

The Ability Congress Lectures
Washington, D.C.

CAUSE AND EFFECT

A lecture given on 30 December 1957

Hiya.

We got a congress this morning?

Audience voices: YES!!

No kidding. Did you do any auditing last night?

Audience voices: Yes!

You know, you people are doing pretty good, pretty good. I guess we'll just have to close up the Academy; there's nothing to be taught you.

Actually – it's a very hard thing to know what to talk to you about today because the whole program is full and that doesn't leave any space for me to say anything. I mean our program is so crowded with material today that I will probably give you the material that was scheduled for today in the last ten minutes. But there's a tremendous number of things that I ought to talk to you about.

Now I was looking through the library the other day. You'll think I'm a book salesman here in a minute, but I was looking through the library the other day and I found this book Scientology 8-8008. That is the basic theoretical text of this subject and I didn't realize how thoroughly that was the case until I started to thumb through it.

I was going to write a little section on Creative Processing in this book so I opened up this book to find out what I had written before and snowed myself under totally. I kept saying, "Did I do that? Gee, that's informative. Is there anything else to say on the subject?" Rather fascinating, so I thumbed through this book, and you know, I think we've been neglecting it; I do, I think we've been neglecting it. There's some – several things in it that are forerunners of everything we've discovered since.

And you have to be awful smart to read this book; I can read it pretty well if I ...

Actually there's only one joke in the book. There is a – there is a big joke in the book. I think it is this book the joke's in. No, it isn't in this book. No, by golly, is the joke in this book? Heck it isn't in this book either. Oh, yes, here it is on the cover: all these degrees.

You don't realize that but that's sarcasm where I'm concerned. There is one of our books that says Dean Emeritus of Hubbard College.

It seems so funny to me – it seems so funny to me for the whole society to be completely overboard on the subject of degrees. Now, a degree does represent competence when earned by demonstration of skill. But all of these degrees that say you were in one place for seven or twelve years or something of the sort are very funny to me 'cause all they attest is that you haven't enough gumption to go anywhere.

The United States government today is degree happy, totally degree happy; where's a matter of fact up at "Ma Bell" the big IT&T laboratories, it's very amusing you see somebody there and oh, he's designing a strategy machine that is going to figure out all the strategy for the admirals in the navy, and you say, "What's your degree?" And he says, "I have a degree I'm" – you notice everybody calling him "Doctor" you know? And he says, "I have a degree" and kind of brushes it off quickly, you know.

And you say, "No, no. What are you degreed in?"

He says, "English."

It's very amusing, it's very amusing to see the government being taken in by this. Because, let's only hire a fellow, you see, for what he has a degree in. Well, this for sure gives us an interesting computation if it's extended reductio ad absurdum. That means that if we ... This is very funny. You'd have to fire the president; he's got no degree in business or government administration. The head of General Motors couldn't stay there; he hasn't got a proper degree, and the head of General Electric, same way. And the board would all have to be swept out entirely because they aren't properly degreed for their jobs.

And then we get something weird that comes along like somebody finds out something where the subject has been just a camouflaged hole, like Scientology, see? There's no background degree; there's no degree in the university that can attest skill in Scientology. Well, that's very interesting, so you just have to take off from scratch. But then somebody comes along and passes a bill, as in California, saying, "Only those people who have attended Stanford or UCLA can be licensed to practice in the field of the mind in California." Yeah, but we haven't got any department in Stanford or UCLA and I doubt if we'd establish one if they asked us. Now, what do you do?

Well, you have to take a new departure. You have to issue degrees to represent competence, no matter what those certificates are, they must represent competence. And we're starting a minor revolution.

You might not realize it but the US is in the tradition of the 16th-century scholastics who took the work of Aristotle and said, "This is science and that is it!" And they pushed it off into the universities and after that why, you studied Aristotle; you didn't look at the real universe. And all work was based on Aristotle. Well, all right, so it's okay. Aristotle did a good job, he had an angel called "Alexander the Great." And he had a lot of specimens; they didn't know how to preserve 'em very well, so with time it got up to the 16th century you had an interesting looking Aristotle, let me assure you.

