

DEFINITIONS: GLOSSARY OF TERMS – PART I

A lecture given on
12 January 1955

You have had quite a bit of the material of Scientology written to you and explained to you. You found out quite a lot about it, but if these were just a series of arbitrary definitions so that we could process, they'd be worthwhile but they wouldn't be very valuable.

Let's take up this business yesterday. Miriam suddenly discovered that the word symbol as given in the English language means a substitute for. Now, that's a very definite English definition. And instead of meaning this, she found out it meant mass, meaning and mobility. And this was a shock. Of course, it would be until she examined it further and found out that mass, meaning and mobility were a substitute for the thing which was life. And all of a sudden – I don't think I am drawing a longbow to say so – her understanding of Scientology in just this one little point broadened somewhat. Right?

If you can't get that kind of a spark out of every one of these definitions, if you can't get a broadening of your understanding of life out of these definitions, then there is something you have missed about one. Got it?

We are in the very happy state that there's doggone little added baggage riding along with us now. Now, you've seen me actually throw away with wild abandon, although you haven't noticed it, a tremendous amount of stuff. Man, we were accumulating there for a long time until we were the – it was up to the Plimsoll mark of Indian Ocean Summer. And we've just been strewing the wake with stuff

Look at all you don't have to know about engrams. Well, that's just one of many. Overt act-motivator sequence isn't very important, but it sure does explain a lot of behavior. We don't use it very much in processing.

More important than that, the whole book What to Audit got thrown into the wake, although today people read that with great fascination because it explains what these preclears have been up to all this time, you see; what they're dramatizing, and so on. It's a piece of understanding, but we don't use it in processing. And similarly there is a tremendous amount of bric-a-brac.

Well, if all of this throwing away has been going on, what has been kept aboard? Because there still is a small amount of cargo in Scientology which is the more important factors. Scientology, even though it now resembles a Missouri steamboat... A Missouri steamboat by the way was a remarkable thing. They tell the story about a steamboat pilot who

got one of these Missouri riverboats in the early days well up the Missouri, passenger and the captain and the pilot were about all the people there were aboard – course a couple of guys to stoke the engines. The passenger woke up and he looked around and he saw nothing but prairie in all directions, not a sign of water, not a sign of water this morning. And he saw the captain and the captain looked awful bleary-eyed, the passenger was bleary-eyed and they had both been drunk the night before, and the captain said, “That's right, we're eighteen miles from the river. The goddamned pilot got drunk last night and there was a light dew.”

Now, we almost resemble this wonderful state of affairs except nobody's drunk. We can travel on a light dew, and this is what you're studying right now. It's not very much.

But by golly, given a hole in one's understanding of the data which we still retain, an auditor can now get awfully puzzled, he can get very upset this is certain.

Let's take first and foremost one of the early basic words in Dianetics: aberration. The actual English derivation of the word means a crooked line, an aberration. It's a term actually which comes from the science of optics. A lens is aberrated if it twists the lines out of plane where they belong. A lens has as many aberrations as it twists the light out of a straight line. Look: cause-distance-effect, straight line between, the introduction of a via. Get that whole philosophy?

Audience: Uh-huh.

All right, it's right there in that word aberration.

We say, “somebody is aberrated.” Well, is there an absolute state of aberration? No, because you could just keep winding it up and winding it up. But is there a theoretical nonaberration? People who are – yes, very definitely it would be cause-distance-effect, known cause, known effect, straight line between and no vias, and that would be nonaberrated and would be nonaberrative.

Well, this is an interesting thing here. Let's take the boy, he knows he's right there, the preclear does, he knows the wall is right there, and he reaches out his hand and he touches the wall. Well, he's coming awfully close to cause-distance-effect, isn't he. And we make him go around cause-distance-effecting until we finally get him in the state where he recognizes that there's no via between him and the wall.

Now, many of the preclears that you have will stand up in front of a wall and can see that there is something between them and the wall, old masses of energy, all kinds of things and stuff and they will actually reach too deep, reach too shallow. It's just like the pilot who tries to land 20 feet under the ground or 80 feet above it. He can't reach his effect points anymore.

Well, you'll see this manifested in very, very many ways. He can't arrive for one thing. He'll start a task and never finish it. See, he knows there's so many vias.

Did you ever run into anybody that – they'd start to – did you ever ask anybody, “Can you please fix this tire?” And they are there and they got a couple of tire irons and so forth, and then they realize they have to have a jack and they go find the jack and they put that under there. Then they realize that they probably have to have a different type of lug wrench, a fancier one, and that one doesn't work very well, it works a little bit, you know so they have

to go and get another lug wrench. And then they realize by this time that they are wearing pretty good clothes, so they've got to go and put on some different clothes. And then they look over the spare that they're going to put on, and they decide that this needs some repairs first, although it looks all right to you. And they keep accumulating data, until at last they start accumulating excuses, and there sits the flat tire on and on and on. They are just departing on vias that keep them from arriving. And the more vias they hit, the less they are going to arrive.

