

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM, HOW TO GROUP PROCESS (part 1)

A lecture given on 10 January 1953

[Based on R&D transcripts only]

Okay. We have here the first lecture of the Saturday course in Dianetics and Scientology.

This course is designed primarily for the teacher or the person who would normally process groups of people out of a pre-prepared list of questions. You understand the difference between that and professional auditing, or individual auditing.

A list, perforce, must be a sort of a broad shotgun and uses a mechanism which is very general to every case. A list of that character makes it possible, however, for an individual to process with considerable success a large group of people no matter how scattered their techniques are.

You might – might be very interested to know that the – that Group Auditing is a very important technique; it is not a technique which is merely, "Well, it's better than anything else we could do for a large number of people, and so we're going to do that," and so on. No, it's a very specialized function, a very specialized application. And people who are doing this work will acquire, actually, an entirely different viewpoint in processing than they would acquire only processing individuals. It's another thing; it's a specialty. Now, when they talked of low-cost therapy in the last two decades, nobody dreamed of anything like this, because the cost of Group Processing with Scientology is probably something like a halfpenny per child for every ten years of processing in the schools. It's incalculably small; and as a matter of fact, makes money because it delivers the attention of the instructor to instructing those who can and be – can be instructed.

Get that as a difference. Here we have an instructor who, all day long, is trying to pound reading, writing, and arithmetic into the heads of children who have no ability to absorb it. That's a waste of money.

That is a big waste of money. That wastes the pay of the instructor and it wastes the cost of the quarters; it wastes light, heating and it wastes government. And the only benefit is, is the child is kept out of the hands of his family for a certain period of time every day. That's a pretty high price to pay for a nursemaid, a pretty high price.

And where we have a nursemaid who has to have the degrees and training of a school instructor, there's something very wrong that should be righted. Because unless children of a certain bracket can be brought into a level where they can study and absorb information, they belong in the hands of an attendant, a nursemaid, not in the hands of an instructor. All right.

Then what do we do just on that level! We don't alter the system. You will find as you go through this life that systems are less and less susceptible to being altered. The government objects to the alteration of a system. Councils, school boards and so forth object to the alteration of systems and plans, And where we have a system, we'd better match up with that system. All right. The instructor – the instructor is there to teach children.

Once upon a time in a war which occupies much space in American history books, a fellow by the name of Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders received orders one fine morning to attack and take a place called San Juan Hillz against the Spanish forces there on the hill. And at 4:30 in the morning, everybody rolled out to take San Juan Hill. And the orders said, "Jump off from El Caney and take San Juan Hill," That was very good – that was fine – except they hadn't taken El Caney And they had to remedy this situation by fighting in the hot sun until noon to get El Caney, and from that, they jumped off and took San Juan Hill with dreadful casualties, because they hadn't taken El Caney.

Now, this is applicable in instruction, But let's take El Caney – that is to say, let's have a child that can be instructed. The system has provided a room, it's provided a trained instructor and it's provided a large number of children. And then the system says, "Instructor, now instruct these children so we will have an educated public," Well, that's something like saying – something like telling a fellow to go out and sit down in that airplane and fly off to the moon. And he goes out and he'd be very happy to sit down in this airplane except for one thing: there's no airplane there.

To instruct a child, it is necessary to have a child that can be instructed. That seems to be one of these supersimplicities that so easily gets overlooked. All right.

The devotion of twenty minutes a day of putting children in a – Puttin not just a state of mind, but a state of health where they can be instructed, would salvage all the other hours in that day. And so we would have taken El Caney. We would have children who could be instructed by the investment of that.

Now, of course, it is up to you to demonstrate to your own satisfaction that this condition does occur, and we do get this advantage from using these techniques.

They tell you in old-time psychotherapy, "Yes, we could have remedied the condition of a child. We could have remedied this situation, but you see, individual address is impossible, and therefore the situation cannot be remedied," Oh no, I'm afraid that does not happen to be the case now, because we don't need very much of this individual attention. Once in a while, if you're – as an instructor, you keep having to ... One of the children that you're processing there, and he keeps leaping. out of his chair or his seat, you see, and flying up to the blackboard and leaping out of his seat and flying up to the blackboard and knocking over other children in progress and so forth, you'll have to give some individual attention on

this; you will have to glue him to his seat or something of the sort. But we are not interested in individualized, high-paid consultation for each child. What we're interested in is taking a big group of children, and by the use of processes such as those contained in Self Analysis – Self Analysis is the one you have available; there are others under preparation, or even now in your hands – and putting that class into a state where it can be instructed.