Well, all due respect to the scholastics – the best place to read about the scholastics, by the way, that I know of; is Willem Hendrik Van Loon's book called Tolerance, something that I could really recommend to you, a very, very splendid book. There is one engramic phrase

that keeps running in the book, is "No matter how much things seem to change, they always remain the same." Other than that it is a very fine book. But he covers this sway of the scholastics, and we're looking at it now.

You probably don't realize that the government scientists, all of these people who have been – who worked on the "Manhattan Project" in Los Alamogordos and so forth, were all degreed in something, but very seldom in the subject that they were working in, which is rather fascinating. They were all Doctor "this" and Doctor "that" but they had been grabbed from scratch and they had to make up their minds about what they were doing and go ahead and get the job done.

Now, the government has insisted on only those people who have a degree in the subject, work in it, see? I think this is fascinating because there aren't any degrees in the subject they're working in. So you want to know what happened with – why we got whipped in Sputnik, why the foreign scientists that we hired got whipped in Sputnik, it's because no US scientist can be hired because they don't have degrees. That's more or less the case, horribly enough.

You'll see this terrific emphasis on degrees from a standardized or accredited school; you see this tremendous emphasis. Wherever you see this you're looking at some kind of a framework like the scholastics had in the 16th century. You really ought to read about that, it's very, very funny.

Scholastic professors became the butt of all Europe. You see, Europe in the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th century had universities exactly on the American pattern – exactly. You went there, you sign an oath at the beginning of the school that you would not think or have an opinion or overthrow the resisting idiocy. And when you did that you were all set.

And they tell a story about a professor who was teaching about sturgeons, and he was teaching natural history, and he was giving this lecture about sturgeons, and he was drawing – of course, the only sturgeon he dared teach about was out of Aristotle – so he was drawing a picture of one of Aristotle's sturgeons from down in the Bosphorus, you know. And a sturgeon from up in the Black Sea or in the North Atlantic or someplace walked to the door and knocked and the professor opened the door and it was a sturgeon but not the kind that Aristotle described. And the sturgeon wanted something or other, and the professor turned around and said, "If one of you young men will remove this strange beast, we will get on with the lecture."

Scholasticism had many jokes, good or bad, like this which were pushed down into the – and eventually they went into the mud and we had the free type of education which is probably responsible for much of Europe's political unrest during the first half of the century, the last century, but it was freedom of thought.

They fought for and achieved freedom of thought. We merely have it in the lawbooks in America, we do not have it in actual practice: freedom of thought; freedom to think; freedom to work in the area of one's interest.

The American university has today become a pattern of the scholastic university and that, more than anything else, will whip American science before they finally get through.

In the first place in the university they teach only those things which have already been found out. And if you teach them in such a way that nobody is permitted to think on them evermore, you of course will get a totally dead-ended scientific world.

Well, the only reason I bring that up is because we have a text here called Scientology 8-8008, and if you people think that I have the idea – of course I can tell you how to achieve a result with a preclear – but if you think I have an idea that nobody ever ought to think on the subject of the mind, he merely ought to read this and bow down, boy, you better change your mind. I really mean it. I really mean it.

I will scold a staff auditor from departing from known procedure occasionally. I will. But only when he didn't get away with it.

Therefore, I give you this, a definition of auditing which some of you have heard before but not all: auditing is what you can get away with.

Now, today we are entering a sphere of "processing by definition." Now, discovering some definitions for the mind and so forth was quite a trick. I would hate to think that those definitions would remain static and unaltered for the next five centuries, but they happen to be the highest definitions which we have at the moment which have a workability. And slavish following of a definition without ever questioning it, of course, never lets you find out the definition in the first place. You get the idea?