You get a government, a bureaucracy. The reason we object to a bureaucracy is because it's via-via-via-via-via-via-via-via-via-via, and it never gets anyplace. What men are trying to do is make the system responsible. The system has got to be responsible, not the individual, and if this keeps going you have a very aberrative state of affairs, because you are looking straight at an aberration.

Aberration means no more, no less than a great many vias. Now, did it say a great many necessary vias? Unnecessary vias? No, it just said “a great many vias.”

For instance, here I sit talking to you. We have dispensed with a great many vias. There actually is a possible via on this line; there's a tape. All right, but this still has been unviaed down to a minimum.

You will notice however that every once in a while somebody objects to tapes. They just don't like these tapes. Well, they just – so, it's a via, it's obviously a via, so to some degree it's aberrative – some slight degree. Now, it just depends then on how much deaberrative material there is on an aberrative tape. It's just a sort of a contest between these two points. All right.

Now, we look at this aberration, if we understand aberration very well as a word, and as a definition, if we understand it – not just be able to quote it – if we understand this thing, we'll understand an awful lot about what's wrong with Joe Doakes and Bill Frud. We can also understand what's wrong with a psychiatrist.

A psychiatrist is sitting there looking at the patient and he's got to go find an electric shock machine. Dah! And the electric shock machine doesn't make anybody well. He's just putting some more vias on the line between the person and his own body and anatomy, see. But there the psychiatrist sits, you see, and there the patient sits. Now, let's take an E-Meter. Actually, what was originally called an E-Meter is going to be called shortly a physiogalvanometer, which word is trademarked by the HASI – a physiogalvanometer, it just happens to be a happy combination of words that has never been used before so it can be trademarked.

And the main difficulty with the old E-Meter was that the fellow who was making these things just couldn't bear to arrive or something, and we would have a conference and there had to be certain things put on this E-Meter to make it work, or certain things taken off to make it work and so on, and I'd get this thing pretty well streamlined and agreed upon with him, and then son-of-a-gun, we'd go back and put on two more dials, until we got something that was all dials and no meter, or all meters and no preclear. It just got to be so many vias.

In the first place, it was a big via between the auditor and the preclear, big via. But it had its purposes. It was actually merely a substitute for communication lag. That was all it was a substitute for. Now that we understand communication lag, our own understanding

came up, what possible use is an E-Meter? Well, the funny part of it is, it does have a use, but not in auditing. The physiogalvanometer today will be produced, probably, by the HASI or the HDRF for the purpose of personnel counseling. And it will be used to check employees' references without going into the vias of more letters.

We'll just ask him, "Why did you leave the job?" and he says, "Well, I just got tired of it." And the needle goes wham, you see. And you say, "You mean you got fired?" And the fellow says, "Well, yes."

This, by the way, gets around the fact that many employers will give an employee a reference, a good reference, just to get rid of him.

All right, so we can really then, with Scientometric testing, turn around and get a – with this physiogalvanometer – give a personnel counselor a very, very valid tool. We are going to indulge in just as an experiment a little bit of personnel counseling. We are going to start an employee certification service. And we are going to give anybody whose references are in good shape, or who is in good shape, and who can do the job a little card that says so. And in addition to that, if they can't do the job we are going to give them Group Processing for the same fee as their testing. See, this is a very direct line to raise the employability and employment capability of the country at large. If anyone wishes to start this up, it could roll.

We might start it up and let it roll.

The physiogalvanometer though, which will be used in order to accomplish this, doesn't even vaguely resemble in its parts, circuit or anything else the old E-Meter. It has two lights; it has a switch; the switch says ON and OFF. And one light is red and one light is green and they burn in varying degrees of intensity so that the needle is really falling. On an old E-Meter, you'd get that thing burning red-red-red-red-red-red-red-red-red-red-red-red, and if it were rising, you would get green-green-green-green-green- green-green-green, and if it were neither rising nor falling but were stuck, both lights would be out, regardless of what the tone is. Nobody ever made sense out of tone anyhow.

So this will be the personnel counselor's physiogalvanometer. You have a red light and a green light, it'll have an on and an off switch, it'll have a plug which you plug it in, it'll have one electrode that the person holds in his hand, and that will be the end of the meter. There's nothing more there. No other adjustment, no other dials, nothing. And it'll probably look like a desk ornament. Or it'll look like a nice little desk clock or something of the sort. Now, that's taking the vias out of the line.

The only reason we are giving it to the employment counselor is because he doesn't know his Scientology, so he needs something to give him the word.

Actually a Scientologist can be very ruthless on personnel counseling, he doesn't like to cut his ARC down to the point that he would have to cut it down by reason of talking to people; he just doesn't like to cut it down this far. He likes to believe for the best – and he knows doggone well that that person with that neuritis – ding! below 2.0. He knows that. Experience will bear it out. He doesn't need an E-Meter to tell him this person is telling lies about his last employment. He would just look over the physical condition of the individual and tell you whether or not he had the straight dope. The easiest thing in the world if he really

wanted to study it from this angle and recognize exactly what he was looking at, he could do this.