That's our aim and goal. There you will find that their IQ comes up and that they are able in most cases to address studies where they were unable to before. This is quite startling. You can look for other things to happen – certain psychosomatic illnesses will turn off in them and so on; there's a lot of odds and ends that will happen. But that is not the goal of what we are doing. The goal of what we are doing here with children, immediately, is to put children into a frame of mind where they can be instructed. That's what we're aiming for and that's what we can attain with this. This is something like – something like giving somebody a diamond, by the way, and saying, "Well now, you see, that is very good for marking doorknobs," See! It's very silly to think of this along in such a supersimplified level, but you will find nobody will argue with this level.

We can say, "All right, now this puts the children in a frame of mind where they can be instructed."

And everybody will say, "Well, that's right, that's fine, that's good. Good roads," where everybody is in favor of good roads and good weather. Everybody is in favor of good roads, good weather and children in a frame of mind where they can be instructed. So you just take it from there and take it on that level and expect that result to occur, and that you won't be disappointed and nobody will be upset by it. You can expect all sorts of other things to happen too, but we won't go into those. They're none of them bad; they're extra results. With everything considered on Group Processing of children, everything is an extra result except the child in a frame of mind where he can be instructed.

Now, let us take another type of group, not just the child. Let's take a group of people, of men, who have lost much of their ambition, who feel that they themselves are quite useless in life, Let's take a group of veterans at a government hospital. Well, what can you do with these! Does Group Processing apply to them! Yes, it very definitely does. If you were trying to go down and sell the Home Secretary (I'm a very good friend of the Home Secretary) on the idea – or the War Ministry or somebody – on taking groups of adults and giving them something that made them more efficient or made them again an asset to the state instead of a liability, you'd run across this same thing. They would say, "Well, we've always been able to do something for them, but you see – you see, it – you can't give individual attention,"

And you say, "We don't want any individual attention. All this is, is we want half an hour, an hour or something like that a day for adults. That's all. And the cost of it is very slight. Extremely slight," They wouldn't be able to argue with it very much.

Now, the chances of your running up against very much opposition on the level of a veterans' hospital – quite slight because nobody has got anything for them to do. Nobody has really any planned programs. There's the – it's very good, you understand. I mean, they try to do something for them. But again, the mission of these programs is to get a man interested in

life. If the man has no potentiality to be interested in life, you can dream up programs and write up programs and systems and throw in auxiliaries and Wacs and movies and anything else you want to throw in and nothing is going to happen. And yet, you will find for two, three, four years, five years, ten years, a man will stay in a state whereby he cannot be interested in life.

So therefore, here's an enormous amount of money being put out on a program of keeping these men interested in life without putting them in a situation where they can be interested in life. The truth of the matter is, is they are incapable of being interested in life until given something on the order of this Group Processing. Now, there again we take El Caney, we get them interested in life. If you just went in and showed a man that he could make up pictures and look at them, if you just got him into that state only, the odd part of it is, you would have given him a new interest in life, wouldn't you! It was quite personal. And we won't worry about its therapeutic value. Just do that, and that would be very interesting to him. And so you would have improved his interest in life in general.

You can't do this without knocking his case into a cocked hat. That is to say, he will right and come back to battery the moment you start doing this, for odd and, sometimes to some, very obscure mechanical reasons. But what you have here, then, where you have a group of veterans, is you have a restoration of interest in life. All right.

Now, when we've restored that, then we can bring up the Wrens and the movies and the hobby shop and all these other things. You see, we can roll in with the tanks, you might say. But let's repair that; let's take El Caney once more.

