

5707C07

14th lecture at the „*Freedom Congress*“ held in Washington, DC

CHILD SCIENTOLOGY

A lecture given on 7 July 1957

[Based on clearsound version and checked against the old reels. Clearsound omissions marked „>“. This tape also had a section marked „⌘“ missing on the old reels and present in the clearsound version. It is possible that the old version was edited because this tape was used as part of the 2D lectures sold to general public prior to clearsound. Considering that this lecture is a bit short, it is possible that there are further sections that are missing in both the old and the clearsound versions, so if anyone has a copy rerecorded in DC prior to the St. Hill or Flag versions of the old reels, please check it.]

It is absolutely fantastic how long I have held back from saying anything vital about children, or really giving you any kind of an authoritative rundown at all on the subject. Really fabulous! A little later this afternoon, I'm going to give you some more and give you a little rundown on CCH, the way she is done, if you want me to. And it's absolutely necessary that I do that, by the way, because some of you are not going to be able to restrain yourself in trying to run Tone 40 processes on children. I know that you will do it, whether you've had the drills or not, and Child Scientology is almost totally based on Tone 40 processes. Child Scientology is not workable without Tone 40 processes and, therefore, for the first time, I can tell you very, very pertinently that we have arrived somewhere. I am willing, now, to talk about children, for the excellent reason that we aren't going to miss on the subject.

> Up to this time, I would say that our liabilities and our > misses were many with regard to processing of children. But > they're not, now. They're really not.

It is quite remarkable, the number of misconceptions which have existed concerning children - the child mind and child processing - and that is the first thing I'll have to take up here. Those misconceptions are so considerable that they are woven into the woof and warp of everyone's lives here in this nation. And they're a pack of stinking lies! When you're talking about children, you are not talking about everybody's case. That is something psychoanalysis gave us. There is probably no slightest connection between your case and your childhood! It is just incidental that you were a child.

Now, that's a sweeping statement, when you come to think about it, because the psychologist and the psychoanalysis people have, all of them, maintained that, *„If you could just clear up childhood, you'd be all right.“* Jerks! I say *„the jerks“* because they led ME astray and I don't like people who fool me.

When I first started research and investigation into the field of the mind, my attitudes were a bit colored, I will inform you, by Freudian analysis which I knew very, very well. I had studied it, not suffered it. Also, I knew psychology, I knew what passed for child psychology. I used to sit over in the engineering school and some of my pals in the Columbian College would come over and they'd say, *„Oh, my God, I can't pass this examination or write this paper.“* And I'd take their textbook on psychology and write the paper for them - they'd do my mathematics. Anyway, (laughter) children have less connection, and observation of children has less connection, with the field of the mind, if anything, than death. Death has a much more intimate connection than childhood, very much so. But more important than this... Oh, there's only one thing that has even less connection, and that's mice. Mice have practically NO connection with the field of the mind. I mean, you probably couldn't get further from the point than to study mice. They got almost that far, though, by studying children.

Now, here's why the study of children has been such a booby trap to all of our think-ings. This is, this is very important because it changes the whole basic concept, if you can see this, it changes, it will change your whole basic concept of values as to what behavior is. These characters, with a princenez and a VanDyke beard, back in the '90s, who were adventuring to foist their opinions off in the guise of scientific fact, were actually basically working at what would turn out to be eventually the destruction of the people of Earth, because they insisted upon certain basic principles which were VERY very incorrect.

The first of these principles is this, and you can see what I'm talking about at once here, because here, here we have an idea that the CHILD is the primitive or native state of Man. You got that, now? You know, you've read that opinion around, haven't you? In order to find out - I've even erred in this direction, just to show you how much you can color people's opinions - in order to find out how an adult would act or how a primitive would act, or something or other, we compared it to childhood. Childhood was being used as the standard base for behavior. You see this now? We took a look at childhood and we said, *„Now, that is a standard by which we can evaluate human behavior.“* It's just like taking an old piece of copper wire somebody found on a dump out here someplace, just at random, and saying, *„This is a foot and everybody now will have to call this old wound up piece of wire one foot. That's one foot, now.“* Just a complete arbitrary run into the whole thing, because it isn't even basically, it doesn't even compare. There isn't any such standard as *„child behavior.“* Child behavior is no more a standard than psychotic behavior is a standard for the basis of HUMAN behavior. Anybody who claims that child behavior progresses through a number of clear-cut stages, which are then comparable to every other child, DESERVES to be psychoanalyzed. (laughter)