All right, let's take this word aberration, and let's find out that the greatest via in the world is an unknown. That's the greatest via there is. All right, if the greatest via is an unknown, therefore the more mysteries that you impose on auditing, the more mysteries you impose on living, the more aberration there is going to be.

The more data which I would – I don't – but the more data which I would hold in my back hip pocket on the subject of Scientology to secure it for the HASI, the more data which I would withhold one way or the other or would misprint or not print totally of, the more aberrated you could expect this science to be. The science is not aberrated for the good reason that when I get ahold of a datum, I just hand it to whoever is handy.

But you'll find groups where the leader of the group is withholding data and boy is that an aberrated group.

Do you know, nobody realizes why we made it necessary for every member of an authorized group, every real member of an authorized group, to be a member of either the HDRF or the HASI. You know why we did that? It's so that nobody could sit there in the middle of that group and withhold any data. In other words, we had a communication line to all the members of the group and therefore if anything important was being released, it would be released to all those people.

There's – withholding data or twisting data or perverting it in some fashion leads to an aberrated condition in the society. One of the most aberrative things in the society, by the way, right this moment is a newspaper. The newspaper is specializing in one tone level: emergency disaster. It doesn't match the tone level of a great many people in the society. Furthermore it does not report its news accurately, and even after the news has been reported by a reporter who is already repressed and didn't understand what he was looking at anyhow, it's then edited to fit the policy of the paper.

And today you find the newspaper world going very steeply out of communication. This is almost an impossible thing to recognize unless you actually go into a newspaper office today.

Many of us have had experience with the press. Many of us have worked for the press one way or the other and we found the press at times could be a very great adventure and that reporters very often were very crusading people and that a lot of good has been done by the press. But we don't – that isn't the condition which obtains right this minute. It is with great shock that my attention was suddenly jerked to this circuit that is going on right now just a short time ago, and I tried to discover what the score was, and found out that the reason why a press release couldn't be issued to the press had nothing whatsoever to do with the press release but had a great deal to do with the fact that most of the sections of the country today are depending on a thing called a teletype, and this teletype is spreading its little ticker tape far and wide and what comes off the teletype is news. This is not at all reasonable.

And they have gotten so dependent on this darned teletype and news services that are someplace, that I don't think there is any beginning on the teletype. I think that the boys up at MIT developed some kind of a brain machine that simply dreams up some news, you see, at

opportune dates consulting an almanac or something of the sort and shoots it through the teletype.

We don't have today an accurate picture through the newspapers of what is going on in Europe. We have a highly wildly colored account of what the commies are up to. We have – I've seen no news stories – I've seen a couple in a magazine – but I have seen no news stories today that told us accurately that Germany was trying to get on her feet. Actually, Germany is trying to get on her feet desperately. If the American people understood a little bit more about Europe and got some news through from Europe instead of colored propaganda, we might have a greater responsibility for that very small section of the world. It's a very tiny section of the world.

You could lose Europe three times in Texas. A tiny section of the world, not very many people in it to tell you the truth, this thing called Europe. Why we didn't annex Germany and why we didn't square away this hot bomb that is sitting over there is more than I will know.

We went over and took her government, we took the government of Germany, of half of Germany, we are busy governing it now just as though it was Minnesota, and yet the Germans themselves are getting on their feet with what? With resentment. Why resentment? Because we have to some degree repressed their initiative and we're just cooking up another hot spot of resentment.

But it is up to the news today to report what is happening in the world, not what some political party wishes people to believe is happening. And so we introduce this colored via. And actually we mean prop – when we say propaganda we mean there is a via on the line, the word itself is colored today, so that we say propaganda; aberration, see, the same words, equal magnitude. Not equal, similar magnitude: propaganda; aberration.

Unless people get the straight story about what's going on, they can't solve any problem. The way you keep a problem from being solved is to introduce enough quirks in the line. Now, let's take Freudian analysis. Here sits a preclear, patient; should be a preclear, he is a patient. And the analyst goes and pours to him a lot of interpolation, an analysis. I know, the analyst will very often tell you that they have stopped evaluating, but then a lot of them have read Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health.

And by the way, a recent survey, a recent series of letters to analysts brought back quite a few responses on the subject of “Good heavens! I didn't know I could be trained in it! How much is it and where?” about Dianetics; they'd been using it.

And God, I tried to train some of them. Lord knows what they are doing and calling Dianetics.

But they introduce a via into the fellow's bank by evaluating for him. Now, so does Mama introduce a via into a little kid's bank until you will find many a preclear in this condition: You will say, “Now, what happened? Where were you when you were about four or five? What happened during that period?” And this person will give you the most glib response you ever listened to, and then you would say – if you were very wise to this particular fact – you would say, “Now, are you remembering that?”

“Well, yes.”

