



ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

**A lecture given on
3 November 1955**

Thank you.

This is the second morning lecture of the 3rd of November, 1955, Fourth London ACC.

Now, I'd merely like to talk to you about something light and very airy, which is simply the attitude and conduct of Scientology when and where successful.

It's very interesting that we should know something about this because apparently there's not very much to know and you just kind of bumble along and somehow or other it all works out. Or does it?

Five years! Five years of active organization in the field of Dianetics and Scientology has taught us a few things. We would be very stupid if we hadn't learned a few things along this line. First thing that we have learned along this line is Scientology is best run by Scientologists. That's the first thing we've learned along in this line.

The next thing we've learned along in this line is Scientology problems are best resolved by Scientology. The next thing we've learned is that organizational problems are best resolved by Scientology, and that there are just exactly two methods by which

personnel can be handled—two methods. And these are very sharp and very definitive, organizationally. They are handled in one of these two ways. They are either processed, or they're—.

Pardon me, they—let's take two classes of personnel. Personnel that is getting something done, and so forth. Well, you just help them all you can get something done, you see?

But the two ways of handling those who are not getting something done is (1) process them, and (2) disconnect them from the organization but not from Scientology. Got that?

We're assuming now that these people are Scientologists, you see. We either process them up to a point of where they will get something done, and if they don't do that, and that still is not operative—and there is one basic reason why that is sometimes not operative and is kind of outside our zone of control—that works or we sever them from the organization as an official post, you see, on an organizational payroll. But we do not, I repeat, do not separate them from Scientology or Scientology organizations, nor at any moment fail to give them organizational support or cooperation in the starting of any new activity in which they wish to engage for the benefit of Scientology. You got that?

In other words, the arduous lesson along this line is that no-communication lists, revocation/suspension of certificates, court action of any kind whatsoever within the realm of Scientology, and so forth, is not only—not only difficult to do but *does not work*.

That's just the end of it. It just doesn't work. It's for the sea gulls. That might work in Gestetner Limited or Westinghouse but it does not work in Scientology. Got that?

Because a person who becomes a Scientologist is on your time continuum. And being on your time continuum he also to some degree is operating with a broader understanding of existence in general and is not just necessarily a little bit off the society's time continuum but himself would be completely lost if he were ejected entirely from Scientology.

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

You got it? He'd just be lost. This would be about the cruelest thing that you could do. It look—it's much more cruel than you would at first notice in it. It is a very vicious sort of a thing.

Now, therefore we are rather put to it this way. That when an individual, when a person becomes part of Scientology in general or the organization in particular, they are part of our own time continuum. And enturbulences which affect them and separate them out of an orderly existence, kick back madly all the way across the whole set of dynamics, and you have apparently practically offered to kill somebody! I think mere capital punishment is not a fitting description of comparable magnitude.

See, you say, "Well, that's all right. Don't come around to this group anymore. You go away. And now that you've been booted out, why, you're off of communication, and we're not going to do anything for you, and don't associate with us anymore," and so forth. This creates one awful reaction. And I'll tell you why I know it creates an awful reaction. These people don't spin necessarily but their retaliatory gestures demonstrate that they have received a motivator of enormous magnitude.

I can tell you how it seems to them by what they do.

They practically devote the rest of their lives and all of their action and attention and everything else to trying to get even with you or remedy the situation somehow or something. This is one of the more fabulous things, so that it must be something of magnitude.

It evidently doesn't compare to simply being ejected out of a country or ejected out of some kind of a universe or out of a family or something of the sort, you know? It isn't evidently of comparable magnitude.

This is a very great oddity. I wish to point this out to you.

In the first place, Scientology is a road out of and into

universes. And it must be some order of magnitude—. I'm not trying to pat us on the back, or give us an overevaluated opinion of ourselves. I merely wish you to look at the enormous actions undertaken by people who have been ejected from organizations and otherwise.

They seldom go off and suck their thumb dismally. They seldom do this. They might go completely into apathy. If they do we just never hear of it again, you know? It'd just go, *phoo*, that's that. But simply being booted out of the family wouldn't produce that reaction. They usually come in there fighting with violence; they've got to do something of magnitude.

Now, it isn't because we're afraid of that reaction that we say that throwing them out of communication and non-communication and all that sort of thing doesn't work. That isn't it. We could stand up to this.

As a matter of fact if we wanted to create a sufficient unknownness in the central organizations of Scientology, we just start booting people out to let them go out and fight this fight. And there'd be that much commotion that people would realize there were a great many unknowns in the Central Organization, and the public at large would have a tendency to cone on into it on unknown basis, you see? Actually, could work in our favor just to boot people out. I mean, it's not because we're afraid of it.

It's because we're not in the business of injuring people, and this evidently provokes or brings about a greater injury than we understand. See, we don't quite understand the magnitude of the injury, and the magnitude is considerable.

Now, at the same time, we don't today tolerate the continued existence of people within Scientology merely because we had better not kick them out. See? We don't do that either.

And I'll tell you why we don't do that. Because, in the first place, they are not routinely, ordinarily or averagely or in the

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

majority, people of good intentions—it's because they *are* people of good intention. And by saying these people are not fit to associate with us anymore, we have told a lie of magnitude. This is not true. It's never true. You got it? *Hm?*

Now, very ordinarily we get such things as professional jealousy or scarcity-of-preclearosis. It's a dreadful disease that may set in in some area.

And a couple of Scientologists start fighting with each other one way or the other; they conceive each other to have some bad intentions of one kind or another, you know?

The degree that these boys will rise to is the degree of freedom they have attained in Scientology. And this can become magnitudinous, believe me. They can start clawing each other's eyes out. Their imaginations are better too. *Umm*. Imaginations are much better.

Now, right here in England we had a couple of interesting situations along in this line. Couple of *very* interesting situations along in this line.

There were two specific groups who had been tarred by rumor as having bad intention and doing bad things, before I came over. There were actually three groups then which had been tarred and that was the Central Organization as it existed in London at that moment. It was supposed to be doing everything all wrong, you see.

And one of these groups was supposed to be members of a secret society, all of whom had dreadful plans for everybody in Scientology, and another one of these groups that was supposed to be using poison and electric shock and all kinds of interesting things on people in Scientology. And we had three groups here.

Now, some of these rumors, I see, didn't reach all of you. Well, believe me they always reach me.

Now, here's this fascinating thing. Here are evidently three groups, three groups: one was the Central Organization which untended and to some slight degree ungoverned during a long period of time, had gone through many vicissitudes and had by disobeying a couple of the earlier tenets I gave you—such as, Scientology organizations should be run by Scientologists, by having in its midst a few non-Scientologists, in other words, you know—had accomplished some interesting injustices. It had managed a few interesting injustices. Said—it had said, “business,” you know, “*business* comes first.” You see, “We must do this thing in a *businesslike* fashion.”

I don't know that “business” as done by Gestetner is “business” as done by Scientology. I don't know this at all. They might not be the same order of business. See?

But I know definitely that the principles used by Gestetner do not work in Scientology. I know this. I've told you before we have had the very, very best, most-skilled, learned, agile, witty managers, publicity men, advertising men, office managers in Scientology. No, this is right. I mean these guys were hot, these guys were the best that could be offered.