You know, Group Processing is not new. It's old. It's very, very old. Effective Group Processing, however, has been nonexistent. You get the difference there! Because you're going to run into this. People are going to tell you, "Well now, look, Group Processing, creative imagination, these things have been used since time immemorial. They're old," and so on. Don't criticize that statement; just thank your stars that somebody has this delusion. Because it's "Open, sesame." They know this: this is old, it's done, it's usual, there's no argument with it. Of course, but don't try to tell them there's any result from it. They've written up in journals and things how wonderful all this is – everybody stays crazy or everybody stays disinterested. And it's wonderful how people can stay that crazy or that disinterested, but don't try to batter through on the idea that this is something new and startling. No, no, no, this is something old and sort of mildewed at the edges and nothing has been added. You can't put anything into a mildewed system that creaks that isn't mildewed and creaks. See! So kind of chew up your copy of Self Analysis, you know! (audience laughter)

Now, you may know what's going to happen; don't bother to tell anybody else what's going to happen. In other words, don't bother to make any promises, either on a level of schoolchildren or a level of veterans or anything of the sort. You're just doing something that's interesting, and that produces some interesting results. And if you have a very conservative attitude toward all of this, you see, the process will shock them – the results of it, rather. These results will be quite shocking.

If you were to take a group of veterans who hadn't done anything since Dunkirk, and you suddenly had these fellows very alert, very interested in going out and getting jobs and going and contacting their families and getting things going, and the dickens with being on – in a government hospital, and the dickens with this foot that's hurt ever since, and the devil with it sort of a thing and interested in life again and ...

"Because that's funny. We've had – this week we've had thirty-five discharges from this hospital, and there hasn't been a discharge from this hospital since 1946. What's happening!" Well, if you're extremely bright, you won't even be obvious enough to be pointed to in doing that work. You'll let them go out and hire some scientific expert on an investigation of the increased incidence of the cosmic rays in the ... In other words, this is totally obscure. There's no reason why you have to do that. Of course, you will get spotted; there isn't any doubt about that, And what I'm talking to you about is the same thing I'm doing – see, don't overrate or overestimate something which does not have to be either overrated or overestimated. Do what you do and let's be done with what gets done. The idea that you are advancing into something new and strange, peculiar, unusual is something you should abandon right here. You're not. You're not really going into anything strange or peculiar or unusual, but you are going into something which is effective.

Because man helping man is something that has been going on for Man he an awfully long time. You're just being a little more efficient. That's about all.

That we have discovered here – one can say that we've discovered here psychotherapy of actuality and validity – is a true enough statement, but it's always been there to be discovered. It's always been there. Somebody had to look. And perhaps the single difference between me and former researches – researchers, simply this, is I looked at the MEST universe. I didn't look at books about the MEST universe. You know that could make a big difference. I looked at the MEST universe. I was foolish enough as a boy to get all tangled up with the MEST universe one way or the other – go out and get run into, and various things happened. And I found out there was a universe there. And most people that studied this have been sitting up in the back room of someplace or other; they've been reading about the universe being there. That's a big difference. And it's possibly the only thing that shortened this route. Somebody sooner or later would have discovered all this material.

We're discovering it here at a catalyzed level. It's just – it's been very fast for a subject to have progressed in three years of public knowledge (actually in twenty-five years) as fast as Dianetics and Scientology – appears just a little bit dizzying. That's no great compliment to my wit, it's no great compliment to anything except that ... This subject itself: if you hit the – if you just started in on the right track, you couldn't help yourself. There was a great big hurricane started behind you. And you had raised a sail in this hurricane and, fortunately or unfortunately, you just went from there on, see! It would have been much more difficult to have stopped developing this subject than to have continued developing it. It would have been very difficult to have stopped, and yet it was very interesting. And on every hand you could see various things happening and – did you ever walk out of a movie just as the villain grabs the girl? Well, to have stopped developing this subject would have made that happen.

Now, we have – talking to you now from two rather, the rather comfortable security – now the two very workable processes: one of these is those lists and mock-ups contained in Self Analysis. Terrifically workable, very, very workable. It's built on a formula that is very workable, and done as it's done, it gets the job through, one way or the other. I don't say how long – I don't say how long it will take to get the job through, but just that all by itself will get the job done maybe 150 hours or 2,000 hours, or something like that. It's just one of those things that's just – you just go on and on and on, and that's it.

And the other one is Theta Clearing. And this is an esoteric and strange, undoubtedly daffy, sort of a thing that couldn't be, of course, and all that. And there, actually, lies the main body of knowledge. It's a very technical subject, by the way. It takes quite a bit of study to digest it. And that level now is a gunshot, you might say, on cases, The missing links have been found present after all, been isolated and so on, so that we don't have problems. It's true, you know, we don't have problems, And I can talk to you from that level of security. I know what we're doing, and if you do Group Auditing, you will find out a lot of what we are doing and what can be done. And if you were to become a professional auditor, you would be able to do the rest of this work.