Now, the last thing I ever intended was to overwhelm anyone with this particular subject, course of investigation. I never intended to overwhelm anybody with it. Do you understand that? That's quite distinct from many courses of investigation.

Where it does not lead to freer thinkingness and enlightenment in the individual, I consider I have failed. Every once in a while somebody comes along and he says, "Ron" he says, "Why don't we put on a show with a few Operating Thetans and send a few rockets spinning around Earth, and blow up a few vases on the stage, you know "vases" we'll blow up "vases" they are more expensive than vases. And "Why – why don't we – why don't we get real spectacular and just impress the living daylights out of everybody. Why – why don't we do that?"

Well, we don't do that because we're not nuts! That's what a crazy man does! He is so anxious to produce an effect that he wipes out everything and everybody. A man that would do that would act like a national government.

You can't talk to another nation; you've got to shoot 'em. You get the idea? Anybody who is crazy enough to think that he needs weapons, weapons, weapons, stacked all over the house before he can continue to exist is nuts! Because he is telling you that he cannot produce an effect without an arsenal!

Now, it's all very well to say, "Well, all we have to do is just do a bunch of tricks and we'd have people flowing in from all directions and a great interest and so forth." Yes, we'd have overwhelmed people, and the people of Earth today are overwhelmed. And the more they are overwhelmed, the less they can think. The more they are overwhelmed, the less they

can act. And the less they think and act, the less they can live. And no government to date has ever been able to afford a slave population.

Press relations staff prepared for me some very excellent data from direct source on the economics of Russia. They tell us conclusively that Russia's economic picture is so inflationary, and so poor that she must parasite off of new conquests continually in order to survive. She has to have a new Red China she can loot because she can't produce. She has produced a slave economy. Everybody's a slave.

Long since in Europe they learned that private enterprise was far more beneficial than a slave economy and therefore they let the slaves go. There was probably no other reason they let the slaves go. They found out that it was not efficient.

And here's Russia pretending to hold up a light of hope for the world and supporting that light and providing its oil with the slavery of millions and the enslavement of more millions.

Now, this isn't merely a condemnatory political statement. It isn't a standard White House release on how bad it all is over there. Paul prepared this data rather – he prepared it very precisely; I am giving it straight off the pan. Russia is not in good economic condition at all; she cannot support herself internally because she is a slave economy. It's terribly important. Her inflation is far worse than ours, but you can measure the degree of disintegration of an economy by the amount of slavery introduced into it! And as a government becomes more and more anxious to enslave companies and people within its borders, it becomes less and less solvent and more and more inflated! It's a fascinating little gradient scale. We know about gradient scales but that's the way it goes. As slavery increases in a country, as freedom becomes less, inflation and other economic evils become more because slave peoples do not produce and free peoples do.

It is a very, very serious adventure to embark upon the enslavement of a human being; that is probably the most dangerous venture that anybody ever embarked upon. To invite his co-operation is one thing, to enslave him is something else.

What element is necessary in order to bring about slavery? The element necessary is unwilling and unknowing. You could call those two elements but they go hand in hand: Unknowing and unwilling service to the state.

You become adventurous in the field of slavery when you accept something that is unwillingly given; you have then become a partner to this deadly dwindling spiral. You have an instinctive reaction along this line.

Somebody's mad when she cooks breakfast, let us say. You know, "There's your breakfast." You're a fool if you eat it. You will get into more trouble if you eat that breakfast. It's unwilling service.

Now in Scientology, we not only have the mission of liberation of intellect, we also have to overcome past enslavements on the part of an individual.

I really believe that relatively few new things have been developed in the field simply because of past habits on the part of auditors. After all, the grade school caught them early,

high school and so forth. They are so used to studying that oddly enough I have not been able to lay down the pattern of a Greek Academy at the Academy. It's called the "Academy" because it hopefully expects someday to lay down a pattern of study. But an American today is not fitted for it; he cannot master it.