One publicity man in Dianetics, by the way, was the best that Hollywood had to offer. He was astronomic in his Hollywood reputation. Major studio, see. Publicity. He's supposed to be able to handle his stuff very smoothly. He couldn't get to first base.

He could understand a film in a can, he could understand a mimeo machine, he could understand a car or a can of soup, but he was being asked to understand understanding and he couldn't do it.

And he failed, he failed miserably.

So evidently some of the practices used by Gestetner, although they seem to be open and shut practices, are not workable in Scientology unless they are done by Scientologists and then the practices become more workable. Savvy?

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

Scientologist does these same practices, he does them handling the commodity we handle, which is life, and the handling of this commodity is evidently not a terribly hard thing if you understand life. But if you don't understand life, you start killing it. You take instinctive reactions.

Now, there's a basic principle that goes along with this which I will elucidate in a moment. Let me pick up a few of these loose threads.

First, there are two reasons why processing sometimes does not work on the individual.

One: it isn't good enough to do the job. You get that as a specific reason, you see. No matter, if the science were good the auditor might be poor. Earlier we could have said, "The science itself might not be good enough to do this job fast enough." See? Earlier—much earlier—could have said that. But we could have: the science itself not doing the job well enough and the auditor not following the science itself closely enough, and we would have a double compounded reason why—why we were not successfully going to rehabilitate this person in the organization, see. There's that, see.

Well, today this is much less. And because in yesteryear we had to say, "Well, no, we just won't attend to that. We had tried it, it wasn't too successful, we couldn't give that many hours to the project and therefore we had to lay off of this as a method."

Today, this is no longer true. (1) the Technologies *are* good enough. And (2) the auditors *are* good enough, see? And with any care of selection of the auditor at all and any discussion of the problems involved, Scientology can do the job. Not because this guy was real bad off, but he had to have a better ability to do the job he was doing. He had to handle people a little better or he had to handle this or that a little better. Do you—you understand? Well, we could—we can now make that ability, see.

But nevertheless, there is one more reason why that is not always usable today as a method of putting together an organization just by taking a person or two in the organization and making them better, see? That is sometimes not workable today for this reason: You remember I've spoken to you about what makes a squirrel. It is a person on the other side of the squirrel. It's a person who was invalidating him, invalidating his goals, invalidating his interests and kicking the props out from underneath him by covert hostility or overt hostility, but in any way kicking him apart.

He's interested, he's working. But part of another universe, on the—practically on the same time continuum is an invalidative mechanism about this man's—not Scientology, the devil with Scientology. It could stand all the kicking around that anybody in this universe or any other could give it, see, as a subject, because it doesn't breathe, you know. It could get kicked around plenty. But it isn't kicking that around. It's kicking around somebody's stable data. It's creating continuous confusions for him, and so he splits off not quite knowing where he stands—is he in this universe called Scientology or is in this universe, or is she in this universe called husband or wife, something, you know.

So here we have this invalidative person who is agin it. And this is the person standing on the other side of our guy. And we sometimes can't reach that other person. By our own mores, we will not interfere with that human relationship any more. We won't overtly interfere with it.

If by processing we unstabilize it, so what. You see? Because this processing was done to improve somebody's power of choice and if they finally chose not to do something about it, all right. Fine. Okay.

But here, here we have the occasional time when we can't reach that other person. Therefore, we process our boy, and it becomes a contest whether or not we raise his ability and stability faster than it can be knocked apart.

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

I'll give you an example of this. The editor of a great science fiction magazine in the United States, which is no longer really a great science fiction magazine, got a session from me one night. I ran out a couple of engrams. Fantastic. I ran them out. They were actually basic-basic on a whole chain of stuff that had him labeled as a psychotic with his own insurance office. And we knocked these things flatter than a flounder. Boy, did we blow it.

And he—the shiver and chills that he would occasionally get for no reason whatsoever turned on, turned off. We ran them through. He was practically screaming a time or two. We had this thing really settled, we had it in the bag. *Mm! Mm!* But good, see.

And he went out of there and for the first time this man felt about nine feet tall.

And he went home and he ran into somebody who was very friendly toward me but very, very intensely hateful toward him. And this person, not antipathetic to Dianetics at all, but not liking him at all, simply knew exactly what to say at the right moment to knock it out from under, and said it to him at about one o'clock in the morning when he was feeling real good but, you know, a little tired; he needed some rest, and so forth. Said, "I've heard all that before. I suppose you're going to tell me now that you're going to become human or something like that? Beat it!"

Taaaah!

And he fell all the way down in the basement again. His state was not stable, it was untested, it was still not a convincing state for him, and she just kicked the props right out from underneath him.

Funny part of it was she was a friend of mine. His wife. She was a friend of mine, a very good friend of mine. She had no idea that she would ever do anything to me by this action. No thought of it. She was just tired of this guy, so tired of him she could have killed him on sight! Ran away from him a short time later.

But it finished him, and I looked at that case lying so far down into apathy and I said, "Boy, to hell with it. I'm not going to do it again. Not until this situation changes."

The situation changed, and because I had a lot to do I didn't do anything about that. We never recovered this territory. Only of recent years has he become a little mellowed in his attitude toward Dianetics.

See what could happen there? We give them auditing, we audit the exact thing necessary, and then somebody who really isn't agin us at all but is definitely agin him decides to knock the props out from underneath him and does. Because of that tremendous power of association, can knock him flat.

Now, I'm not directing this talk toward anyone or about anyone. I just want to show you that there are these mechanisms.

You can repair a guy, see. You can process him, you can snap his ability up to where he *could* handle that post. You get the idea? Unless, one—that's the way it exists today, there isn't a question of technology or auditors today—you *could* do it. Or you could face up to the squirrel situation he faces, you see, and try to do something about that, or you could just leave it alone. But I'll tell you that you don't do this: Boot him out of Scientology. Give him a hand. Give him a hand.

And so the total liability to him comes about in this fashion. He disappears off a payroll, or if you're—you're hiring him in an office, you just take him off of your payroll but don't then say, "Well, he's not a good auditor. He won't be given any preclears. The office is going to give him a bad recommendation"—something like that.

Why kill him? Taking him off the payroll isn't important, not even vaguely important really. There are jobs all around. The guys usually can audit, and so forth. That's not important. What's

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

important would be removing him from a universe with duress—particularly a universe which evidently has this much power.

All right. So, here are these three groups. You see how that situation is? See, you don't do it because you're afraid of what will happen to you and the organization. You don't do it because there's big liabilities to it. You just don't do it because you understand that this person is not of bad intentions. Please, for God's sakes, understand that because that's the truth and the rest of it's a lie.

All right. Now, here in England were three groups. Central Organization had this dual situation. One of its personnel had a violently antipathetic person on the other side of this person. See, right in the Central Organization there was a person who couldn't be processed up for the reason that there was another person sitting over here who was knocking apart the stable data as fast as it was stabilized.

This was not clearly understood elsewhere, but nevertheless made processing of little use there. And this person was not a Scientologist so, of course, we had trouble; of course, there was some trouble. Some trouble in the organization.