Now, don't try to exclude out of Group Auditing groups of any kind. You can audit any group you want to audit with this same technique, and that includes groups of raving psychos – guys that are really spinning. The fact that you could get eight or ten psychotics together around a table and have them talk for a short period fairly rationally has been known in institutions for a very long time, very long time. That could happen. Something or other happened from it once in a while, but what they were doing, whether they knew it or not, was opening up a few communication lines that were otherwise closed. And they had what's known as "group processing," only they didn't call it group processing. They had a group therapy, and it has more coats – it has more coats than a sheep has. Now, you can apply that, and you'll find back along the line that this one has a group therapy and that one has a group therapy, and it was not an inclusive phrase, But when we say "Group Processing," we are saying precisely "Group Processing," and we mean the techniques which we are talking about here today. We mean a very specific thing.

Now, you could take, then, a number of psychotics in an institution, and whether you could get their attention or not, in any great degree, if you put them down in a group and you gave them mock-ups on this level as a group, or made them give the rest of them mock-ups on this level as a group, is quite immaterial. You would get a job done. I don't say how many hours it would take or how ragged your nerves would be, but it will do the job.

There's something about people in groups that opens up communication lines and brings about an accessibility.

A child, for instance, that you would not be able to process individually because you couldn't hold him still, yet will quite often (not always) but will quite often be susceptible to processing when included in a group. There's something about this. And therefore, the individual – the individual who is in poor condition will very often be found inaccessible as

an individual and may become accessible as a member of a group. Now, that's something for you to remember; that's something for the professional auditor to think of once in a while.

You know, man behaves differently as a mob and as a well policed group and as an individual. He's three different people: as an unpoliced group, which is to say a mob; as a disciplined group, such as in a schoolroom or something; and as an individual. He behaves those three ways.

So the only thing a disciplined group is, is it meets on schedule, it meets for a certain purpose and it agrees, as it meets, on who is the monitor. That's the disciplined group.

And an undisciplined group just sort of surged up and got there. An You take a lynch mob, for instance, there's an interesting spirit – difference. And the difference of a disciplined group and a mob: the mob is pouring out, disagreeing, and the disciplined group is willing to take in and pour out. So a disciplined group is characterized by a two-way flow, and a mob by a one-way flow, And the individual – god help this fellow – don't know how he'd be characterized as bluntly as that. He has one-way flows and two-way flows. He can flow out only or he can flow in only, or he can flow out and in, and an hour later he's changed his characteristics again. Well, a group is more stable than the individual and changes its characteristics less often.

Now, that should be of interest to you. That means that your processing is going to be held down by this stability of the disciplined group. Stability of this group is itself going to inhibit a change in the group. But when they do change, you ordinarily have a relatively stable change.

When you change an individual when he is part of a group, you will see the marks of that change on him years later. You change him as an individual, you quite often won't see the marks on him at six o'clock Interesting, isn't it!

For instance, I had a ship one time, organized this ship, booted it up the line, did quite a few experiments with its personnel and so forth; it was in combat quite a bit. It's very easy to cohere a group that is facing a common danger and has a great deal of excitement going on. So it was very easy to handle a group that way because they don't choose you for its randomness; they choose you for your ability to help them confront this danger, The danger exists, then, as the villain there, not the leader of the group. When you get a group which isn't faced with danger, they generally will choose the leader or some other inner group as the villain. And the group will exist, really, because it has a villain. And therefore, managers are dogs. It's of necessity true, managers are always dogs, if they're successful managers. What do you know.

And you can take me to any plant in this area, and find a plant where the manager is well liked, and I will show you a mess, just a complete ruin. And you'll find the dust all swept under the carpets in the offices and you'll find the iron filings all dumped in the engines out in the shop. You'll find all the communications missing and everybody sad and the absentee-because-of-illness list higher than any other plant in the area. Why! Well, he's liked, you see!

In other words, they inflow on him. He agrees with them. You can't agree with anybody in this universe and get anything done. It's obvious.