This is quite peculiar, because it brings about this misconception in the social activities of Man. They say that a child is anti-social. He comes into the world aware only of

himself, and progresses through various stages of awareness, until he gets to be a social character. And only the duress, and hammer and pound, punishment and so forth, makes this child a social character. Look! They've accepted „*child behavior*“ as the standard, as the middle, as the common denominator, as THE thing called human behavior, and it isn't even vaguely resembling it. It doesn't even resemble it, there's no comparison. Don't you see? They say that, „*We have to take this person and lead him out into the world from this state of childhood, and if we didn't do so-and-so with human beings, they would then act in their native state,*“ which is what? A child. Childhood is no more a native state for Man than mice. It is, in essence and actually, a very trying period of mental duress. And to tell everybody that this is the way everybody would be if they weren't socially trained and so forth, is to tell everybody that they're psychotic. And I wouldn't say that this was the end goal of the people perpetuating this idea, but I wouldn't be surprised if it were, to tell everybody that their basic standard of conduct would be psychotic activity.

⌘ You take Karl, ha-ha, Menninger. Menninger believes this so well, he confessed the other day to being totally insane. He did. It was on the front page a few months ago of the Washington Post. Washington Post has four or five psychologists on staff just to make sure that their murders are juicy enough. He said he wouldn't say that one out of ten or ten out of fifteen people were psychotic, he wouldn't give an average, because he said everybody in the world was. Oh yes, he did. Some time or another during his life, everybody in the world was nuts. So therefore, everybody was crazy, so you couldn't say ten out of fifteen, it was actually fifteen out of fifteen - direct quote. That included Will Menninger, only he didn't notice it.

⌘ Some of these characters go around, try to discourage a loss of practice, you know, they don't like to lose their practice any more than an auditor does, and they try to keep the practice from being lost by telling people I'm crazy. I'm probably the only one that they would find, I wouldn't be terrifically disturbed or flattered by the remark of being called crazy, because who is calling who crazy? It's quite interesting, I mean, it's one of these fascinating things. Who is calling who crazy? Well, they believe everybody is crazy, so what is this idea of „*crazy*“ and what do we mean by „*crazy*“? Well, it must be because the standard of behavior looks pretty crazy to all of us.

Actually, the standard of behavior of a child, to use that as a standard of behavior, is to brand everybody with, at least, eccentric behavior, irrationality and so forth. Look at the, look at the tremendous thing that has happened here. They've said, „*Man is stupid until he's educated. He is anti-social until he's beaten into being social.*“ Do you get the idea? Well the core of all of that ideology, if that's what it is, is that standard behavior is the behavior of a child. And to find out how people behave before they're colored or messed up by the society, you should study children. You see how that would be? I mean, and immediately, we then would have this idea that everybody, everybody must be beaten and hammered and pushed and educated and so forth. And nobody has given a being this possibility that maybe, if they just left him alone for a little while and let him relax, he'd straighten out. You got the idea? It's very true, by the way, if

people in sanitariums were simply permitted to rest and eat - some of them would die, they would just lie down and die - but the greater number of them would probably say, well, they'd get enough sleep eventually, and come out of it. In other words, stop fooling with them.

Well, similarly with children, we start to work children over with unworkable theories, unworkable duresses, unworkable tricks, and most of these child psychology things and so forth are just a whole series of gags and tricks which, if you worked them on a preclear, he'd be mad as the devil at you. And these, these children could just be left to relax, they could be permitted to relax. Do you get the idea? Why keep working with them? It's a funny thing, but if you take a child who is having a, a, well, he's having a fight with some other child, and if you merely assume that he's either tired or hungry, you're right. See? He's having a fight so you assume he's tired or hungry, feed him and put him to bed. He's very cross and he's having a great deal of libido complex or something of the sort, or he can't control his constipation or something, assume that if he's upset that he's tired or hungry or both, feed him and put him to bed. (laughter)

Now, if a child is having a very great deal of trouble in school and being extremely anti-social with his playmates and that sort of thing, before Scientology, all you could have done to him that was effective would be feed him and put him to bed. Why? You mean to tell me, you can teach a thetan anything? You can UNteach him. You can restimulate and snap out into the clear a bunch of teachings, what we do in Scientology, as-is them and straighten them out, and an individual can then do better. You should think of this, you should think of this as very peculiar that when we audit somebody in the direction of erasing a bunch of his concepts of one character or another, blowing a lot of his past misconceptions about life, that he suddenly becomes more intelligent, his IQ goes up.