“Well, what are you remembering?”

“Oh, my mother told me all about it.”

“Well now, how about you remembering what happened?”

“That's impossible. That's all blanked out.”

Childhood memories when blanked out this thoroughly have been blanked out by somebody else evaluating for the child. And here we have evaluation now in auditing up to its full stature. So we don't evaluate for the preclear. Why? Because we will introduce a via into the line; we will keep that line from being straight; we will bend it through ourselves back to his recognition. And if we have done this, then good God what have we done? This individual is not then capable of stringing a straight line between cause and effect. We have given him a via, you see? So evaluation is just a via and evaluation is aberrative because it introduces one.

Now do you see what all comes out of this word aberration? And a very interesting long line of understanding has come out of it.

My instruction of people, of you, might be considered to some degree a via. Oh, it very definitely is. It's a justified via, however, in my viewpoint because nobody has dug it up for the last two or three thousand years that I know anything about. And it was about time somebody did. And my instruction of you is justified only to this degree that after I have called your attention to something, you as you go along the track with auditing and living, will all of a sudden string the straight line yourself and say, “Hey, what do you know!” So that you do it first analytically almost superficially as a subject and then suddenly you run into this thing and you'll string a straight line – zip! Sometimes you will even feel a little electric spark as you just knock out all the vias on the line, you see. And suddenly you've got a grip on this particular datum, and you say, “Gee. That lines up real nice.” And the next thing you know, you're running a cause-distance-effect on life instead of a cause-via.

But think of the number of vias one might have had before I started digging this stuff up, see. They must have had tremendous numbers of vias, you see? So I'm actually short-circuiting a tremendous number of vias and then I leave it up to you with your experience with preclears and with life at large to short-circuit the remaining vias. Do you see that? So that your understanding should eventually become very clean and clear on these. But it won't if I keep being very powder-puffy on the subject of giving you the straight definition. I mean, if I keep saying, “Well, it is all right. You probably understand that,” and so on. If I don't really try to get you to get to the exact meat of a definition of just exactly what I am talking about, then all these various words which I use will remain as a definite via. My effort to get you to a straight definition and recognition of it is simply an effort to get you to un-via, to take the aberration out of the subject. See that? All right.

By the way, this particular glossary was – which I am not going over with you in full, I am just telling you about it – was compiled by Burke, and he dug it up out of a lot of copy here and there and wrote it up because we were in a very bad crush to get through to the printer with Creation of Human Ability And he wrote it up and sent it through, so many of these definitions had to be just extrapolated by him at that time.

It is not that I am taking no responsibility for it, but I am telling you that you may have a, you may have a briefer series of definitions. These are all very acceptable definitions, but you may have a briefer definition or a briefer series of definitions, a briefer glossary with that book on its second or its third printing when I get around to writing one.

I write up a glossary every once in a while, every six months or a year, something like that, I will write up a glossary.

The last two glossaries which have been published, however, have been written by other people who have taken the meanings, usually directly from my work or lectures. All right. Acceptance level: There's a whole PAB on this subject, one of the more fascinating subjects. But rejection level is its companion, and as Accept-Reject is a very, very high echelon process, you should understand something about acceptance level.

Therefore when somebody – you understand something about acceptance level, you better had. Because I will tell you that a preclear who sits down there and is playing a superficial game with you and this person has a very, very bad neuralgia, this person has glasses a half an inch thick, this person has a pretty bad comm lag, and this person says to you, “Well, I can accept all Packard cars and fur coats and diamond rings.” Ding. Ding. Ding. This person can accept garbage cans, sewers, decayed bodies and that's about it.

When you get yourself a good command of acceptance level I am afraid you can look holes through the activities of man, and his rejection level will explain to you a lot of rebuffs that you have had and have seen.

Just whys. And that's it. It's acceptance. What is their rejection level? What is their acceptance level?

Now, the statement here, “The acceptance level of a preclear is the condition in which a person or object must be in order that the preclear be able to accept it freely.” It's not a bad definition if you know exactly what it means and what acceptance level means.

Acceptance level is simply that level in existence which Q-and-As with that level in existence. You got a duplication here, of course.

If you find the preclear at the sewer level then, Q and A, he'll accept sewers. Get the idea? If he is really at a Cadill – you know there are a lot of people around driving Cadillacs whose acceptance level is a two-wheeled donkey cart? Hm? And you know they have more trouble with that car? They just can't understand why they get into all that trouble with that car. There's a social acceptance level there. There's a social acceptance level – what a person is expected to accept. And he very often finds himself completely at war with what he can really accept and what he is expected to accept. And if we get this, we will understand all we need to know to get the war between social man and individual man. If there is a war it is between these two levels.

Social man is expected to reject certain things. He is expected to reject foul play. He is expected to reject disloyalty, infidelity. He's expected to reject this and that. He is taught carefully to reject an enormous number of things, and these may not be his rejection level at all. His rejection level may be loyalty, courage, decency, fidelity. That may be his rejection

level. These things may just be fingernails on the blackboard to him, these qualities. Any good quality of the society may be just horrible to him.