That's a peculiarity. You can tell a manager – whether a manager is going to be good or bad, by the way, by discovering whether or not he has to be liked. If he has to be liked by his people, he's not going to do too well. If he doesn't care what, he'll do all right. But if he wants to be hated by his people, he's really better off as a manager; he really will do a better job than the fellow who has to be liked. That's an oddity. The officer who has to be liked gets men killed in action; the sergeant who has to be hated will generally save their bloody mortal lives.

So you want to remember these various characteristics, I haven't gone into them in any detail. Giving you some sort of an idea of what you're facing here. And you're facing them with more hours of this lecturing here.

I've given you some sort of a rundown here on the purpose of the course – very general – just to give you the data and, perhaps, a prediction which will assist you in aiding groups of individuals. These individuals could be then anything, any kind of a group. They could be a bunch of workmen; they could be a group of veterans; they could be a – they could be a group of insane people. By that I'm not recommending that you practice on the insane. I definitely frown on the practice, of any practice on an insane – beyond giving them space.

You take a man who is utterly mad because he hasn't enough space, you see, and then they give him less space. And they take a man who is quite mad because he has – too much energy has been thrown at him in his lifetime of one kind or another, so they give him some more energy. It's a sort of an insistence on his continued state of insanity. And by the way, this is nothing new. This practice has been going on for the last thirty-five hundred years, so there's no reason for you to get excited about it. Instead of that, you should admire constantly the fact that man is so incapable of change, He shows a constancy there which is very admirable. Of course, it's more admirable in an elephant or a pyramid, but that's what happens.

Now, in other words, practice on the insane – a professional auditor that will go around and practice on the insane is – that's fine, that's fine. There's nothing wrong with that, if he wants to do that, but the truth of the matter is, is he would probably be much better off if he left them utterly alone. And the reason for this is not because he can't do the job, because he can do the job. But there isn't any reason why you would go down here to the Jaguar plant and get their top motor mach, their top engineering artist, and put the two of them together running a kid's scooter outfit.

Now, what would you do if you had those two people available! You would provide more automobiles and remedy some of the problems that had to do with automobiles, wouldn't you! That would be the smart thing to do with them. And you would make able automobiles more able. And you would have more able automobiles than you'd had before. You wouldn't – you wouldn't go around and find all the broken toys in the back – in the back room and drag out these broken toys for that pair to repair. No, I'm afraid you wouldn't do that.

Now, it's a horrible – and that's just utterly gruesome of me to talk that way and so forth, but if you were – if you were tens of thousands, instead of scores, I wouldn't have to talk that way. But if you only knew it, you're spread awfully thin there. If you don't believe me, read the newspapers. (audience laughter)

Now, your main – your main goal is to do something for mankind, I hope. That's what we want to do, want to do something for subdivisions of – that is the third dynamic, the fourth dynamic – and therefore, we're getting there. We're right there at the third dynamic now, and we're not passing off the third dynamic to you as a little light thing that say, "Well, we can't address that because we don't know enough or we aren't doing enough or we don't have the techniques to do enough on the first dynamic for each one of these people." That's the wrong way to look at it. Look at where you've arrived. You've arrived at the point where you can hit the third dynamic – that is to say, groups, bing, without hitting individuals.

Now, you can do something, then, broadly for groups. That, believe me, is triumph, And if you can do that, there isn't anything at all could stay man from shifting a bit for the better. There isn't anything at all could stop him.

Now, the groups are wide-open for this sort of work, The individual auditor, the professional auditor who will go out and take a group of children, take a group of people in a hospital, take a group down in the old ladies' home – I don't care where he takes this group – he'll just go down and pick up a group and go down and process it. For what, how much? Nothing.

And he will find, by the way, that he is unable to keep up with the individual – individual bids for processing. That's a real, you might say, highly practical way of looking at the thing, but he is not wasting his time; and he is not, by giving something away, doing something for which he will not be paid. There is an interchange possible there, and that interchange becomes possible when you do something for the third dynamic.

What is money! Money is an attention unit of a society. Get that. There was something called "technocracy" in the United States not too long ago – Howard Scott. And he said that money was something on this order. And one of my auditors in the US, who was a disciple of Scott's, thought it over one day. He came up and he said, "Money is the attention unit of a society," Even going further than that, with "Money is the attention unit of society" Looked around in his head, and he figured on this, and he worked with it and so forth. And he was trying to figure out marks of commerce, economics, transportation and that sort of thing in a society. Oh no, the problem is simpler. The problem is much simpler. You will get as much money as you get interest.