Now, that's very interesting, isn't it? Because child psychology has never at any time, done anything but say, „*It is impossible to change anybody's IQ. IQ changes as the years go along and it changes along a certain pattern where the person is never smarter than a person is smart...*“ In other words, they shoot you from a gun and in flight, your course will never be changed. I'd say the boys who were doing this must have been educated in, in fatalism. I think the god Kismet must be the god of psychology. It's all fate, and there's nothing you can do about it. Very well. Before Scientology, this idea that the child was a standard of human behavior and that an individual got in bad shape if not super-educated and put under super-social stress, have actually colored the entire field of human behavior to such a degree that I think you'd have a little bit of difficulty dispelling all of it, suddenly. Why?

Because we have to enter a relatively forbidden field to find out what a child is all about, and that relatively forbidden field is para-Scientology. Well, it's time for us to face up to it. It's all right for us to tell the truth and then say it's a fairy tale, I guess. But there comes a time when it is necessary to front up to the actual nature of Man if you're going to do anything for him. There is a CCH process called Then And Now Solids. It's very doubtful if a person could be run on Then And Now Solids, for any length of time at all, without falling through. He's running full track material before

you can stop him. In other words, you say, „*Well, let's just stick to this present lifetime and let's erase childhood and that'll make him all right.*“ It's not true. And you start running Then And Now Solids and you at once will find yourself confronting the phenomena of whole track, which is to say, Man has lived before. And which also tells us that Man will inherit, in the next life, all he didn't do in this one, which, I guess, is the idea of fate.

Karma. Karma isn't true. But it's true that if somebody kicked off all the bodies... I've had it explained to me that it was perfectly all right to kick all the bodies off in this life because, you see, ha-ha - the fellow saying this is old, you know - and he says, „*Well, I'm old and I don't care whether I'm kicked off by some disease or by an atom bomb. What difference does it make?*“ Pfah, what a goon, what a stupe. Imagine his embarrassment. He comes back and he tries to pick up a body on a planet where there ain't none nohow. Well, if he was in the field of psychology, I can only hope that he picked up a particularly obnoxious mouse. (laughter)

The future is quite interesting in that regard. Where do you go from here? Well, we know in Scientology where you go from here. There's no use kidding ourselves and saying, „*Well, the public doesn't like us to talk about things like that.*“ We know where you go from here. You go and pick up another baby and you're on your way. Well, if that's the case, we have to take up where you've been.

Now, an E-meter is a very interesting thing and an E-meter tells us... We still have them around, by the way. And every once in a while, we use an electropsychometer, we use one to track things down. And you can take one of these E-meters, or you could take the biggest and most beautiful police lie-detector you ever laid your eyes on, and get exactly the same results, because that's all an E-meter is, it's a more accurate police lie-detector. You take either of these instruments and you could trace somebody back earlier than this life. Now, I'm not, I'm not telling you, now, a bunch of Eastern superstition, I'm telling you something that's probably much better founded than MV squared. I mean, this is demonstrable, this is very easily demonstrable - demonstrable with an E-meter, demonstrable in other ways. And the individual, who starts to get well in processing, falls through, he falls out of this life into earlier lives and starts knocking stuff out of them. And he finds it's much more aberrative to become...

Well, let's say he is having trouble with his present wife, and his last wife fed him cyanide. Now, you're going to get this fellow over his worries about his present wife, and leave the fact that he's been killed by a wife just utterly neglected? Hah! How silly. In other words, he's worried about women because they've knocked him off. So, the auditor could sit there and saw away on little pieces and chips of a log, you know, and chip at it with a teaspoon. And he could do some interesting things, he could wipe out all the times his wife has been nasty to him, he could wipe out all the times his mother has kicked him down the stairs, and he, the auditor could erase and deal with numerous other incidents dealing with women in the current lifetime. And the mystery of it would be that, at the end of the time, the fellow wouldn't feel quite as bad about his wife, but women wouldn't be solved. Alright. We, we erase this getting knocked off with cyanide in the last life and, all of a sudden, why, the fellow'll say, „*Well, to handle*

women, I'll just buy up all the cyanide in the world and ... " In other words, being killed was a much more serious experience than having a teacup slammed in front of him angrily. Do you see that?