Even though this person was honest and by the very best standards quite efficient, it still was not a situation which could be tolerated by the Central Organization. Do you see this?

And this person had turned around and used a bit of power and duress to try to eject out of Scientology some Scientologists. But this person wasn't a Scientologist, but was using some power to try to get rid of some people out of Scientology, which couldn't be done.

It's really not possible to do that. They still stay in Scientology, they merely fight. See?

All right. So we had two other groups, and one of these groups was supposed to be about the worstest—and the most horrible things

they were doing. They were just doing terrible things to preclears, and so forth. And this other group was a secret society or something of the sort that had infiltrated us all, see, and had bad intentions toward all of us.

Now, these two groups had actually come into action or had lifted their heads because they felt that the central organizational point here in London was not really sympathetic toward them. And how right they were.

See, they were right. How about this? And they did have a legitimate excuse because the person who was agin them in the Central Organization was not a Scientologist, so they didn't feel that this person was an equal order of magnitude, therefore, didn't have any right to be agin them or criticize them. See? Get how that would be?

But this person was still operating by business standards as such as those used by Gestetner or somebody but that don't work in Scientology.

All right. As far as this "secret society" was concerned, that's for the birds. There isn't a word of truth in it. Know all about it, knew all about it, know all about the society and myself have been a member of allied societies to that society which are probably senior to it. So this one was for the birds, see, this was really nuts. There was no secret society infiltrating us, but there were also some people that were also members of a secret society. So what? So what?

Now, we look at this other group that was supposed to be using horrible means and terrible duress and awful drugs and all that sort of thing on people.

And let's get a final adjustment of this. I put this one on the back burner. There are complaints about it, I talked about it, and

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

so forth. But let's put this one—I put this one on the back burner. I said, “Well, let that simmer a while. Let's take a look, huh? Let's take a look.”

Do you know what I found out? I found out that this group was getting the most expensive preclears in the town and doing a good job by them.

I found that this group was doing a very, very remunerative and good contact job in the field of auditing.

Now, I wouldn't put down everything that had been said about this group or had been started in rumor to a little professional jealousy of success, would you? We'd never—we'd never assign that value to anybody, would we? *Hm?* And yet I'm fairly well satisfied today that was the total reason of the origination, wherever it originated, of any story about that group. Somebody just couldn't stand that much prosperity and started to talk and started to say things. And then other people in good faith, feeling militant and being perfectly willing to fight a war in any direction—uptones, you know—took it up and stated these things as fact. But I—the basic origin of them—the basic origin of them—rather obscure, but nevertheless basic origin—unknown to the later people who took up the cudgels, you understand—was to some degree professional jealousy.

Now, any Scientologist in the operation of business is going to pull a few blunders. He who hath not broken the Auditor's Code, cast the first certificate into the fire.

Get the idea?

Now, we look this over, and we find that any one of us here or there have—have tried to push at least the metacarpals of a skeleton underneath the couch. You know, we've said, “She wasn't spinning when she left here, but maybe it was my dropping that cup of coffee all over the front of her dress when she was back down the

track that spun her the next morning. But, of course, we won't say anything about that; we'll just kind of forget the whole thing." And fortunately we've had very few such incidents, but they would occur, wouldn't they?

Our inability to understand such carryings-on stems, in Scientology, from a highly amusing standpoint. Our inability to understand the actions of other Scientologists has a very fascinating barrier. The limitation on our understanding is simply this: We say they have bad intentions and that is a lie. Got it?

So the whole in—situation's liable to enturbulate around that postulated bad intention. *That's* what enturbulates the situation. That makes a lie.

The situation then becomes unsolvable. Because we've entered a changing factor called a lie into it. We've said, "These other people, those guys on the other side of town," or something of the sort, "have very, very bad intentions and are doing terrible things." Do you see?

"I have evidence right here before me," we say, "that such-and-such and so-and-so has been conducted by those people." And then we try to do something about those people; but listen, communication demands a reality of what the situation is. And the reality of the situation is that it didn't have any bad intentions in it.

And the unsolvable, uncommunicative factor lies in the fact that the bad intentions are postulated in there.

See, the bad intentions aren't there. We cannot communicate across an unreality. And somebody has said this group has bad intentions, therefore, we can't communicate to the group and we can't solve the problem easily.

Why can't we solve the problem easily? Because the bad intentions don't exist.

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

This is a terrible thing to tell a court of law. If you were to go down here to chancery, and you were to say to chancery, "Look, you have tried this case now for a year. The reason you were having difficulty in trying this case is that both the plaintiff and the defendant are equally innocent. Nothing has occurred here." The court would not be able to accept this. Something must have occurred here because it's been before them for a year. And that's the best reason in the world why something must have occurred there.

There was a charge made so therefore something must have occurred, and this jurisprudence will merely continue forever.

It becomes unsolved, becomes an engram in the society, *if* we had a condition where there was no guilt on the part of the plaintiff or defendant. The plaintiff actually feels that he is equally, wonderfully, beautifully, supported. See? Plaintiff feels that he was supported at every turn. He has every reason to believe that his charges are correct, that his statement is correct. He believes that his evidence is uncontrovertible. He believes that he has seen it with his own two eyes. He knows that he himself has suffered for some reason or another, from some quarter or another; and he assigns it to the defendant and says it is the defendant's bad intentions that have brought this about.

Well, wonderful to behold.

The defendant sits over here, and he says he didn't even know that this condition existed so far as the plaintiff was concerned; if he'd known about it earlier he could have reversed his course, but that some kind of a happenstance has occurred here where two courses have come into collision. And if these two courses have come into collision, this is tough, it's too bad and it's upsetting—but there's something in collision here, but it is not the charges of the plaintiff. Something else. See?

And the defendant says that he did not do any of these things,

and can produce evidence that he can. And we have a case that could be carried on forever.

Don't we?

Now, where one or another of us in Scientology have been injured by somebody else in Scientology—which is inevitably true—human beings step on other human beings' toes. And you cannot be right and be human. We're playing the game being Scientologists and being human too, and these things get crossed up sometimes, see?

Somebody gets his toes stepped on, see that?

Somebody plays it just a little bit too hard. His anxiety or something of the sort to do this or that or produce an effect causes him to play the game just a little too far. Something of the sort. And somebody gets his toes stepped on.

The basic thing that has happened there is that somebody, trying too hard, will step on somebody else's toes. That's what happens.

Human relations get in the road of the best of intentions, one way or the other.

Somebody to some slight degree gets hurt.

The thing to do in such a circumstance is to do what you can to patch up the guy that got hurt.

And all hands ought to pitch in on that—on that project to straighten it out, and you'd get adjudication in the courts, case would settle.

It'd be possible, then, to move on the track without a bunch of engrams, see? This court case would settle. "Well, all right," the defendant says, "I am sorry. We thought we were doing right. We thought we were in a tenable position. We did not realize that this

human action on our own part was going to produce this effect to that degree or was going to hurt anybody that much.”

And they're not accepting responsibility otherwise, but they say, “They say we are guilty. They say we have done something.”