All a Greek Academy did was sit around – all the Instructors did was sit around and wait for the students to ask questions. When the students asked questions, the Instructor told them to think about it. The simplest sort of an Academy you ever heard of; That was about the total of it's curriculum.

An American is so well indoctrinated into the idea of classrooms, schedules, Instructors, lectures and so forth, that he has – you can't break him out of it! It's a horrible task! He says, "If I'm going to be instructed then it will have to be on this pattern." And he never realizes that the pattern is one of the most artificial patterns you ever heard of. It is fantastically artificial!

It's awfully hard to explain to somebody here or in England how wild and arbitrary the Anglo-American educational system is. Because every – all these arbitraries he accepts as usual. Now, I won't go into or try to do it here, not because you couldn't grasp it because you could. But the point is that it's a very odd thing to have an Instructor who tells you something. That's odd! It's a very odd thing to have a pupil who doesn't want to know and who is brought to the Academy by his desire to know; that's an oddity. You mean somebody is going to give you some students who don't want to know. Oh, no! That's a thing you could shudder over. And yet they assembly line them into the modern university five hundred abreast. They don't want to know. What they want's a credit. A total artificial knowingness.

And if you look over the educational system that we have, you will discover that it seems usual to you in its – most of its parts. Most of its parts seem usual.

And I'll give you a little mental exercise which is quite amusing. Try to figure out how else it could be done or try to figure out some other way to approach the same goal. And you'll all of a sudden find that we are saddled with a number of scholastic data which tend to freeze thinkingness, and because they are on the subject of education themselves, then they do impede education. Until we get rid of a great many of those data in the individual he can't learn. He cannot learn; he can memorize.

Now, data is something one uses to think with. It isn't thinking. And when the data becomes a substitute for thinking we have frozen the whole forward progress of education.

A "datum" is something you think with; it is not thought. A "definition" is something with which to think!

Now, I have about four or five new definitions, action definitions in Scientology – I gave you one of them last night. I found out that if you process toward Operating Thetan you made a Clear – that's just a way-stop, so it's very easy. But if you try to make a Clear and process against the definition of Clear, you don't make it which is rather fascinating mental exercise all by itself

But the definition of an Operating Thetan is as follows: A thetan who can be willing and knowing cause over life, matter, energy, space and time. Knowing and willing cause.

That tells you that an aberrated person is somebody who is unwilling or unknowing effect of life, matter, energy, space and time.

Now, if your mind was totally free and if all its investigation summed up to that definition, if you had wide freedom of thought in this, if you hadn't been told you shouldn't think about this at all, you wouldn't need any processes. You'd process straight by definition. And I've been doing that for quite a little while with some rather fabulous results. I just take the definition and go ahead with it.

Now, we don't find this processing by definition new. Anybody that's been near an ACC knows all about processing by definition; they know something about it. The idea that you take the definition and then you audit with that definition in mind and the definition provides a pivot or a stable datum around which auditing occurs. You could take an E-Meter and merely find wherever the fellow is an unknowing or unthinking or unwilling effect and ask him some questions about it until he made up his mind he could do something to it or at it! And you'd free him, free him, free him.

All processes do evidently is assist that process. Now, because the material universe is the most constant effect upon the person – it creates the most constant effect upon a person evidently – objective processes for that reason only then reach the furthest in auditing. And we get processes which are listed here in this ACC manual; this ACC Preparatory Manual and we get the "Summary Research" project here. And it tells you some interesting things that a poll of auditors gave us these processes: Havingness of several varieties, the best results on self. This was their own subjective reality on processing. They've gotten the best results on self by having been run on Havingness; 8-C; Opening Procedure by Duplication; Start, Change and Stop; Waterloo Station; Two-way Comm and Creative Processing and Problems of Comparable Magnitude.

They had achieved the best results on preclears with the following processes: Havingness, 8-C, SCS, Inventing Problems, Opening Procedure by Duplication, Two-way Communication, and Locational Processing.