And someday along the line he does an unsocial act. Why? Well, he'd just break down, that's all. He just can't stand this tension any longer, being told at every hand that he should be honest. You'll have somebody talking to you sometime about how honesty should apply or shouldn't apply – you know, whether or not it is really best to be honest. They are teetering around with this curious thing: Their rejection level is honesty, their social acceptance level is honesty. Get the idea. Their real rejection level is honesty, and their social acceptance level is honesty.

So somebody comes along and has told them and taught them very carefully they must be honest, where actually all the factors in their case cause them to reject honesty. So you get a war, and you'll get a war in the individual. He'll go around puzzlingly about this, worrying about it, thinking about it, and most of the worries which a preclear comes to you with are these two worries: social acceptance level, personal acceptance level, social rejection level, personal rejection level, at war. And those are the problems of the preclear. It really breaks down with great rapidity.

The reason Freud could have so much fun on the second dynamic is because the society has more to repress on this than anything else; there are more vias put on the second dynamic and the second dynamic is itself a via.

Why you just simply can't mock up another human being is... Well, I guess it makes a better game. Well, anyhow...

Now, here is another word here – affinity, affinity. It's one of the least understood of the three words: affinity, reality and communication. Yet you'd better have some feeling about affinity; you better have some sense to affinity.

Now, affinity is the consideration of the individual about the distance. And that is the definition of affinity. It's the consideration of the individual about the distance. That's all. I mean there isn't any more to affinity than that. It's the least understood of these things mostly because it's so idiotically simple and because it can get balled up.

You realize that somebody appears who is dressed exactly like you, looks like you, talks like you, comes from the same part of the country and you hate his guts, and yet he's making a perfect duplicate of you.

Male voice: Over there.

Yeah. Over there. You get the idea? So, you ca – your – the reason you dislike him is because – if you do dislike him – the reason because you dislike him is because you consider that there is a distance, that's all, see. And you just don't like that distance. All right, at the same time somebody might have somebody walk up to him who is dressed like him, who thinks like him, who talks like him and welcome him like a brother, you know, a wonderful guy, a terrific guy.

I've seen this happen. I knew two Marines once who were exactly alike and of course being Marines they did wear the same clothes. They didn't come from the same part of the

country but they talked more or less the same language. And these two boys were absolutely inseparable, they were just like twins.

And I knew two others that were quite similar to each other who just hated each other's guts. The more distance between these two, that hated each other, the better they liked it. See? This was gorgeous. I mean what – “You mean that guy is going to be shipped to Quantico now. Well, that is wonderful. I am over here on China station. The further the better.”

Whereas this other pair considered that if one of them had been shipped to Quantico they would have been real upset. Get the idea here? It's the consideration about the distance.

Now, reality takes the similarity into effect, the duplicate is taken into effect under reality, agreement. See?

Now, you have to have a consideration of whether an agreement is taking place or an overt act.

So affinity is the consideration about the distance.

Actually all emotions and everything else are simply considerations. And there is no other thing but consideration when you come right down to it. The next time you see an art critic, please tell him so. He is making a – he's trying to mathematically codify consideration. I'm sorry, but it can't be done.

The acceptance level of art can change for a whole society. The Greek for instance – wasn't it the Greek that had to have fat hips on a woman and wasn't it some other period that the only beautiful woman was a pregnant one? When was that, the 12th century or something like that?

Male voice: The 14th.

Fourteenth century? Fantastic. But we wouldn't consider that the same way now. So we've had a consideration change on the part of the whole society. Well, who indoctrinated them this way in the first place? And we have merely social acceptance level. And social acceptance level can add up to acceptable art, but this doesn't make consideration any different than consideration. Just because a lot of people are considering a thing in one way really doesn't make it real, although it does under R make it real.

Now, R is simply the agreement upon considerations and that's R. We had a lot of agreed upon considerations. We've got life. We got reality. We got walls and floors. And if we've got disagreed on considerations, why we don't have any masses or spaces. We have some that are orderly or arranged. If we have disagreed upon considerations – you know, nobody is agreeing upon these considerations at all – we have chaos, one kind or another, or we have no universe at all.

We have to have agreement upon considerations before we can have anything.

Scientology is the study of the agreement of considerations which has evolved into existence as we see it today, and that is the study in which we are engaged. We're studying the agreed upon considerations, and these agreed upon considerations as listed are the Axioms. An axiom then is not a self-evident truth as it says here in the next word or two. It is a self-

evident agreement upon. It's just obvious that somebody must agreed upon it; it's there, isn't it? Well, if it's there, then somebody agreed upon it including the person who sees it. All right.

The consideration of the distance is affinity.

An ally has been with us a long time. We don't use an ally very much today. But it's a nice thing to know that somebody is in somebody's valence. And the ally – the person he's likely to get – most likely to get into the valence of is an ally.