Now, what would be the immediate recourse, what should be their next action, and what should be the action of people who have joined hands with the plaintiff? What should be the action then of the defendants and the friends of the plaintiff? Where should they join hands?

They should join hands in doing something to straighten out the situation for the plaintiff, because if the plaintiff is casting himself in the role of the plaintiff, the least thing that is wrong with him is that he needs a little more ability to handle his own sphere of action.

That's the least thing there. But that certainly would be in—a little bit in error, wouldn't it, hum?

So any way we look at it in Scientology, but not in human relations, the most sensible thing to do would be to give the plaintiff a hand. This guy says he's been hurt, he's screaming to high heaven, let's try and give him a hand.

In view of the fact that he's in Scientology the probability is that he actually has been hurt. See? He probably—that's the—the probabilities are very in favor of that. And he wasn't just standing there screaming, or she isn't just standing there screaming and saying, “I've been done in,” just to stand there and say, “I've been done in,” see.

From this viewpoint at least something bad has happened. People then should just simply say—the friends of this person and enemies alike simply get together and say, “Well, let's see—how can we straighten this out? I think the best thing to do would be to back up the truck and get it off of her leg.” Get the idea?

It'll serve no purpose whatsoever standing around the radiator of the truck saying how seriously is it resting on the leg and it is really true that you or I were driving the truck.

This gets nowhere, you see?

Let's back the truck up off the leg. Let's straighten them up. Let's run out the engram and get the show on the road. Get the idea?

That is workable. That does work. And I'm only interested in the workables. And it does seem to me that we in Scientology raise our abilities as far as we can, as much as we can, but we still find ourselves human. And maybe that's the way it should be.

But we find ourselves a little bit different than human in that we have a possibility of understanding even the fact that we are human.

And if we understand that, if we understand that, we can then do something about it.

The most valuable asset we have, actually, is our ability to understand, to do the right thing, to be kind, to be decent.

Amongst us we have occasionally the feeling like: life requires that we be stern; life requires that we be ornery enough and mean enough to fire him; life requires that we've got to tell this preclear the next time we come that she must go, she must leave, she must never darken our door again. Life requires that. We must be stern, we must be mean, we must occasionally be ornery, and we must steel ourselves to take an unkind action. And we feel sometimes there's something wanting in us, because we refuse to take this unkind action. We feel we are being cowardly, that we are ducking back from our responsibilities. We feel the best way to solve the thing would be to be a little bit mean about it. Get the idea? We should be able to be tough.

That's the darnedest trap there is. That is a weakness. It's a weakness. We're saying, "We should be able to be weak."

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

Our strength does not lie in our ability to be tough, our ability to face up to it, our ability to say sternly to the preclear, "Go! Never darken this door again." You see?

We've actually got to fall way down hill to do this. And somehow or other life nags at us and says, "We must be tough, we must shape up to it, we must grit our teeth and learn to be mean to people. If we can't be sufficiently mean to people we'll just never get along."

Ever had that feeling? It's the most weak thing you can do. It bears out this way. Interestingly, if you want to observe it, get some more data on it, I invite you to do so. There's never any necessity to be mean to anybody.

This is fantastic. The weak, unworkable thing to do is to get un—to get tough and to get ornery, you know, and to steel yourself into it, you know. That's very weak. Because we're trying to ape the fellow who can do nothing else. We're trying to ape the nation that can only solve its diplomatic problems by indulging in war. And if you can show me a nation that ever won a war, if you can ever show me a war that was ever won, by everybody, why, then I am willing to lay aside the statement that being tough and steeling ourselves and being mean will ever be necessary. It's never necessary.

And I'll only be willing to say that it is sometimes necessary *if* you can show me a war that has been won by everybody.

No war ever has been won even by the (quote) "victor" (unquote). The victor usually wins the right to feed the enemy for a while.

The—the oddity is that we nag ourselves about this. And we sometimes hold ourself in a state of inaction because we think the situation requires that we be, you know, tough about it. That we brace up to it somehow. That we really do finally, cruelly and coldly tell this person off. Get the idea?

And so our kind impulse is muffled by the fact that we "know" we had certainly better tell this person off.

And the actual result of this, quite ordinarily, is inaction. There is no action of any kind undertaken to resolve the situation because we know we should resolve it by being tough. And our own kind hearts won't let us do so. So we do nothing.

Well, I hate to unsettle a very stable datum, if it does unsettle it. But the only way anything ever does resolve is by letting your own kind heart reach through. That's the only way it ever does solve.

And it never solves by being tough. And believe me, ladies and gentlemen, here talks a guy who in his college days was a top sergeant of the reserve marines, who drilled battalions. And when I tell you that it doesn't pay to be tough, I've had experience.

An officer in the war, and I can tell you that at no time, at no time during the entire war, did I ever see toughness win either in the field of discipline, the field of efficiency, or the field of getting a job done. I have never seen it win.

And not because I myself wasn't tough and not because I resented people being tough to me. There is a sort of an agreement by which we can all be crisp and precise that wins, we don't have to be old buddy-buddy with the colonel all the time, you know?

You can still salute snappily and turn off. You know? That has nothing to do with being tough—being crisp, being precise.

I've never seen this thing win. The day when I see it, I'm willing to call myself a liar and say, "Well, yes, there are times when all of us must realize that we must find some steel in our backbone and stand up there, you know, and grit our teeth and go against our kinder impulses and—and mow him down. There is a time when we must draw the gun and cock it and pull the trigger. There is a time when we must sturdily fire everybody in sight.

There is a time when we must front up and finally knock out this particular contestant in our game of life.” *Uh-uh!*

The only time—there is a time to do it, and that’s the time when you are Tone 40 and you need a game. And when you’re at Tone 40 and you need a game, turn around to the nearest thetan and say, “*Grrrrrr.*”

But as long as we aren’t at Tone 40 and as long as we’re simply human and connected with human affairs, one way or the other, as long as we are, no matter how well exteriorized, still on the communication lines of humanity, as long as we are that part of man—even if we would call ourselves a *Homo novis*, we are still, you know, saying *new* man. It’s interesting. “Homo” is still there, you know?

As long as we are in that situation at all, and as long as we find ourselves in a game which already has far too many problems and far too many cut communication lines, being further tough simply makes more game.

And maybe we’re not in a situation to completely enjoy that game. And if we want the game of Scientology fighting Scientology then all we have to do is to face up to it, somehow or another, muster our failing courage—. Because, you see, courage—it’s—we’re cowardly, you see, we’re not courageous when we’re afraid to be ornery and cut people to pieces. We’re just being cowardly. We’re just falling away from our responsibilities. That’s what we tell ourselves, you know.

And when we listen to that voice and we say, “Well, all right, this one time I’ll be tough,” we create more randomness than before.

The way to create randomness is to break ARC. You always have more game. And on this particular planet, and the way we’re going, we could easily have a lot more game than we could handle. In fact, we’re having a hard time handling as much game as we have right now.

So let's turn around to Bill and say, "*Grrrrrr.*" Oh, oh. We have now an internal game, only we're fighting with an opponent who is a Scientologist.