So, when we deal with the magnitude of human aberration, we're dealing with the drama of life and death which has happened many, many times. Now, an E-meter demonstrates this, processing demonstrates this. And when all of this Bridey Murphy came out, I imagine a few of you wondered why we didn't plunge in. Well, as a matter of fact, we plunged out, at once. The London Express people were quite upset with us because we told them, „*Can it, can it. Lay off of it, lay off of it. Skip it.*“ They came forward to us with a program whereby they were going to offer reward for any other people who had remembered former existences. We said, „*Can it!*“ And they said, „*Why? Why? I mean, gee whiz, we think this is a good idea!*“ We said, „*Look, it isn't how to find people who have lived before. That isn't the trick. It's to get them OUT of having lived before that's the trick.*“ And sure enough, in three days they cancelled their entire program - on our advice, originally, but they had found out that they were flooded by people who remembered having lived before, and they were plunging all over the track and getting stuck into things and so forth, and having a wonderful time. And the London Express came off of this whole program immediately.

The trick is not getting people into past lives - it's getting them out of them, that's the trick. And you start to run Then and Now Solids today on the most innocuous, skeptical person that you ever saw at all, and you've gotten him up with CCH to a point where he could run it, and the next thing you know, why, he's running a life here and a life there. And he sees a little girl running, he sees a little girl running around, and he says, in auditing, „*What's all that? Little girl running around... My god, no wonder, no wonder I'm having trouble with sex, I was a little girl in my last life.*“ See? I mean, you get, you get all sorts of things. You worry about homosexuality. I don't know how there could be anything else, the way you get scrambled on sexes on the track. It's quite remarkable that the sexes stay straight, I mean, I think that's the remarkable thing.

Now, you take Creative Processing. Creative Processing works. We have somebody mock up - create the mental image picture of - women or men or cycles of action, something like this. Those pictures are not usually hitting against this lifetime. They are actually dealing with earlier existences. I'm sorry we have to face up to this, I'm sorry we have to be brave and strong and say that's it. Of course, it's a good thing that, that something has forced us out into the open on this, because any inquiring mind can pick up an E-meter, do some auditing and so forth, and run into this phenomena. The phenomena is not just there to be run into, it is inescapably present. We have been aware of this phenomena, by the way, since middle 1950.

Well, we never had any real reason to go outside the field of auditing and say anything about it until children, as a subject, came along. And now it becomes vital that we say something about it. Why? Look, this little child has just gone through the experience of death and his tiny, his havingness is not up to the larger body that he just lost, he is insecure, he is entirely disoriented, he has lost all of his possessions, he's lost all of his friends, and he's lost his memory. And yet, he's still aware of all of these things having been, and he picks up this body and he tries to get oriented somehow. Now, listen, if

you had somebody with that much loss on his immediate backtrack, you would find him in an „*only one*“ state, wouldn't you? You would find him pared down to nothing, wouldn't you? He would really be STRICKEN. That's a child. All you have to know about children is cases. And if you don't stop compartmenting children out as a special category, which is the standard for the human being, or if you don't stop just compartmenting them out, you'll continue to have trouble trying to instruct them, trying to do something with them and so forth. They're in AWFUL condition. It's a wonder they're not psycho, but they're not. They're the ones that didn't go psycho, they went and picked up another body. You got that? So, they actually represent the tougher strata of thetans. They're still in there, willing to pitch.

But, boy! What kind of a state is he in? He's terribly easily exhausted, his havingness is shot. You can't give him, you can't give him a Buick roadster. All you can give him, on a gradient scale, is a little tiny plastic car, that long. He can have that, he lost his Buick roadster. Now, do you see the function and this fixation on toys? They build back a gradient scale of havingness, that's all.

Now the kid's got to wait for eighteen, twenty years, everybody tells him, until he can have a body that he can do something with. They tell him also that he won't be able to work until he's got gray hair. They tell him he's got to remain totally dependent. They tell him he doesn't have any role in the society. Look-a-here, he's just been kicked out by death, and now somebody's going to make him wait all these years to be enfranchised again or have any duties. You know that a little kid is tremendous. He will actually try to work to the best of his ability. Most parents are too impatient with children to just let them work, because the children mess things up and so forth. So, the average child, by the time he's five, six years old, is somewhat disabused of the idea of working. That's how you'd really ruin a society.