It says here that an ally is “A person who has aided in the survival of the preclear under engramic or highly emotional circumstances and whom the preclear reactively regards as important to his further survival.” Very well stated, so true.

The only trouble is, with the ally computation – and remember now that the preclear reactively regards as important to his further survival. And because it's under engramic or highly emotional circumstances, you will find quite ordinarily that a person considers these allies to be allies until you process him and then will become angry with them and will become upset about them and so forth. He just goes up tone on them, and going up tone on an ally is uptone from an engram which is pain and unconsciousness, and that's pretty low toned. So as he comes up, he will hit the whole emotional bank on the subject of this ally and he will start hating them and reviling them, and then he will get up to a point of where he can take them or leave them alone.

Now, the ally might have been actually repressive to the person's survival for his own good. So it doesn't mean that the person was nice to the person, you understand. It isn't necessarily true that this individual was nice to the person. An ally is simply somebody who is regarded as important to his further survival. And individuals will go into the valence of allies just to keep them around.

And the analytical mind is that part of a person's thinking machinery and memories over which he has relatively full control. Oh, that's a good First Book definition and perfectly good definition.

But let's recognize something further here. The analytical mind can be defined much more sharply today. It's 'the thetan plus his machines. That is the total of an analytical mind, and we can separate the thetan from the analytical mind. There's no thinking machines left around, and the second there's no thinking machines left around, we no longer have an analytical mind; we have a thetan capable of consideration – many qualities, but no thinking machinery. He can remember without a machine.

Analytical mind interposes the idea of a machine, the idea of a computer, a computation of automatic memory banks and so forth; of analysis of data to summate into conclusions. Well, anytime you have an analysis of data, you've got an analysis of experience, which is an analysis of past, and that's a machine because a thetan does not need an analysis of past in order to think. All he needs to do is predict.

He can take a know at the environment, you see. He doesn't take a look at the environment, he takes a know at the environment and predicts its state. Get that? That's the way he thinks. And the second he begins drawing up things from the past and past experience – we've got a banker or we've got a government or we've got something else or we've got an

electronic computer up at MIT or we have an analytical mind. See? And that definition is imposed by the words themselves: analytical, which means analysis. It would be a mind which did analysis and it analyzes via machinery.

We understood this very clearly back in 1950 that the analytical mind was something which was capable of sane conclusions based upon rational experience. So an analytical mind is that part of a person's thinking machinery and memories – get that “and memories,” see, memories – past; memories are part of this analytical mind – over which he has relatively full control.

But that isn't the way a thetan thinks, and if you've still come up from Book One thinking a thetan thinks that way, he doesn't. He takes a know at the environment and predicts.

For instance, as I sit here, I can't tell you why because there is no why to tell you about, but I can tell you that certain events will transpire on certain days and hours of the coming six months. Now, this is very easily dragged down scale to crystal ball reading or something like that. I first encountered this as an analyzable, observable, demonstrable phenomena in the field of navigation. I could look in at a – on a navigating machine and know whether it was right or wrong, and I thought, “This is real peculiar. That's a machine, and machines are right, and yet I know whether that machine is right or wrong.” And I puzzled this for some time. This was on expeditions where I had a lot of fancy equipment to measure things for the Hydrographic Office and so forth.

Came the war and I didn't have time to navigate. I used to bawl out the assistant navigator or something or other, “Why don't you get the right latitude and longitude for God sakes. You haven't even been near the nav shack,” see. But we weren't in the right position according to his piece of paper.

“How did you know that?”

Well, you just knew it, you see.

“But how did you know it? Why did you figure that out that way?”

Well, I didn't figure it out, I just know we are not in that position and that's all there is to it.

And this drove me to despair because it drove other people to despair. Here was this phenomenon, not in the field of crystal ball reading, but being applied to life and death, you might say. It is a very – and therefore open to question on the part of people in the immediate environment. And I knew I'd been doing this for a long time, but I didn't know how.

I thought there had to be a how to it, and the more I worried about their being a how to it, why, the less I did it. You get the idea?

If you could be totally relaxed about existence and not worried about it at all, you would know what the president was going to have for dinner in August – that's right – if you could be just totally relaxed about it. If there was nothing you were trying to prevent, if there was nothing you were trying to vigorously and violently effect, you see, you could really relax about this.

For instance, I tell the boys around here once in a while, “Well, such and so and so and so, or that's a bad deal.”

And they say, “How do you know because you haven't read the despatches on it yet?” Well, they no longer tell me that. They no longer say to me, “Well, you haven't read the despatches yet,” or “You didn't know.”

I just say, “Well, that'll wind up in a bum beef. That's no good,” and so on. Because I had to redevelop the faculty with the first Foundation. Any one of you has this same faculty. It's only when you think you had better depend on it in order to survive that you lose it. See, if it's not important, if it's not an important part of your survival, you can always do it.