[R&D note on Howard Scott: "an American engineer and writer who was instrumental in the development of technocracy, a theory and movement for social reform, prominent about 1932, advocating control of industrial resources, reform of financial institutions and reorganization of the social system, based on the findings of technologists and engineers. Part of this reform and reorganization would have been to discard monetary terminology, such as balance sheets, dollars, etc., and replace these with terms like ergs, calories, etc.]

Now, let's look at it economically, and let's look at it very practically. Did you ever hear of anybody that nobody had ever heard of, who was ever receiving any interest or attention! (audience laughter) Let's look at that. Now, let's just consider that the dollar, the pound, the franc are the attention units of a society. And let's just consider that, and we'll see there that they flow to the degree that interest exists. The main thing happened in the United States in 1929 was that everybody got disinterested. That's the truth of the matter. They got worried and they got disinterested, and so we had a stock market crash and depression. Anybody who could have come along at that time and have dubbed up a new – and mocked up a new ruddy rod or something of the sort that was of such fascinating ... Supposing somebody had come along at that time and say, "You know, I've just come back from Mars. Ahem. They have diamond mines up on Mars, and I'm in the market for these ships and here are the diamonds. Yeah, here's eight gallons of diamonds, and I've just come back." What do you suppose industry would have done! They said, "It's very hard to build these spaceships," and that sort of thing. It's just interest.

You see, none of this matter, energy, space or time is actually purchasable or not purchasable. You never own any MEST; really, you never do. The only thing you have is your own interest in life and your own ideas about life. The most valuable thing there is about a man is his hopes and his dreams. When his hopes and dreams are dead, the man is dead. I don't care how much MEST he's – has, how much material matter he has accumulated. It just doesn't matter. And that's why, sometimes, you will talk to somebody who has an enormous amount of material objects around, and you realize you're talking to a dead man. The fellow has not established any flow of any kind; he's just sitting there holding on. Hold on, hold on, hold on, hold on. He dies holding on, too, by the way. It just kills him dead.

They say a rich man – a rich man couldn't go to heaven any more than he could go through – a camel can go through the eye of a needle (old Arab proverb, wandered into the Bible and other places). The reason why is he is just holding on so hard, and he is so isolated that he can't move. That's why he couldn't go to heaven; he couldn't go anyplace, and when you process him, you'll find him stuck on the time track. He's stuck and he's holding, and that's the characteristic. He hasn't got any flow.

Well now, an auditor, for instance, who would just simply go and it wouldn't matter, he could outfit the most beautiful office in the world and he could put a gorgeous secretary out there and he could be this ... Oh and do all these various things, everything necessary to the equipment of that and he'd just sit there, just sit there. Nobody would ever hear of him, he wouldn't hear of anything else. No communication line. Well, a communication line consists of particles, consists of interest.

So therefore, if he were to go out on a third dynamic level, and if he were to devote – if he were to devote an hour of every working day, or five or six hours a week on the third dynamic, he wouldn't be able to put the brakes on that MEST. You want to be careful of what you start like that. You want to be careful what you start.

I'm very careless about starting things, by the way. I don't give a doggone. And I'm always convinced that the interest level will be less than it is. I always underestimate the

interest level, I suppose because of my own interest level or something. So I know what it takes to get me interested in life and so on. Gun this through and it gets very fascinating.

Next thing you know, people are putting up their storm windows and bringing in the cat, and tying the roof down and so forth. And I say, "What's going on! What's the matter! What's the matter!" They give me a dirty look and go on battening the place up for the storm, you might say.

To come into an area – come into an area and calmly announce that the so-and-so and so-and-so, and then do something on some individual, and then go ahead from there, so on, stimulates interest. Well, how does it stimulate it! It's just – well, you just do something, that's all. You just do something beneficial and something interesting, preferably on the third dynamic.