You've got to spend time... Little girl comes in, she's about 3-4 years old, and you're mopping the floor, something like that, and the little girl takes a sloppy rag and bangs it into the wallpaper and so forth. Aw, give her a break, give her a break, show her how to wring it out and guide her hand a little bit on the floor and let her mop the floor, too. She comes up smiling. „*What do you know, you mean I could really maybe be some use someday!*“ Don't just say, „*Get out of here now, you're messing things up,*“ and all that sort of thing.

Children are people. Don't forget it, because the whole problem becomes unworkable the moment you assume anything else. Children are people. Alright.

We've got another factor that's a bug factor that we will have to do something about, and that is this idea of attention span. You get all these stable data about children which aren't data at all. „*Children have a short attention span.*“ That's not true. „*People who are in an exhausted frame of mind have a short attention span.*“ That's true. And the shortness of child attention is not something that you, as an auditor, should pay any attention to, at ALL. It is something you should just totally neglect beyond it is a sign that your preclear is having a little bit of a tired time of it.

Then what is child processing? It is not the processing of psychotics, because these children are exhausted sane people. They're kind of shook-up sane people, you got

the idea? They're not batty, they've got a future, but they are certainly not the kind of preclear that you would handle carelessly. And the first thing that a child requires, as a preclear, is good, formal auditing. And the one thing he ordinarily gets is careless, patch-up auditing. And if you had just lost all of your possessions in the last couple of years and an auditor came along to do something for you, you certainly would not appreciate an assist which didn't start with any kind of rudiments, no formality of a session, ended when the process wasn't flat. You got the idea? You just wouldn't appreciate that, would you? Well, this speaks well for Scientology that it's functional in this area.

Children are people. They have been through some very rough experiences, they are not in very good shape, their possessions are very small, their dependence is tremendous. That they pick up some engrams and locks in childhood is almost beside the point, of no consequence. It's just bluntly of no consequence the childhood is aberrative, to some extent, because all of these aberrative locks of childhood sit on heavier engrams of great duress earlier on the track. Don't you see? How about somebody who was diving on a Jap battleship and got his teeth full of explosive machine gun bullets, hm? And now you've got him as a little boy who can't even have a toy airplane. It's quite interesting. Sometimes, you take a child and he has these, all of these odd fetishes and symbols and difficulties that children ran into are, were quite remarkable, because they were not understandable. You couldn't quite add them up, one way or the other. I remember little Tinny-tin... You know, by the way, I'm not occupying the interestingly, the absolute - to be an authority on any subject, you mustn't have had any experience with it - and I'm not occupying that tremendously advantageous spot of having no practical experience in what I'm talking about. It's very advantageous to be in that position. The number of kids I've got are quite numerous.

Little Tinny-tin was doing all right - my little boy, he's about 3 now - he was doing all right. One day, when the maid, the girl that was taking care of him, came in and she took him into her room and she had a clown on her mantelpiece. And Tinny-tin took one look at the clown and went all to pieces, just went to pieces, cried and sobbed and everything else. As a matter of fact, he had headaches for another year and was banging his head to pieces on concrete and every other darn thing until I finally got to him with CCH, fairly recently. Remarkable, huh? It all went back to a clown on a mantelpiece. He'd just gotten killed as one. And it was more havingness, this little tiny clown, you see, than he could take. He just couldn't take it, he just shattered, right on the spot. The reason I know this is a fact is because he has also become nervous with later clowns. But he isn't nervous with the subject now.

His head would ache so badly that he would roll his head from side to side, and it wasn't until I suddenly noticed that his motions were that of a person who would be in considerable pain that I finally dug this thing up and figured it out. He was hurting his head because it hurt, he was shaking his head because he couldn't stand it to stay still. When I first found this out many, many months ago, I simply gave him an aspirin. See, you can't ask a child what's wrong, he can't talk to you too well. That aspirin just made him all right and he went to sleep. That was that. And when he'd get these

headaches, why, I'd give him a little child aspirin. Then I gave him some CCH and he hasn't been troubled that way. It blew his, blew his head somatics and so forth. I don't know what he did as a clown, I don't even know what the facsimile was. I haven't a clue as to what it was all about, except I know Tinny-tin had never been hurt in this lifetime. But he'd gotten a key-in, one day somebody had bumped his head, and his other key-in was the clown. Bang bang, and there we had a little boy who was in trouble. He was nervous, he couldn't learn and he couldn't do anything, he felt quite destructive and he was in pain.