Nearly all of those are objective except Creative Processing, and Creative Processing had some small liabilities, which have now been overcome. So it would take a higher level there had the data been available.

Well, that's an interesting number of processes, isn't it? Do you know what they add up to? How can you make a preclear willing to affect MEST? How can you make a person willing to have an effect on the wall? If the wall has him trapped, then how can you make him willing to have an effect on the wall?

And we get something that is so sweeping it rather staggers one and one reaches back and hurriedly clutches to the commands of 8-C. We've just asked somebody to be God! We said, "How could you have an effect on the wall?" Well, let's just carry that up to its *reductio ad absurdum*, "How do you build one that everybody can see?"

And if I remember rightly, we used to teach people that was what God did? "God created this universe," we said. And then we got into the imponderable question of "Who is God?" "God is that being who has a total effect on you." Church definition from way back when. "God is that being who knows where you are, and knows what you are doing, directs it, fixes it up, puts all of the tightrope across the sidewalk, slips the ground glass in the salad, and God's the boy!" Man, is he a total effect on you! And you can't do anything to God, so you'd better obey him! Well, I can tell you directly how you find out who and where God is.

There is no sense in going through a bunch of processes called religion to discover where God is. Just figure out the effects you could have on God and you've got it made.

But anything which you must not touch and upon which you are not supposed to have any effect at all will sooner or later make you the unwilling or unknowing effect of it. Right? And if I tell you, "Under no circumstances should you alter, change, think about, Scientology" – dizzz – all I have done is set up another monster. Right?

And in a world that is all too prone to build Frankensteins, we don't need another one!

Right now we have national governments building things upon which you can have no effect. We call those things "weapons." What effect could you have on an A-bomb? Well, of course, you say, "Well, an OT could have an effect on an A-bomb." And right away you've loosened your thinkingness. You've got a point of entrance.

What is "hope?" Hope is simply a future possibility that one might have an effect on something and is a substitute for being able to have it on something now.

Now, what do we mean by effect?

Awful lot of people around get confused with the Scientology definitions of cause and effect because cause and effect has always been around, and people have always been describing it, and we read in every philosophic text "Cause and effect." And they never say "cause and effect" in a philosophic text. It's always "cause and effect."

And people get this nebulous idea of bruuurr and druull and we don't quite, and so on. Well, the idea in Scientology is too simple, when we say cause it means identity or point, either one, of impulse whether that impulse is thought or a pellet or a custard pie or anything else.

Here's somebody, he throws a custard pie. He's cause.

Now, we attach to that shame, blame and regret. But those are opinions of cause, and we didn't talk about the opinions. You have to be able to think of cause without thinking of opinions of cause before you can think about cause. It is neither bad nor good or effective or ineffective or anything else; it's merely cause as you look at it.

Now, as we trace down this mechanism, the bullet goes across space and hits somebody. All right, to define cause there – we used to be working with this a long time ago - but to define cause there, is it the bullet? Is it the powder? Is it the priming cap? Is it the barrel of the gun? Is it the hammer? Is it the trigger? Is it the gun itself? Is it the fellow's shoulder? Is it his body? See what we're doing here, we're backing up cause as the point of impulse. Is it the fellow's mind? Is it the person himself or is it his environment? Pzhht. Well, man, that's

one where we draw a line; I just wanted to make sure you understood that. It's one where we draw a line in Scientology; in Dianetics we were – rather recklessly let the environment do all the causing.

It tells you, then, that a person can be cause who can accept some responsibility for his own actions. Otherwise he is only effect even if he acts like he's being cause. So the fellow who acts like he's being cause and the fellow who is being cause are two different guys. One is knowing cause and the other's unknowing cause. He says "the environment did it" but he did it! So therefore, it's unknowing cause, isn't it?

Well, so we get an order in the middle of the definition then, there is such a thing as unwilling and unknowing cause. And we get into the field of weapons.