It's interesting, the other day, that a newspaper reporter came up to me and was going, "Rawr-roo, Dianetics and Scientology is a cult, of course." (She was from Australia.) Anyway, "Is there any story?" She was getting all ready to just roll up her sleeves and just whush, you know, roll up her sleeves and hrrrh, hwrhh. And I said, "Group processing children, group processing children, group processing chil – " "I'm sorry. I'll come back in a month from now. Excuse me, I'm sorry I exist." (audience laughter)

Now, that's very interesting, isn't it! Because that is an interest and attention line in the society. You're not doing that simply because it is an interest and attention line. You see, insincerity is doing something – is doing something to make it into an attention line without doing anything. That, you might say, is that sort of insincerity. You notice this on the part of publicity campaigns. Somebody wanted to be in the newspapers, they go down and they hire a press agent. They don't do anything, they just hire the press agent to say they do something. You don't need a press agent. If you were to walk down to the corner where the blind man is selling papers and turn his sight on, you'd think you were pretty good. That isn't enough. Go up to the next corner and get the one up there and turn his sight on, and then go down the line and pick up the cripple who runs the elevator and fix him up. And you go through the level like this, and just keep going on without paying any attention to how much interest, and the first thing you know, people will be putting storm windows on and battening the roof down and giving you a dirty look. You'll generate too much interest.

But that's a rough deal, by the way – processing individual, individual, individual, individual, It's rough for two reasons. One is the proximity of the people you're processing, if you're just going at it hammer and tongs and working hard and on a big frame to make a lot of miracle cases and that sort of thing. No, do it on the third dynamic and then you just gunshot the whole group.

One day a little boy was – everything you say to him, he says, "Hey," or something of the sort and hits his ear, you know. He's got this mannerism. And his nose runs. His family objects to all this. And he turns up home one day and his nose isn't running and he isn't batting his ear. Did you do it individually! No, you didn't even know it happened. He was part – a member of your child group. You prepare to be very surprised at Papa or somebody coming to you and say, "You know, Oswald has been telling me all about this sort of thing. I

want to thank you, what you've done for Oswald." Well, you possibly didn't know you'd done anything for Oswald, so you want to prepare at that moment to look wise. (audience laughter)

And is it enough to stimulate such an interest with just one group of children? No, I'm afraid it's not. Go up and down the line, around; get Lots of groups of children; And don't just start hitting backwards children because the chances of tomorrow's genius coming out of that class are not really worse or better than some other class, but tomorrow's genius might come out of some other class than the one you're auditing. See! So you want to spread yourself around just a little bit, just on the off chance that this will happen.

Therefore, in following this data and addressing this subject, you are doing something. You are helping people. Don't for a moment believe because it isn't profusely thanked that helping people is ever wasted. It happens that an individual never thanks anybody for being helped. The quickest way you can get into trouble with an individual is to help him. You should know that, just bluntly know that. And you should know at the same time that the quickest way you can get into trouble is not to help him.

And you should also know – and you should also know that the only thanks you're ever going to get is going down this track, anywhere along the line, me or thee or anything else, is the thanks you give yourself. You know you've done a good job, that's the only person who ever has to know you've done a good job. Now, I can prove this by processing, by the way. This is not just one of those Emersonian quickies that are supposed to be very epigrammatically something or other. Happens to be a technical datum. The only one that's ever going to thank you is you. The only mistake you ever made was expecting anybody else to.

Now, if you go at Group Processing on the idea that you're doing it, and you're doing it because you're doing it, because you want to do it, because you're going to thank you for doing it, and you go ahead and you ... Because there's more people than you can count, you're – if you go at it with that idea, you wind up with a tremendous satisfaction. If you go at it with the idea that everybody is just going to swarm around you and pat you on the head and thank you, huh! No, that's never going to happen. And then go up and say, "You know, Oswald was all right before he was part of your course, but he's had convulsions ever since." You inquire a little bit further and you'll find out he always had convulsions; they've always been attributed to various things and now you're the target.

TBD

There isn't any reason to expect any thanks for doing anything you do. Now, that's a heck of a thing, isn't it! Heck of a thing. But that doesn't mean there isn't any thanks, and that doesn't mean there isn't any admiration for it.

But it's the only guy who ever gets admired is the fellow who doesn't need to be. It's something like coals to Newcastle. The fellow who needs to be admired is ignored. When a fellow really needs thanks, he never gets them. The fellow who needs no thanks, needs no admiration, nothing of the sort, they throw it on him like Zambezi Falls. Odd, but true, horribly true.