You'd say that all bad children are in pain and all bad children are in trouble, but it's necessary for YOU to understand exactly WHAT trouble they're in. And that requires tremendous power of observation, of which child psychology is nothing, there is no observation possible in that field. There is no specialized state of mind known as childhood. Now, that's an awful make- nothing-out-of-it, wipe-it-all-out, but I've got to tell you that and give you the, the idea pretty clearly so as to persuade you to use the most formal processing of which you are capable. You process a one-day-old baby, start the session! It doesn't matter that the kid can't answer you, that has no bearing on it at all. Start the session. Audit the child in a proper auditing room. Use communication bridges when you change the process. Bridge out of the session and end the session smoothly, when the process is flat.

Don't pick up a kid sitting in the living room, kid's sitting in the living room and you come in, and you say, „*Well, I'll run some processing on the kid,*“ and then dinner's ready and you leave. You wouldn't like that. And your kid, after a while, will become extremely allergic to processing. Why? He's received very bad auditing. You can make a, you can make a bad preclear out of him. It's pretty hard to do, but it can be done.

Now, the only thing that works on children, and I say this, say this - sounds like an adventurous statement, it isn't - the only thing that works on children, with any degree of uniformity, is Tone 40 auditing. That works and the rest of it doesn't work. Now, I have processed a child on less than Tone 40 auditing, here and there, with marked success, don't you see, I mean, here and there with good success. But it wasn't until Tone 40 processing came along that I got a look at a child, and found out that I had an adult on my hands. I ran enough Tone 40 on a child, on one child, to discover that I was auditing a person. Child began to talk like one, began to act like one. Because his body was lighter than an adult body, he could get around better. Therefore, he was livelier. And because he had the hope of growing up and acquiring more havingness, he had a little brighter outlook and didn't have to take things too seriously. Heh, you could tell any adult that he was about to inherit a huge estate down in Florida and he'd brighten up too, see? No difference. I found out I was auditing people.

Now, over in London, we have audited children, audited children in the clinic, very successfully, and we've done so here. Audit them just exactly like you would audit any other preclear. Only, please, audit them like you would audit an adult preclear. You've got it made. Attention span? Forget it! Cute sayings, being cute with them? Forget it! Somebody came along to you and said like this, you'd think he was nuts, „*Goo-goo da-da.*“

Now, you'll find children will pick up more successful phases of earlier lives in their choice of toys, just as any adult. Diana, for instance, undoubtedly had something to do with the telephone company in the last, last life. She undoubtedly did, because she paid no attention to any toys, had nothing to do with any toys, until one day we brought in a telephone. And she said, this little baby, you know, „(Sigh!) *Klonk.*“ (laughter) And even today, she holds long complicated conversations over dummy phones, and her telephone manners are very, very good. You walk in and talk to her, she may give you a good social interview and maybe not, but you can call her up over the phone and you would find the politest, most mature little lady that you ever wished to talk to. Quite remarkable. I phoned her up this morning, by the way, and asked her how she was doing and so forth, and we had a very pleasant conversation. The meticulousness of her telephone manners is what is fabulous. This she knows well, she's had something to do with switchboards and telephones. It's the only thing she pays any attention to. Her one ambition is to go dancing in the pictures - that hasn't changed since she was about six months old. She's going to go dancing in pictures, that's what Diana's going to do. I suppose there's nothing you can do about it. It's probably the one activity on the backtrack that she hasn't been killed at. (laughter)

No, you really have to, have to limber up your mind and open up your mind on the subject of concepts of one kind or another, concepts of life, to look at a child, and you realize that you are looking at an adult with less body. He's got more future and less body and that's about the only difference. Now, when you run CCH on a child at Tone 40, you run CCH on a child at Tone 40. You open sessions, bridge them, end them. It's a formal auditing session.

Now, the other tremendously important thing, the other tremendously important thing about children, is this whole area where the child is trying to participate in society and in its activities, and unless you can frame a child into society and its activities, with something like 8-C and that sort of thing, the child is still stuck. So, what you're trying to do is bring the child up to present time. Of course, the child comes up to present time, he has less body than he had if he's stuck on the backtrack in an adult body. Do you see that clearly? Alright.