So we have this interesting trick. The early Foundation where I was teaching about eight hours a day and evening and morning and I was trying to get stuff written and had all even – I was even buying the desks and renting the typewriters and so forth, mostly because we were moving a little bit above the speed of most of the people around. They couldn't get up to speed on it, and it all would have fallen in on our heads if we hadn't gotten up to speed. So anyhow, had to redevelop this faculty. But because it was desperate, for a little while the faculty took a steep dive and went out of sight.

I'm very well acquainted with this particular phenomenon, very, very well intimately acquainted with it.

I've had people stand around and tell me that this could not possibly be true, that such a phenomenon could not exist, and boy, as the track unreeled, it certainly was true that these people did not mean me any good. You get the idea? If they could just knock down your ability to predict in this wise, they could knock your survival and luck to pieces. And this is luck. The faculty known as luck is the ability to predict.

When an individual depends utterly upon luck without predicting, he's going to be failed. But if he is relaxed about winning the poker game, he will win. You get the idea? Why does he win? Well, it's because he is so relaxed that he predicts whether his hand is the winning hand or not. He doesn't try to read it from the faces of his fellow players. It doesn't matter; it's not on their faces anyhow.

I've gotten so I don't play cards anymore for an entirely different reason: It's just too much restraint to stay three feet back of your own head. It is, it's just too much restraint. Now, when you start to analyze a situation, then you are giving over your own basic power to predict because you can know the situation and know its future without analysis.

And one of the most wearisome things there is, is to explain to somebody in accounting or someplace how he should keep an accurate record of finances, when you yourself know whether the organization will be broke or solvent at what date. And when the government comes in and tells you that you must keep an accurate record, you know that you are only keeping it for the government.

Now, you can then know whether or not you should spend or not spend and so change the future. Whether or not you have to get wildly active in order to alter the future, because the odd part of it is the future is alterable by the individual; the future is alterable by the individual, and this is what makes this also confusing. You know exactly how things are

going to be if you keep right on sitting there; then you know how things are going to be if you act in direction A and then you know how things will be if you act in direction B, but you've got a hundred and – a thousand directions that you could act in life. Well, so therefore you would have a hundred thousand conditions to be predicted couldn't you. And so you get an evolvment which can be very easily explained by memory, experience, analysis and prediction. And memory, analysis, experience and prediction is a very lame and involved explanation for the ability to predict. Because the only thing you have is the ability to predict, and the more vias of how you predict you put on the line, the worse off you are going to be. You know, it is an old saw that somebody reading the crystal ball for somebody else or telling the cards for somebody else will eventually lose that faculty. You know that old saw.

Female voice: I heard it for money.

And it's also for money, that gives it stress, you see.

But the crystal ball, the deck of cards are the via which enter the aberration. So if you are ever going to go into mind reading for sport or otherwise just simply pass your hands magically through the air to attract the attention of the person whose mind you are going to read and get a dreamy expression on your face, if you feel dramatic, and give them the future. Don't tell it off a deck of cards or out of a crystal ball. You don't need either the deck of cards or the crystal ball. If you use them, remember, you don't need them, you don't want them. Curious, a very curious thing.

The easiest thing in the world to understand is thinking, if you don't try to get yourself involved in the factors of memory and experience and computation. The psycho is up there in the psycho ward because he's tried to compute the future too long. Now, this “must and mustn't happen again” is the most revelatory process that you ever wanted to run on anybody. He's trying to prevent things from happening. In other words, he's holding onto experience so as to change the future. There's no reason why he should do this at all.

He should be able to tell at any given moment what tire of his car is going flat. He doesn't have to recall a facsimile, or hold onto a facsimile of tires going flat to know a tire can go flat.

As you come up scale and exteriorize and so forth, you find yourself dealing with this. And the only reason it ever falls down scale is the introduction of a via and it gets to be an analytical mind just because you rig up a computer. That computer will always fail.

Well, that's a long way from lecturing, telling you how to crystal gaze. But the odd part of it is, instead of a wild, unheard of or strange activity, it's the woof and warp of existence for a thetan: crystal ball reading.

Oh, I must tell you that one day I had a big chronometer case under my desk on the USS Algol, and I had taken the chronometer out and put it down in my room because the quartermaster kept winding it at odd moments and so forth, and so I took this out of the case, and it left part of my chart table with a big glass-covered compartment in it. So I got a goldfish bowl and – ashore one day, and I mounted the goldfish bowl on a little velvet pad, and, oh, it made a very, very pretty little crystal ball; it was down underneath there. And this was my big gag, you know.

And one day the admiral of the transport division with which we were working came aboard, and he walked in and he asked me how things were going and what kind of navigational equipment us guys had these days. And of course he was interested because he was an old-time navigator, and we did have lots of new equipment.

And I showed him around, and then I said, “Of course, this is my best equipment.” And took him over to the chart table and showed him this gag, you know. And he looked down through this and saw this crystal ball sitting there on a black velvet pad. And he says, “Fine,” and he went out of the chart room. And a little while later the captain came in absolutely bursting – absolutely bursting with laughter.