Hardly any soldier isn't slightly unwilling, and every soldier is unknowing, on the subject of the cause of weapons. He has to be. You let a sniper go and inspect his victims and rest their head on his folded up blouse and take the – as he did in "All Quiet on the Western Front" – take out the pictures of the wife and kids out of the fellow's blouse, he won't shoot any more soldiers; he will always manage to miss. See, he didn't know what he was causing and therefore realized that he had been "unknowing cause" of a great deal of suffering which went far beyond the person he had just shot. Do you get the idea?

And so we reach the field of morality with regard to cause. Now, there's morality and ethics and so forth.

But the definition of cause is simply cause. It doesn't have anything much to do with whether it's good or bad or moral or immoral or anything else; it is simply cause.

Now, you can have opinions about that cause, and you can see what kind of causes are successful and what kind of causes are not, but it doesn't alter our definition of cause, which is just merely "the point of impulse."

Now, when we run cause, we, of course – very few people, particularly people who are badly spun in can envision this other point: If there is a cause then there is an effect. Horrible enough that's true, even if it's only the cause-point.

Did you ever have a preclear here – did you have a preclear that says, "Well, every time I get to feeling better I invalidate myself." Did you ever have anybody do that?

Well, you get this sort of a picture here. You get this picture very clearly. You get an individual who is source-point here: A black thetan, and he has a cause here – line, but it comes around and hits him. He cannot conceive of an effect: All causes are effects, all effects are causes. He's got causes and effects all balled up here. Now, to try to teach this person the definition of cause and effect gives him the idea that he's always on the same spot with regard to cause and effect. Now, this is an overt act-motivator sequence: If you shoot somebody else you're shot.

So to enforce morality people in past societies or this one have carefully confused cause and effect until it works out that they are confused. "Do not send to find for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." Well, that's one that tells everybody that they are an effect of everything and every action. Now, this is not necessarily true but only in a limited sense it is

factual that you can not have violent causes all through a society and expect it to live on the third dynamic. It all falls off to the first, or like Rome, goes totally to the eighth.

So here's cause, here's effect, and in Scientology we simply mean cause-distance-effect; cause-distance-effect.

Now, I showed you here that the cause-point can be the effect-point too, but we still have cause and effect. Now, an individual could have all effects be all effects in some balled-up fashion, but we'd have "A = A = A" or the old identification. "All effects are all effects." We could have it "all causes are all causes" and get it just as crazy.

Until we get these two things separated, cause and effect, we can not have sanity. People have them so confused that the public at large could probably not even vaguely live with this datum. Causes are causes and effects are effects, and causes aren't effects and effects are not effects that are causes.

What you've got here primarily is simply this one fact: that an effect is an effect; a cause is a cause. And we have this thing called "association" and we come to one of the later discoveries of Scientology. This has occurred and it doesn't seem much-like much of a discovery, it's just like this definition of Operating Thetan, it's not much of a discovery, just not much of a discovery, that's all. It's too brief. Let's see how I can drag this out so you'll think it's more important. Add mass and time to it, you'll think it is important.

It's simply this: Association is the chain of cause and effect, but a close association is cause and effect close together. Close association: Cause and effect; they are very close together.

Let's be – let's be much more useful with this datum. Association means only this and we at once discover why Havingness works. Association is theta with MEST, spirit with matter. As a being becomes unwilling to associate with the material world he becomes entrapped in it, and all you are running out of a preclear or running into a preclear is simply a willingness to associate theta with MEST. And we get all the old theories in Science of Survival have suddenly popped up with this new simplicity and it is simply this simplicity: It's just theta associates itself with MEST, and when it does it unwillingly or unknowingly it becomes upset and considers itself trapped. That is all association is.

Thought association of thought associated with thought, of object with object or anything else is basically this association of life with the physical universe.

Now, that sounds too sweeping and I – but I wouldn't say it if it didn't work in processing.