And part of that is this. Every Scientologist is trying to lead his kid too far. He's leading him, leading him, leading him. Now, this kid is growing up, but leading him is the sin. Nothing he does anywhere is all right, it has always got to be better. And you breed him into an apathy eventually, his recognition that he cannot do anything to please you. You never give him a win when you do that. You got it? You say, „*Lean forward, talk better, get better educated, go on up scale better, grow better, do this better, do that better.*“ When I see Scientologists handling children, the only crime that they're committing - they're handling children beautifully on the whole, just gorgeously, except this one little crime - which, if not spotted and isolated, can actually make a child very unhappy. Lead him, lead him, lead him.

It isn't don't let him, don't, don't fall off on the cliché of, „*Well, let him be a child once in a while,*“ or something like that. Most play is simply hysteria. You watch a bunch of children running around in the yard and, all of a sudden, they become very hysterical and their eyes start staring around and they start clawing each other, boy, and their

voices go up in high C, and you say, „*Oh, look at the little children playing*“ They're going nuts! They're too tired and they're probably hungry, they're probably worn out, and the thing to do is to get them inside and calmed down - not just because you don't like to hear them yell. It's because they're going to get worse and worse, and then somebody is going to get hurt. They only get bunged up when they go completely spinning. But this idea of „*letting them be a child once in a while*“ is not what I'm talking about. Let them be as adult as you want, demand they be as adult as they can be or as a child as they can be - that isn't it. It's give them a win once in a while. See, I mean, here you have this child, and he's growing up here and he's just, and all the time you're saying, „*Well, he's going to be better,*“ and so on. And you're getting him to take five steps - he's taking four, you want him to take five, see? Once in a while, let him take four. And here's the key to it. In processing them and living with children, every now and then, tell them to do something they CAN do, not something you HOPE they can do. (applause)

This is, by the way, one of these simple observations that is SO simple that it usually entirely evades observation. Got that? It usually does. Now, the best child process we had, up to CCH, was simply Withdraw. We'd put out our hand and the baby would reach for our hand, we'd withdraw our hand slightly. That was the best we had, the same process that worked on cats and so forth. But the whole of CCH will work on a child, eventually, and certainly the first two steps are very functional on any child that can even vaguely walk. And that leaves one process at the bottom for those that aren't ambulant. Fortunately, it's a fine process, has three sections. CCH 1, „*Give me your hand,*“ „*Thank you.*“ Right hand, left hand and both hands, and that, that works on a child who isn't ambulant and can't talk yet. But as they go on up the line, the rest of them work. Don't worry about, don't worry about, is he old enough for the process. No. Has his CASE progressed enough to take the process.

Now, when you realize that you're teaching a child arithmetic who knows arithmetic, you realize that education is normally invalidative. You know, you can mark him wrong all the time about his arithmetic. He possibly knew arithmetic, but he couldn't talk or handle a pencil. By the time education, quite normally, gets through with him, why, they've gone on a wrong assumption: they have assumed that he did not know any arithmetic and they're going to teach him arithmetic. You got it? Well, that's an incorrect assumption. The proper assumption, the workable, I should say, assumption in this case is assume that he has a college education, if he could just get at it. Assume he knows how to drive a car, if he could just sit up high enough behind the wheel. What he's held down with is size and control and mechanics, do you see, that's, that's holding him down. But whenever you teach him something, for heaven sakes, as I said before, give him an occasional win.

I'll give you a very amusing example of this. There was a little baby and he was lying in his crib and he was crying, crying, crying, crying, crying. And I'd noticed both of his parents, Scientologists, just been leading this little kid and leading him you know, I mean, they'd given him more than he could do. And so I got alongside the crib and I said, „*Hello,*“ I said, „*Lie in your crib. Thank you. Lie in your crib. Thank you. Lie in your crib.*“ That's what he was doing, see, and he heaved a tremendous sigh of relief and

shut up. (laughter) So, you see, you can get, it's pretty simple, it's pretty simple. You gave him a win. You gave him a win, you told him to do something he could do. Do you see that?

Well, that's the size of child processing. It actually requires a good auditor. It requires a very good auditor. And when they blow sessions, you don't let them blow and you carry right on through, you don't let them wash it up just because they became upset about something. That's the time you carry on. And Tone 40 processing cracks these cases. I cannot tell you, at this time, how high a child could be raised or into what concept of existence or how adult he could become. I can only tell you that we can fix him up on most anything that's wrong with him. I don't know how far north a child will go on CCH, it has not been tried. Everybody is so astonished at some now-mannerly little lady or little boy or something like that, who seems to have good sense and is carrying along and is much happier about life, that they never try to push him any further. Their ideas of what a child should be hamper them to such a degree that they never push them on up to being able to speak French and Latin, too. I don't know how high this can go, I haven't any idea, I haven't a clue. This is in its infancy, but it's quite remarkable that it has reached infancy as a subject.