I'd think twice before I'd tackle a Scientologist. I mean if I were just looking it over, I would think twice before I would do it. Because with what kindness would he unmock the game? Get the idea?

It is proving, more and more and more, that it's not a safe thing to do. Not a safe thing from the standpoint of a vested interest or something like that to attack Scientologists. They're too agile, they communicate, they talk. Get the idea? I mean they do upsetting things. They don't go back and sit down apathetically and say that's the end of that.

They write letters. They do things. They think of ideas. They think of ways to get a communication line through.

The bank says, "Well, there's been too many overdrafts now." "Dear Mr. Auditor, we are here and before stated going to suspend your account to high heaven, and shoot you from guns." You know? "Dear Mr. Auditor." And so help me, the one thing happens usually that should never happen to a bank manager, he finds himself talking to somebody.

You mustn't talk to bank managers; that's not what they're for. They're supposed to write letters that say, "Dear So-and-so, we're now shooting you from guns." And the guy finds himself in the horrible position of having to talk to somebody about this.

If I were a bank manager I would just look at the fact that the guy was a Scientologist, I'd say, "Well, let him go another couple of thousand pounds," and then—then have him in for tea or something, you know. "If you write him, he's liable to come in here and talk to us. He's liable to wind up with half the bank," you know? Something wrong. People will become uncertain; they won't quite know what's happening.

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

But you have a weapon. And when you try to use the weapons you have used in wending your way through the world, the weapons you have found fairly reliable, you'll make your way all right; you always have one way or the other. But let me point out the fact that there's a better weapon.

Now, you say, "Well, communication isn't much of a weapon; being kind isn't being much of a weapon. And you've just said you should be kind to people and now you're saying that there's a weapon contained in all of this."

Well, by weapon we maybe mean tool. Maybe we have a tool which does everything we ever expected force to do for us.

Maybe we have a tool that does everything we ever expected meanness or orneryness to do for us. See, maybe; maybe we have such a tool.

Maybe we have a tool that serves much better than sternness and showing our courage and fronting up to the situation and bawling him out or firing him or doing something. See?

Maybe we do have. Therefore we would tend to call it a weapon, wouldn't we? But it really isn't a weapon, it's a tool. And that's ARC. And this, this is one of the more fabulous things.

Now, you think of ARC in terms of the Dear Souls Area, and that's a rather low-toned use of ARC if you want my candid opinion.

You trap somebody and then you come along and you say, "Well, now, you poor thing. Oh, well, we let him out of a trap. Now, come over here and we'll show you all how to be kind to people"—who trapped you in the first place—the "dear souls." Get the idea?

So this doesn't ring true. This is sort of false. This is a sort of a Dale Carnegie aspect of existence; there's no punch in it, you know?

Dale Carnegie, the great advocate of 1.1. The great prophet of the 1.1 point of the Tone Scale. And we say this is kind of phony. We're kind of worming our way through here, and it's propitiative and it's this and that.

Well, yeah, there's a lower harmonic on being alive too. There's a lower harmonic on—on enjoying drink. But none of these lower harmonics have very much to do with power of choice or self-determinism.

What is this tool we have? It's R2, I think, if I remember rightly, it's R2-40: conceive a static.

If you really go along being decent, communicating, being a good guy—a lot of guys have said this in the past, but nobody could back it up because they didn't know what the mechanics were, so they tended to go down scale on it—you would simply ask the opposition in any case to conceive a static.

Ohhh! It's just like—it's just like putting their hand on a hot stove. If you want to be cruel, you actually ask them to conceive a static. This is the most horrible thing you can do to anybody.

If they have bad intentions towards you and their bad intentions continue and they keep offering up these bad intentions, what's the least that would happen to their ridges?

Do you know what happens to a guy whose ridges are being melted by some other agency than himself, he's unknowingly being robbed of havingness of one kind or another? Supposing these are the ridges of bad intention. He keeps offering them to you and they keep melting. They're ineffective.

The guy goes appetite over tin cup, he interiorizes into his own ridges. That's the least that happens to him.

By being as kind and as decent, by being as well conducted as you possibly can be, you can throw completely into a spin and wipe

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

out a person below 2.0 on the Tone Scale. And that is the most—that statement's made without reservations.

The surest way to kill him is not with a bullet but with a kind word. That's the surest way to kill him—providing your intentions are not to kill him.

Therefore, it looks like it's a weapon, doesn't it? But the fact that you use it, and the fact that you use it well and know it well actually prevents him from dying. In other words, you handle both sides of the situation at the same time. You keep him from going out the bottom, you keep him from throwing you down.

I've seen this occur time and time again. I myself lost grip on a conversation quite a little time ago. I lost a grip on the conversation for the excellent reason I felt about half worn-out and a guy hit me with a sudden random remark which was very vicious, and I realized that this guy was a very vicious guy.

And I went halfway with this. I went into communication with him because I wanted to cut the ground out from underneath his feet, but I was too tired to communicate well. And I wound up in kind of secondhand condition. My intention was to cut him to pieces. I made him feel bad but I made me feel bad too, so he won too, didn't he? So nobody won that war again.

I remember another one. A guy came up to me one day on the streets—. It's very seldom people make cracks at me or something, but this guy did make a couple of cracks at me. Well, I was tired that night, but I wasn't remembering an earlier lesson. I simply talked to this guy. I talked to him.

I never saw a guy go down Tone Scale so fast in my life. I was standing there, I was saying, "What am I doing here," you know? Just talking to him, good roads and good weather. And he was trying to make these nasty, snide cracks, you know? And kind of trying to *gurf-rumf*, and so on.

And he dropped below that to where he was going, "*Nya, ahh,*" you know. And he dropped below that and he was crying about how bad it all was.

And I thought, "How on earth am I going to catch this guy before he goes out the bottom?" you know. But I was still being very nice to him and he stood there apathetically and looked at me.

Took him about three minutes to run—to run from 2.0 to greater anger to 1.0 to grief to apathy; and he was in apathy. He was like a block of wood. You could have moved him wherever you'd want to move him on the Tone Scale. Why?

Well, it wasn't that he wasn't making an effect. Although this had something to do with it. It was the fact that there was nobody matching his tone. And he had this sort of feeling like he was striking out against nothing.

The only reason a bull is ever defeated in the bull ring is because they keep him charging and hitting nothing, you know. There's nothing behind that cloak. And he keeps charging thin air.

It's the greatest satisfaction to the bull when he finally gets his horns into a horse, you know? The picador's horse, you know. He finally gets his horns in there, boy, you can see him brighten right up, he says, "*Haah-haah.* Oh, boy, something to butt," you know, "something to hook." And I've seen a bull come up and get very, very happy about the fact that he'd accidentally gotten his horns against the fence, see? He'll just stand there for a couple of minutes and reassure himself that it's all real. He'll keep butting the fence, you know. But he gets out there again, and here are the toreadors and the matador, you know, and they've got those cloaks, and *ffffft*, he hits nothing. *Ffffft*, he hit's nothing. *Ffffft*, there's nothing there, and the bottom goes out of the world for him.