You can simply ask an individual to associate thought with matter and strange things will occur. Now, at once you alert to some old-time processes like "Put pain in the walls." You just have this fellow putting pain in the walls round and round and round. "Put unconsciousness in the walls." They don't work so well as "Put ARC in the walls." You have a fellow put ARC in the walls. In other words, you put thought – you give him the exercise of putting thought with matter, thought with space, thought with time. You give him these exercises and he eventually works out his unwillingnesses, achieves his willingnesses and so

goes up scale on the definition of Operating Thetan. That's why these objective processes work.

Now, you could take somebody out and say, "What thought would you be willing to put in that person over there?" And you'd exteriorize him. In working out associations do not try to work out association of thought with thought because it doesn't process! Don't process thoughts versus thoughts. Do you follow this? Because thoughts can't get entangled with thoughts! They will stay separate as long as the factor of space is not entered into them.

So, we have matter, energy, space and time having to intervene amongst the thoughts and we get association. Association, then, is not bad, thetan to thetan, but becomes rather intricately upsetting when you get thought to matter, thought to space, thought to time. And from these things all associations become identifications and we have an engram can be an engram, an aberrated thought can be an aberrated thought. An aberrated mind can only be an aberrated mind if the thought is tangled up with the mind and the energy in the mind, you might say, in such a way as to make the person believe the mind is talking at him and he becomes the effect of it.

So what is association? Association is a proximity of thought with matter. It's a proximity of thought with matter. What's identification? Well, "thought is matter" is identification.

Now, let's invert and let's just go down scale, clear down here at the bottom of the dial and we get dialectic materialism: all thought comes from matter. Now, you're probably not – don't realize that but all, I mean, this is a subject that is taught in most universities called psychology – I mean, dialectic materialism. All thought comes from matter. Thought is the product of any two or more – two or more forces, I think states it better than they do. All thought is the product of two or more forces in opposition or something like that.

Of course, reactively you can work with that as a principle providing you don't believe it. Thought does not come from matter. Thought is thought and matter is matter.

Now, we see here a pillar and that has a shape, so thought has shaped the pillar, but the word "pillar," the thought "pillar," the use "pillar" are not "pillar!"

General semantics tried to say something like this. It didn't do a bad job of it but didn't have much use for it either because they said that, "two angels could not stand in the same space." And they can.

So, in processing, all we are trying to do is to free the thinkingness of the individual. That is all we are trying to do. Therefore the goal of all processing is freedom. We cannot improve anybody unless we free his thinkingness, we free his ability to think.

Therefore we must accustom him to associating thought with matter, thought with space, thought with time, thought with energy. Not forbid it like the mystic, not cancel it out entirely like the Tibetan, but actually, factually make it possible for him to do this without feeling he is being murdered by it. To associate thought with matter, energy, space or time, freely and knowingly, is to bring an individual up to a point where he can be cause over matter, energy, space and time!

And when he can do that he can be free! He is never free when he refuses to confront matter, energy, space and time. Then he's a slave, and that's the operation that's happened to him.

Everybody says, "You've got to work!" I don't know what's wrong with work; work is just a sort of a – of a heavy association of thought with matter – usually all work is. If you make him an unwilling worker, then he won't do it and he becomes incapable of doing it and you have the basis of a slave state.

But a preclear is not cause across the boards if anywhere he's an unwilling and unknowing effect. Now remember, he can be the effect of anything as long as he is not an unwilling or an unknowing effect. And that's the one thing we mustn't forget in Scientology. We're not trying to say, "Don't ever be at effect." We're saying, "If you're at effect know what it is."

Therefore we can disseminate Scientology; therefore I can tell you this material without liability because you're here by choice; I am here by choice; we're discussing these things by choice because we are interested.

The day it becomes a vital subject that we must have a credit in, Scientology becomes a slave subject.

So I ask you, don't ever let it happen.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]