The admiral had come up and reported me for using crystal balls in navigation. I never knew how dumb you could get but that was pretty dumb. I guess you have to be that dumb to get to be an admiral. But it wasn't a joke at all. Well, maybe the admiral had had a lot of experience too, you know. I suppose this is all very logical.

Well, you guys certainly don't know, don't know how upset anyone would be if you failed to know what ARC was. If you didn't know what ARC was, everybody would be real upset, boy! And that tells you where the center of this science is.

If you looked all the way down the list and found the one people would be most upset about if you didn't know, you would have the middle of Scientology, wouldn't you. And so you have the ARC triangle which was developed in July of 1950. I developed the first two parts of it, C and R, I think they were. No, they were A and R, and gave a lecture on it as A and R, and then all of a sudden hit C, some such combination, and there was this triangle.

Now, about two months after that I did a paper which has not survived unfortunately, because I will never do it again, which extrapolates ARC into mathematics and demonstrates that mathematics cannot exist in the absence of any one of the factors, and that a mathematical formula must contain A and it must contain R and it must contain C in order to be mathematics. All mathematics is therefore derivable from ARC; which was a cute little stunt, but more important – not any longbow, I mean, it's unswervably true that ARC, affinity, reality and communication, are the basic and component parts of mathematics and there are no other. All you're trying to get is the agreement amongst factors; all you're trying to do is communicate from one mind to another.

Notice one of those Logics in AP&A? “Mathematics is a servomechanism of the mind or mind is a servomechanism of mathematics.” It only communicates those formulas, and as far as A is concerned, we are just measuring the relative quality of similarity.

There was much more to this, but the fact of the matter is that understanding, mathematics, reason, all these things are in the same basket, and we got the oddity right there, in I think it was September of 1950, that these three things composed understanding, these are the three component parts of understanding. And when we have raised these three parts we have raised somebody's understanding.

Now actually, your understanding has raised enormously, I am sure, though it hasn't been tested, it wouldn't have to be, simply by running Communication Processing. That's what's peculiar. Communication Processing, by the way, on one of its early tests under

original investigation, was demonstrating this continually, that it was raising the prediction quality of the preclear, the very factor I was just talking to you about.

You kept running Communication Processing, Communication Processing, nothing more than that and all of sudden this individual was predicting better.

If you want to know what permits an individual to predict it would be raising his ability to communicate. Of course, then he could take a know at the environment and could communicate it into the future.

All right. The other data here similarly has use. But behind each one of these there is a considerable amount of understanding.

We have the Auditor's Code today, 1954, as a much more meaningful thing than it was in 1950, much more important.

We have the Axioms today as much more meaningful than those which were written in late 1951.

We have barrier as being a very specialized definition. Most people consider a barrier a wall or something of the sort. But a barrier would be space, energy, matter or time. If you don't know that a barrier could be space, energy, matter or time, you might get confused as to how a trap is put together. A very good dissertation on this, as far as I – as far as the written works on the subject are concerned, the best dissertation is in *Dianetics 1955!* on barriers, called "Entrapment."

Boil-off is very, very unimportant. But you better know what it is. For instance, I was quite pleased to find the boys in the auditor conference that takes place at 5:00 every day, all of them just chorused. The fellow said, "I kept getting dopey, I kept getting dopey. I don't know what is wrong."

This was a young auditor, he had just been trained. And these other boys have been trained way on back, and they looked at him. And I said, "Go on" I said, "Tell him what a boil – what causes a boil-off." And they said, "It's just too continuous a flow in one direction. It's just a one-way flow." And so they were all very startled with him because he didn't know this. And I just told him to reverse the flow, right where he was sitting, and he only did it for a moment or two and he became quite alert. That's all a boil-off is, it's a flow flowing too long. Actually you could talk yourself into, or I could talk myself into, an unconsciousness if we never got an acknowledgment. It wouldn't happen if we were completing cycles of communication, even if we were completing one cycle of communication it wouldn't happen, but with no acknowledgment you generally will find yourself getting groggier and groggier and groggier. You'll go down scale.

And you want to know why people aren't as alert in this universe as they could be or what awareness is; it is simply a lack of complete two-way communication, you see? And this all by itself would cause boil-off on a gradient scale which is a person has just boiled off just so far that, he is Homo sapiens, see? He's only boiling off to that point or he's boiling off until he's completely unconscious.

The reactive mind could be said to be something that is boiling off all the time in complete unconsciousness, you see, but nevertheless articulate once in a while. See, it'd get a reverse flow once in a while, it would wake it up a tiny little bit.

If you look at this thing called boil-off, you'll understand an awful lot about man.

Well, we could cover these Axioms and definitions in tremendous detail, and I won't do so with you, but I may possibly have shown you – in spite of the verbiage I was giving you – I might have shown you a tiny little point or two that might help clarify some of these things today.

Thank you very much.

(End of lecture)