Well, I'm not trying to teach you how to be vicious. I'm just saying you'll probably find yourself sometimes, just by being decent, having to think as fast as I did that night on the sidewalk.

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

Now, what did I do with this guy? What did I do, cut him up in blocks of wood and sell him for kindling? Or did I cart him off? Or what did I do with him? I had the distinct feeling like he would stand there probably the rest of the night unless I did something.

He went all the way through to the bottom. So I started again on another tack and I got him into two-way communication again, and I built him up.

And the funny part of it was, he hadn't built up—he didn't build up across the same route of the Tone Scale. He didn't come up, one after another, up the tones, you know. He was glad that somebody would now talk to him.

And I don't suppose I raised his tone any but I—to amount to anything, but I did give him back enough self-determinism so he went away.

The guy is now coming to a group here.

But what did he do? It wasn't really that he attacked nothing. It's just for the fact that if he was that ornery, he probably started feeling ashamed of himself. He probably had all kinds of various mechanisms going on. In fact, he had every mechanism going on that there is as a mechanism in this universe.

One or another or all of them were thrown into action—against him—just because he wasn't fighting with anybody. Get the idea? There was nobody there for him to fight.

Now, so this could be an ornery thing to do if you intended it to be ornery. But the fact of the matter is you can sometimes invite people to do it because it's ornery, but the fact of the matter is that it is the only thing in the end which wins. Because the reason they're going down scale and the reason they're getting upset is because they—you're as-ising a tremendous amount of the ridges and stuff that they're stuck in.

People below 2.0 almost perish when asked to look at a static. If you don't believe this, run it sometime on a person. You just say to this person—defining for him what a static is and tell him, “Now conceive it.” “Now, conceive a static. Conceive somebody in good communication. Conceive somebody with a higher level of reality. Conceive somebody with some real love for his fellow man.” Any one of these points, and the guy'll go *zeeeha*. Almost knocks him out.

So when you get tough, you throw away the greatest accidental weapon which you have. But that stays a weapon as long as you don't use it as a weapon, you understand that?

It works. It works.

There is no substitute for liking people like liking people. There's no substitute for reality like reality. There's no substitute for communication like communication with good affinity and good reality. And that's really close to a static. Do you understand?

You go down scale from that you get into Dale Carnegieism. You ought to read that book sometime; it's a real killer. It's how to subvert ARC.

All right. What do we have then? What do we have in these organizations? What do we really have of value in the organizations of Scientology?

The only thing we have of value, actually, is Scientology, an understanding of life, increasing ability to communicate, a good concept and grip on reality, and the ability to like guys. That's all you got.

When you knock out one of those or degrade one of those, you've got less than you had before. You've got less organization than you had before.

The man who manages Gestetner at this moment does not have

ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF SCIENTOLOGY

enough on the ball to run your group or any part of Scientology. Remember that. He'd fail because he doesn't have enough on the ball.

We do very poorly, from a business standpoint, very often. We don't do too well. Occasionally we make magnificent blunders one way or the other.

But the funny part of it is that the number of blunders we make for the blunders offered to be made are in very small ratio. And a person in the business world—*only* in the business world, not knowing Scientology—would make more of the offered blunders than we do.

He would make so many more that the organization would probably swamp in a few weeks.

Your group would probably go to pieces in a few weeks.

So don't let anybody kid you about this.

And when people come running up to you and say, "Why don't you hire bright new shiny people for these points?" And somebody says, "Why don't you suddenly get in—the person you've just hired for this post is—is for the birds. No good. Can't perform it. Can't do this, can't do that. Why don't you do something?" With perfectly good ARC, say, "Okay, find me a person who can better fill the post." And of course the fact of the matter is that they can't. Because I have yet to date to have anybody answer this question. They just go into apathy.

There isn't anybody to fill that post but the person who was standing there. We *did* fill the post with the best guy that we had to hand!

And our only answer to better efficiency is better people. And if he can't tell you what better person that you should put in there as your Group Secretary, if he can't tell you what better person that

you should put in there as your assistant auditor, or as your clinical receptionist, if he can't tell you, then you say, "Then do me a favor, will you? Go out immediately and pick one up and process him until we have a better person."

That's the only other answer we have.

If we deal with these rather simple simplicities—these very simple, simple, simple simplicities—we have all of the assets we will ever have.

When we drop the various points of the ARC triangle in their fullest meaning, we drop also the assets of the organization. And I mean that literally. I mean we drop the mimeograph machine, just like that, you know. Bang!

When we ourselves are more capable than we are, we will be able to do better than we do. And our best hope is the fact that all of us know that we can be better than we are.

And there's only one more thing that we could know that would make us all feel very, very relaxed about the whole thing. There isn't a person anywhere in Scientology who has bad intentions for Scientologists or their fellow man. And that point all by itself is very well worth thinking about the next time some trouble arises in your vicinity because that is the truth. And if you handle a situation with that in mind, you will solve the situation.

Thank you.

GLOSSARY

To assist in your understanding of this lecture, hard-to-find terms and other words which you may not be familiar with are included in this glossary. An example of usage from the lecture is included at the end of each definition. These definitions give only the meanings of the words as they are used in the lecture; this glossary is not meant as a substitute for a dictionary.

ACC: abbreviation for Advanced Clinical Course: one of a number of theory and research courses delivered by L. Ron Hubbard during the years 1953 to 1961, which gave a deep insight into the phenomena of the mind and the rationale of research and investigation. The Fourth London ACC was delivered in London, England from 28 October to 5 November 1955. *This is the second morning lecture of the 3rd of November, 1955, Fourth London ACC.*

agin: against; opposed to. *So here we have this invalidative person who is agin it.*

all hands: (*colloquial*) all the members of a party, especially when collectively engaged in work. *And all hands ought to pitch in on that project to straighten it out, and you'd get adjudication in the courts, case would settle.*

ape: imitate or mimic. *Because we're trying to ape the fellow who can do nothing else.*

appetite over tin cup: (*slang*) a pioneer Western US term used by riverboat men on the Missouri; it means thrown away violently

like “head over heels,” “bowled over.” *The guy goes appetite over tin cup, he interiorizes into his own ridges.*

ARC: a word made from the initial letters of Affinity, Reality and Communication which together equate to understanding. These are the three things necessary to the understanding of something—one has to have some affinity for it, it has to be real to him to some degree and he needs some communication with it before he can understand it. For more information on ARC, read the book *Science of Survival* by L. Ron Hubbard. *The way to create more randomness is to break ARC.*