The subject is, to all intents and purposes, wrapped up as you look at it from the bottom. That is to say, you can't take a child now and flop. If you know how to run CCH, you will do something for it. By the way, kids make terrific auditors, they make terrific auditors. They haven't had to mislearn so many things or something of this sort, or maybe they're just naturally bright, or maybe they're just perceptive, or maybe they're interested, or maybe they're more human beings than older people after they've been processed. But every kid that I've ever run into, who has studied Dianetics or Scientology has wound up being a fine auditor. It's rather fantastic. So, it tells us that there is something to be known about that, that there is something to be done about it, and we've got things in pretty good shape, in general, on this particular subject.

I'm very, I must stress to you that a child deserves a formal session and should always be given a formal session, and that the processes which work on children are the Tone 40 CCH processes. And those are pretty well wrapped-up conclusions with tremendous experience behind them. I hope this information can be of service to you.

Immediately after the end of this lecture, practically right now, we are going to christen a couple of kids. So, don't go 'way. (applause)

OK. If the parents of these here chilluns will bring 'em front and center.

- OK. This is Mr. Bloomquist, Mr. Bloomquist here. (applause) And this is Mrs. Bloomquist, and introducing to the audience right now. And George Sidler and Ethel Fredericks and decided to be godfather and godmother. So we're all set.

Now, as a matter of sober fact, I want you to realize that one of these christening ceremonies is, we've, we've got it right down. I'll show you how you do this. OK? (baby fussing) Somebody's protesting. Here we go. Now, how are you, huh? Oh, that's better, huh? Alright. Now, your name is Kevin Jonathan Bloomquist. You got

that? Kevin Jonathan Bloomquist. Good. There you are. Did that upset you? Now, do you realize that you're a member of the HASI? Pretty good, huh? Alright. Now, I want to introduce you to your father, this is Mr. Bloomquist. Come over here. (baby babbling) Oh, that's all right. No, it's OK, it's OK. That's all right. That's right. Turn it into a laugh. And here's your mother. (baby babbling) OK. OK. It's all right. That's right. And now, in case you get into trouble and want to borrow some quarters, whoa, there's Mr. Sidler. See him? He's your godfather. Now take a look at him. That's right. And here's Ethel Fredericks, in case you want some real good auditing, she's your grandmother, your godmother. Got it? (baby babbling) Ha ha. Alright. Now, you is suitably christened. Don't worry about it. It could be worse. (Ron laughs) OK. Thank you very much.

Female voice: Thank you.

You bet.

Male voice: Thank you.

(applause)

They'll treat you all right. OK. You betcha.

Well, hello, hello. This is the first time I've seen you. Good for you. Now, come here, come here. Fine. Here we are, other way to. There we go. There we are. That's a nice smile, that's a good smile. Yes, sir. Now, you are Galen Farrell, you got that? Hm? Galen Farrell. Yes. And you are also a member of the organization. Got that? Oh, you're a good baby, aren't you? Yees, well, you know when you're safe. Alright. And this is your pop, John Farrell. Introduce you to your pop, this is John Farrell, and he's your father. And introduce you to this Tuc Farrell, and she's a real good auditor, and she's your mama. That's right. That's a girl. Yeah. Alright. Now, I want to show you that you're real lucky, you're real lucky. Now here's your godfather, Wing Angell. And he's very rich and has an absolutely inexhaustible number of quarters, when you grow up. Just take a look at him, take a look at him. There he is. That's your godfather. And this is your godmother, Smokey. This is a gorgeous godmother you've got over here. Isn't that pretty good, huh? Alright, now that's fine. And you're a member of the organization, and everything is just fine. And thank you for coming up here to be christened. You betcha. Alright.

Female voice: Thanks, Ron.

You betcha. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Now, you see, that's a real complicated ceremony, you Scientologists, that's real complicated. The truth of the matter is, though, nobody's done it, nobody. They might have told the doctor, but they never told the kid what his name was, did they? And nobody's ever introduced him to his father and mother. So, that's the way we do it.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]