Now, very rapidly, let me go into the rest of this first lecture. We know what we're trying to do now, and I hope, whether you agree with it or not, we know why we're trying to do: we're trying to help you, we're trying to help groups. We can help people. I'm trying to tell you this afternoon how.

There's – there are two words that you should know, and one of them is Dianetics, the other is Scientology. Magazines – they've been making cracks at me about words, because my words are getting into dictionaries. And they call them "Hub-words." (audience laughter) The third dictionary I've seen now is using words out of these sciences. And there's about five words in this science have now wandered into the dictionary besides these two words, Dianetics and Scientology.

Dianetics means "through mind." I thought I'd coined this word, and then found out that Dianetics means, in the dictionary, "discursive logic," and they've now changed its definition. It means "through mind," so on. That's right. This definition has been shifted in the new printings. So it doesn't mean that anymore; it means "through mind," Now, when you say "through mind," you naturally mean a man. We customarily think of a mind as having something to do with a man, a woman or a child or something like that. We don't think of dogs having minds very much. They have brains which you can examine. But when we say "mind," we are normally and usually speaking of *Homo sapiens*, genus *Homo sapiens*.

Now, we can heal or orient genus *Homo sapiens* through his mind, through addressing the problems of his mind – anything in these sciences which would apply to *Homo sapiens* and let him keep on being *Homo sapiens* without taking the package to pieces. The package comes to pieces so easily, you have to be very careful, be very careful with this. He falls apart rapidly. They didn't put glue in very good. A fellow like me can come along and unglue him. I mean, it wasn't a good job. All right.

Therefore, those techniques which immediately address to *Homo sapiens*, and would not ordinarily in most cases make him anything else but *Homo sapiens*, let's just lump these under the subject of Dianetics. And let's make this word, Dianetics, the public knowledge of survival, the eight dynamics, the very basic and elementary processes – those processes which are in Dianetics: *The Modern Science of Mental Health* and others. Anything that addresses immediately to that level, call it Dianetics

Now, what's Scientology? Scientology is "the science of knowing how to know," and is the adventurous, fly in the teeth of that philosophical conundrum called epistemology. It's the resolution of epistemology. I'm sorry to have to say that, that it's the resolution of it, but it is.

What is knowledge! And how does man know! And what is known and what isn't known and that sort of thing – these problems, they come under the heading of Scientology. So Scientology crosses the bridge between philosophy and science. It is an embracing subject which takes in philosophy and science. That doesn't mean that it buttons up all there is to button up in science, and it doesn't mean that it ends all the things there are to end in philosophy, fortunately. You can make a postulate any day and invent a new philosophy. It does, however – it does, however, very – get very inclusive on many of the maybes man has

been riding. And Scientology as quickly embraces and advances the science of physics as it embraces mysticism and advances it. Now, if you study Scientology, you can become a very good nuclear physicist. You really could if you had the knowledge in Scientology and you went along from there, and you combined it with the routine knowledge of nuclear physics, you'd become a terrific physicist. There is no doubt about this whatsoever. It's very funny, but very true.

Now, let's look on the other side of the picture and find out that YOU could have a very fine time and become a very good mystic. Oh, boy! Why, you could give a yogi-minded fellow cards, spades and the jack of trump and play with one eye on a novel and beat him hands down. Because you can actually produce the things they're supposed to be able to produce in mysticism, in occultism and the rest of the isms along that line.

This doesn't mean that we should now sneer at those subjects any more than we should be amused by phlebotomy – the practice of bleeding, which was quite the thing once upon a time in medicine and will be again someday.

So, with these subjects you can count on – with these definitions, these subjects you can count on a very wide coverage. And Scientology means "There is no limit," And Dianetics means "This is what we do for Home sapiens, poor fellow."

Now, the world at the present time is not in complete accord with everything we're doing, but then the world never has been with new advances, and particularly if they're sensational, particularly if they work. So don't worry about the degree of acceptance measuring the degree of the subject, because it measures in reverse when it happens.

By the way, the Einstein theory, right or wrong, was slambasted for three years to such a degree that fellows – to such a fantastic degree that on the stage of one of the great meetings of mathematicians in Berlin, Einstein was denounced as the greatest mathematical hoax of the century.

(Recording ends abruptly)