ARC Straightwire: a recall process which gets the preclear to remember times of affinity, reality, communication and understanding. *See also ARC in this glossary. [Definition of R2] short for Route 2, a series of Scientology processes employed on a preclear who demonstrated any noticeable comm lag with ARC Straightwire . . .*

astronomic: (*colloquial*) extremely large; exceedingly great; enormous. *He was astronomic in his Hollywood reputation.*

auditor: a person trained and qualified in applying Dianetics and/or Scientology processes and procedures to individuals for their betterment; called an auditor because *auditor* means “one who listens.” *No matter, if the science were good the auditor might be poor.*

back burner, on the: (*colloquial*) in or into a condition of low priority or temporary deferment. From the custom in cooking of placing pots not requiring immediate attention toward the rear of the stove. *But I put this one on the back burner.*

ball, on the: (*slang*) in a condition or state of being alert and efficient, or effective. *The man who manages Gestetner at this moment does not have enough on the ball to run your group or any part of Scientology.*

bears out: shows to be true; supports or confirms. *It bears out this way.*

birds, for the: (*slang*) of no worth; without value or importance. *As far as this "secret society" was concerned, that's for the birds.*

blow: an informal expression meaning to suddenly depart or for a sudden departure. It is usually used to describe either the sudden dissipation (vanishing) of mass in the mind with an accompanying feeling of relief, or someone leaving, ceasing to be where he should really be, or just ceasing to be audited. *Boy, did we blow it.*

booted out: (*informal*) made to leave; gotten rid of; dismissed. *"And now that you've been booted out, why, you're off of communication, and we're not going to do anything for you, and don't associate with us anymore," and so forth.*

buddy-buddy: (*slang*) friendly or chummy, often in an effusive (expressing emotions in an unrestrained way) or insincere way. *There is a sort of an agreement by which we can all be crisp and precise that wins, we don't have to be old buddy-buddy with the colonel all the time you know?*

chancery: a division of the High Court of Justice in England and Wales, presided over by the Lord High Chancellor of England (the head of the part of government whose work is the administration of justice). *If you were to go down here to chancery, and you were to say to chancery, "Look, you have tried this case now for a year."*

comm lag: short for *communication lag*, the length of time intervening between the asking of the question by the auditor and the reply to that specific question by the preclear. The question must be precise; the reply must be precisely to that question. It does not matter what intervenes in the time between the asking of the question and the receipt of the answer. The preclear may outflow, jabber, discuss, pause, hedge, disperse, dither or be silent; no matter what he does or how he does it, between the

asking of the question and the giving of the answer, the *time* is the communication lag. See also **preclear** in this glossary. *[Definition of R2] short for Route 2, a series of Scientology processes employed on a preclear who demonstrated any noticeable comm lag with ARC Straightwire.*

cone on into: come into (a point), like a cone. *And there'd be that much commotion that people would realize there were a great many unknowns in the Central Organization, and the public at large would have a tendency to cone on into it on unknown basis, you see?*

cudgels, took up the (for): came to the defense (of). *But the basic origin of them—rather obscure, but nevertheless basic origin—unknown to the later people who took up the cudgels, you understand was to some degree professional jealousy.*

Dale Carnegie: like or as presented by American lecturer and author Dale Carnegie (1888–1955), writer of the book called *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (1936). His ideas were based originally on public speaking—later he extended it to include salesmanship and psychology. *This is a sort of a Dale Carnegie aspect of existence; there's no punch in it, you know?*

Dear Souls Area: a saccharine-sweet sort of a universe, characterized by lots of enforced ARC, dating back to trillions of years ago. *Now, you think of ARC in terms of the Dear Souls Area, and that's a rather low-toned use of ARC if you want my candid opinion.*

devil with, the: (colloquial) I, we, etc., do not care about (a person or thing). *But part of another universe, practically on the same time continuum is an invalidative mechanism about this man's—not Scientology, the devil with Scientology.*

Dianetics: Dianetics spiritual healing technology. It addresses and handles the effects of the spirit on the body and can alleviate such things as unwanted sensations and emotions, accidents,

injuries and psychosomatic illnesses (ones that are caused or aggravated by mental stress). *Dianetics* means "through the soul" (from Greek *dia*, through, and *nous*, soul). It is further defined as "what the soul is doing to the body." *Five years of active organization in the field of Dianetics and Scientology has taught us a few things.*

dynamics: the eight urges (drives, impulses) in life. They are motives or motivations. We call them the eight dynamics. These are urges for survival as or through (1) self, (2) sex and family, (3) groups, (4) all mankind, (5) living things (plants and animals), (6) the material universe, (7) spirits, and (8) infinity or the Supreme Being. *And enturbulences which affect them and separate them out of an orderly existence, kick back madly all the way across the whole set of dynamics, and you have apparently practically offered to kill somebody.*

flatter than a flounder: a coined phrase meaning very flat (discharged of all bad reactions to the preclear; no longer producing change or a reaction). A *flounder* is a small, edible flatfish. *And we knocked these things flatter than a flounder.*

Gestetner Limited: a manufacturer and distributor of a variety of duplicating machines and related supplies. *That might work in Gestetner Limited or Westinghouse but it does not work in Scientology.*

hand, to: within reach; near; close. *We did fill the post with the best guy that we had to hand.*

happenstance: (colloquial) a chance or accidental happening. *The defendant sits over here, and he says he didn't even know that this condition existed so far as the plaintiff was concerned; if he'd known about it earlier he could have reversed his course, but that some kind of a happenstance has occurred here where two courses have come into collision.*

harmonic: one of two or more manifestations or actions which are,

themselves, different yet are related in terms of some quality or qualities. For example, laughing because one was embarrassed would be a lower harmonic of laughing because something was funny. *And well yeah, there's a lower harmonic on being alive too.*

hath: (archaic) has. *He who hath not broken the Auditor's Code, cast the first certificate into the fire.*

high heaven, screaming to: (slang) screaming very strongly. *This guy says he's been hurt, he's screaming to high heaven, let's try and give him a hand.*

Hollywood: a section of Los Angeles, California, once the site of many US film studios. *One publicity man in Dianetics, by the way, was the best that Hollywood had to offer.*

Homo novis: literally, new man, from the Latin *Homo*, man, and *novus*, new. *But as long as we aren't at Tone 40 and as long as we're simply human and connected with human affairs, one way or the other, as long as we are, no matter how well exteriorized, still on the communication lines of humanity, as long as we are that part of man—even if we would call ourselves a Homo novis, we are still, you know, saying new man.*

magnitudinous: characterized by great amount or importance. *And this can become magnitudinous, believe me.*

matador: a bullfighter whose specialty is killing the bull with a sword thrust at the end of a bullfight after performing a series of formalized actions with a cape to anger and tire the animal. *But he gets out there again, and here are the toreadors and the matador, you know, and they've got those cloaks, and fffft, he hits nothing.*

mellowed: pleasantly agreeable; freed from tension, discord, etc. *Only of recent years has he become a little mellowed in his attitude toward Dianetics.*

metacarpals: the bones of the hand between the wrist and the fingers. *Now, we look this over, and we find that any one of us here or there have tried to push at least the metacarpals of a skeleton underneath the couch.*

mimeo machine: short for *mimeograph machine*, a duplicating machine for producing copies from a stencil. *He could understand a film in a can, he could understand a mimeo machine, he could understand a car or a can of soup, but he was being asked to understand understanding and he couldn't do it.*

mores: the customs, or customary practices, rules, etc., regarded as essential to or characteristic of a group. *By our own mores, we will not interfere with that human relationship any more.*

motivator: an aggressive or destructive act received by the person or one of the dynamics. The viewpoint from which the act is viewed resolves whether the act is an overt or a motivator. The reason it is called a "motivator" is because it tends to prompt that one pays it back—it "motivates" a new overt. When one has done something bad to someone or something one tends to believe it must have been "motivated." When one has received something bad, he also may tend to feel *he* must have done something to deserve it. *See also dynamics* in this glossary. *These people don't spin necessarily but their retaliatory gestures demonstrate that they have received a motivator of enormous magnitude.*

mow (him) down: kill or destroy (him) as with swift, sudden strokes, gunfire, etc. *The day when I see it, I'm willing to call myself a liar and say, "Well, yes, there are times when all of us must realize that we must find some steel in our backbone and stand up there, you know, and grit our teeth and go against our kinder impulses and mow him down."*

nuts: (*slang*) insane; crazy. *So this one was for the birds, see, this was really nuts.*

ornery: (*dialect*) ugly and unpleasant in disposition or temper.

