry about ideas. He's got a lot of ideas he can't handle and he's stuck in his head and that probably makes him very uncomfortable and he has many present time problems that

he just can't get his attention onto or off of in order to straighten them out, and there he sits. Naturally he's unhappy about the whole thing. Now how do we make him happy?

Well, we just straighten up what we see right in front of our faces. And although a thetan is quite invisible, we have today about the most visible science you ever heard of! It's terrifically visible. We're right down to the point where you can measure the wavelength, if you please, of an engram. We're into a precision here. All right.

We should never overreach the preclear or read more into the preclear than is there, unless we ourselves want some problems. If you want some problems, mock up a preclear out here and get how many problems he could be to you. Make some problems that way, not by looking at the preclear and adding some new problems into his skull that aren't there. Lord knows, he's got enough complexities from his own point of view, don't you be complicated about your - from your point of view, too! Anything that's wrong with that pc will straighten out once you get the body over its strange starvations, its hunger to be smashed and done in, and get the thetan into some kind of a condition so he's able to control the body from a distance. It all works out. You're off! Done! See? 1 mean, that's in essence what you're trying to do.

Now you could get very, very complicated, get very complicated. But if you were getting complicated, I'd have to recommend you to the fact that you're probably more used to one of these theoretical sciences that just goes on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and never gets anyplace at all, see. We're not dealing with that type of information. We're dealing with the type of information if you measure one foot off the end of a two-by-four and pick up a saw and saw it off at that point, you will now have a piece of timber one foot long, you see. That's the kind of a science it is, which is flying right into the teeth of authority. It's just bang-bang-bang.

So I ask you to look at an engineering science that does get results, an engineering-type science that gets results, if we treat it as a simplicity, and as a simple science operating upon a simple organism; which for various and peculiar reasons of its own (which we don't care anything about because they're always different, person to person), gets itself into exactly the same state of collapse every time: dead in his head in a body which wants to be knocked off. Well, we just straighten that out and we're off.

Now I'm not making it sound more simple than it is. I'm trying to invite you to look at the greater simplicities of Scientology and to realize that you yourself are part of a revolution in favor of simplicity in the field of philosophy and in the field of the mind and man's behavior. You're part of that revolt. We're, in a way, a sort of a small Renaissance, but we're also a backflash. And I'd like you to know what you're flying into the teeth of and what you're going back toward and why it is that way. You could handle the thing much more easily if you knew that.

You can certainly handle a preclear more easily if you yourself are not trying to put further complications into him. He isn't very complicated. His terrific amounts of romance - there's lots of imagining that you can do about it, there's a terrific amount of material that you could dream up which is corollary material and probably very aesthetic. It's a lot of fun, it's a good game and so forth, but as far as a preclear is concerned, he's not even a very good problem today. He's dead in his head in a body that wants to get knocked off, that's all.

And you solve that with the various levels of processes, and the issue of processing called "Six Levels of Processing, Issue 8" takes these various conditions up, just one right after the other and says you do this about them. All right.

Now, although this lecture possibly is not terribly interesting, doesn't seem very intimate, it isn't very informative, it nevertheless is possibly a clarification in your mind as to why the savants of learning and so forth, have a tendency to sort of press back against you, why you're acceptable to the guy in the street, why you're having a little bit of heavy going in some of the parlors, and exactly what you're doing.

You’re a raw, red revolutionary - you’re simplicity revolting against a complexity. You’re trying to uphold an Anglo-Saxon method of thinking and directness in the teeth of all the complexities which have been used to enslave Great Britain and America throughout all these years. And as such, of course, you know, when you’re a raw, red revolutionary, you occasionally get your teeth kicked in.

Well, if you know wherein you are revolting, maybe you can duck now and then and make somebody else run for a change.