Amongst us we have occasionally the feeling like: life requires that we be stern; life requires that we be ornery enough and mean enough to fire him; life requires that we've got to tell this preclear the next time we come that she must go, she must leave, she must never darken our door again.

picador: in bullfighting, any of the horsemen who weaken the neck muscles of the bull by pricking with a lance. *It's the greatest satisfaction to the bull when he finally gets his horns into a horse, you know? The picador's horse, you know.*

pitch in: (colloquial) set to work energetically. *And all hands ought to pitch in on that project to straighten it out, and you'd get adjudication in the courts, case would settle.*

pounds: the basic unit of money in the United Kingdom; also called pounds sterling. *If I were a bank manager I would just look at the fact that the guy was a Scientologist, I'd say, "Well, let him go another couple of thousand pounds," and then have him in for tea or something, you know.*

preclear: a spiritual being who is now on the road to becoming Clear, hence pre-Clear. *Clear is the name of a state achieved through auditing or an individual who has achieved this state. A Clear is an unaberrated person and is rational in that he forms the best possible solutions he can on the data he has and from his viewpoint. He won't be given any preclears.*

processed: given Scientology processes and procedures by a trained practitioner. *They are either processed, or they're . . .*

propitiative: acting in a manner calculated to reduce the anger or win the favor of another; trying to make calm or quiet. *We're kind of worming our way through here, and it's propitiative and it's this and that.*

psychotic: out of contact to a thorough extent with the present time environment and not computing into the future. The condition

may be acute wherein one becomes psychotic for only a few minutes at a time and only occasionally in certain environments (as in rages or apathies) or it may be a chronic condition, or a continual disconnection with the future and present. A psychotic person who is dramatically harmful to others is considered dangerous enough to be put away. A psychotic person who is harmful on a less dramatic basis is no less harmful to their environment and is no less psychotic. *They were actually basic-basic on a whole chain of stuff that had him labeled as a psychotic with his own insurance office.*

pull: (*colloquial*) put into effect; carry out; perform. *Now, any Scientist in the operation of business is going to pull a few blunders.*

ridges: solid accumulations of old, inactive energy suspended in space and time. A ridge is generated by opposing energy flows which hit one another, and continues to exist long after the energy flows have ceased. *If they have bad intentions towards you and their bad intentions continue and they keep offering up these bad intentions, what's the least that would happen to their ridges?*

R2: short for *Route 2*, a series of Scientology processes employed on a preclear who demonstrated any noticeable comm lag with ARC Straightwire. *See also preclear, comm lag and ARC Straightwire* in this glossary. For further information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. *What is this tool we have? It's R2, I think, if I remember rightly, it's R2-40: Conceive a Static.*

R2-40: short for *Routine 2-40: Conceiving a Static*, one of a number of processes of Route 2, in which the command "Conceive a thetan" is repeated over and over. For further information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. *See also R2 and static* in this glossary. *What is this tool we have? It's R2, I think, if I remember rightly, it's R2-40: Conceive a Static.*

savvy: (*slang*) understand; get the idea. *So evidently some of the*

practices used by Gestetner, although they seem to be open and shut practices, are not workable in Scientology unless they are done by Scientologists and then the practices become more workable. Savvy?

scarcity-of-preclearosis: a humorous phrase meaning the state or condition of an inadequate supply of preclears. *Now, very ordinarily we get such things as professional jealousy or scarcity-of-preclearosis.*

Scientology: Scientology philosophy. It is the study and handling of the spirit in relationship to itself, universes and other life. Scientology means *scio*, knowing in the fullest sense of the word and *logos*, study. In itself the word means literally *knowing how to know*. Scientology is a "route," a way, rather than a dissertation or an assertive body of knowledge. Through its drills and studies one may find the truth for himself. The technology is therefore not expounded as something to believe, but something to *do*. *Now, I'd merely like to talk to you about something light and very airy, which is simply the attitude and conduct of Scientology when and where successful.*

sea gulls, for the: of no worth; without value or importance. A variation of *for the birds*. *It's for the sea gulls.*

show on the road, get the: get (an organization, plan, etc.) into active operation; put (a plan, idea, etc.) into effect. *Let's run out the engram and get the show on the road.*

skeleton: any embarrassing, shameful or damaging secret. *Now, we look this over, and we find that any one of us here or there have tried to push at least the metacarpals of a skeleton underneath the couch.*

spin: (*slang*) go into a state of mental confusion. *These people don't spin necessarily but their retaliatory gestures demonstrate that they have received a motivator of enormous magnitude.*

squirrel: an individual who alters (materials, procedures, etc.) from the original. *That is sometimes not workable today for this reason: You remember I've spoken to you about what makes a squirrel.*

static: something that has no mass, no location and no position in time, and which has no wavelength at all. *It's R2, I think, if I remember rightly, it's R2-40: Conceive a Static.*

steel (oneself): make (oneself) hard, tough, unfeeling, etc. *We must be stern, we must be mean, we must occasionally be ornery, and we must steel ourselves to take an unkind action.*

swamp: be overcome or overwhelmed; become ruined. *He would make so many more that the organization would probably swamp in a few weeks.*

tarred: (figurative) dirtied or defiled as with tar. *There were two specific groups who had been tarred by rumor as having bad intention and doing bad things, before I came over.*

time continuum: an agreed-to, uniform rate of change. If, for example, this agreement was not there, one might be in the year 1776 or 2060, while everybody else was in some other year. *Because a person who becomes a Scientologist is on your time continuum.*

toreadors: bullfighters, especially those on horseback. *But he gets out there again, and here are the toreadors and the matador, you know, and they've got those cloaks, and fffft, he hits nothing.*

uncontrovertible: unable to be argued or reasoned against, contradicted, denied or disputed. *He believes that his evidence is uncontrovertible.*

wending: (archaic) journeying; traveling. *And when you try to use the weapons you have used in wending your way through the world,*

the weapons you have found fairly reliable, you'll make your way all right, you always have one way or the other, but let me point out the fact that there's a better weapon.

Westinghouse: Westinghouse Electric, a diversified company dealing mainly in electrical and electronic equipment. *That might work in Gestetner Limited or Westinghouse but it does not work in Scientology.*

worstest: *(dialect) worst (a humorous pronunciation). So we had two other groups, and one of these groups was supposed to be about the worstest—and the most horrible things they were doing.*