

The Melbourne Congress Lectures  
Melbourne, Australia

# RECENT DEVELOPMENTS ON OT

A lecture given on 7 November 1959

Hello.

Audience: Hi.

It's very warm out today.

Audience: Yes. Sure.

Summer's coming on.

Audience: That's right.

I get out of adjustment on that.

Well, I think probably I had better read you some of the good wishes that you got today from around the world, as the first gesture.

And here's from Saint Hill: "Have a star performance congress in all respects. Love, HCO WW Staff, Saint Hill, East Grinstead, London."

And here's "Welcome to Australia (stop). Best wishes for successful congress. Staff, American College, Perth."

The – tremendous numbers of them here, my goodness! My goodness!

"We all wish you a wonderful congress (stop). Excellent clearing at – the ACC. Signed, HASI and HCO New Zealand."

Oh my, there's just too many of these things, too many of them, too many of them. Wow! Wow. Wow.

Oh, I have to read you this one. This is actually "unofficially" from Spain. This is – this is unofficially from Spain. This little girl is the HCO Steno, HASI London, so she sent it through for HCO London. "Ron. Very best wishes for successful, giant congress at ACC. All our love, HCO London."

You know, you talk about "international boundaries." The people who want international boundaries and borders had better not want Scientology too. The truth of the matter is two of the star performers in London are Australians. And I was on the telex the other evening...

By the way, you know – you know, you're awful close to London. The space is just totally jammed in between on these new jets. I came through so fast that I actually was getting baggage aboard halfway around the world, you know. Some of the HASIs are now connected together by teletypewriter, and all of them will be soon, and you will be connected up with the rest of them by teletypewriter soon, too. And then I look forward to all the franchise holders being connected up by teletypewriter, and we'll have it made.

Now, it's really remarkable. We count noses in the various HASIs of staff nationalities, and it runs as high as 16 nationalities – that's right – in a single HASI.

It doesn't matter where it is, but they just – Australians are there, and other nationalities are here, and so on. But they just don't seem to get the idea that they're different.

Well, some recent developments have occurred technically in the field of Scientology which give us the courage to go for broke on OT.

There isn't time in a congress to describe all of these. They will be taught on the 1st Melbourne ACC, complete. But it'd be a very bad thing if I didn't give you a little peek in, wouldn't it?

Audience: Yes.

That'd be bad show.

I know there are people here that don't know too much Scientology. And I know there are going to be auditors afterwards that will tell me, "Well, I brought so-and-so along and they didn't know much about it, and so forth. And all you did was talk tremendous technicalities, and you just talked over their heads entirely, and they were very upset and so forth." So, if you want to be a friend of mine, don't tell the auditor who brought you that it was all over your head, huh?

But the tremendous developments always come back to tremendous simplicities. The great points of progress – not just in Scientology but almost in any field or area – are based on finding new, more simple fundamentals which themselves illuminate more areas of knowledge.

It's the simplicities that are scarce.

Now, you can get people out making atomic bombs, and figuring out quanta, and missiles and bigger missiles and rarr, and brrr and fixing it up so they land flags on the Sea of Dreams, and – and accidentally land in the Sea of Violence. All kinds of – of complexities exist in this world today. All kinds of complexities, nothing more complex.

If there's anything more complex going to be thought up it's by the "more progressive" scientists of Earth.

For instance, the last Lincoln car that was built in the United States is a wonderful example. Lincoln's always been a pretty darn good automobile. And the last one went on total automatic and it's just got gadgets and gimmicks and thingamabobs and you press buttons and they operate solenoids and doors open and windshields flap up and little men come up and dust off the radiator cap. And people – people around Washington, are – in the organization

and so forth, are always trying to get me to turn in an old 1954 Capri I have. And so I tell them "I'll turn it in any day that one of your new ones, you see (meaning the car they just bought, the 1958 or 59 or something of the sort) can beat it away from the stoplights and so on."

They haven't managed that yet, so I'm still stuck with this old Lincoln. I finally took it to England so it wouldn't be out of style.

But anyway, salesman came up and got ahold of me, and he says, "You've got to come down and look at the new 1995 (or whatever it was) Lincoln. And you just should be ashamed of yourself driving that old car... Want to get this new, big, wonderful, sensational..." So forth.

So, he takes me down, and unfortunately for him I walked through the repair shops into the showroom! And here's nothing but 1959 Lincolns! See? Stacked up one on top of the other, so to speak! And I said, "You haven't been able to sell any Lincolns this year?"

"Oh, yes, we're selling Lincolns beautifully!"

I said, "What are all these Lincolns doing in here?"

"Oh, well," he says, "uh, ahem, come on into the showroom."

I said, "No. No. No, I'm interested in this Lincoln right here."

And I got in and slid under the seat and started to press switch buttons. It has panels full of buttons, you know. I started operating these panels, you know. Windows didn't open, doors didn't open, hoods didn't fly up, you know, boots stayed shut, lights stayed off. It wasn't operating.

It had gotten so mechanically complicated, had so many vias and supercontrols, and little motors and so forth to go wrong, that all you have to do at one of them is sneeze, you see, and something stops operating.

You know, it's like these new – these new missiles the same way. They put them on the launching pad and they fill them up full of fuel, and they blow up. They put a new one on the launching pad, they get it full of fuel, but as they're disconnecting the electric razor or something off of it, why, it blows up and so on. And they finally manage to put it all together and back off very carefully and get in and then push the button and it blows up.

Well, now the funny part of it is that they think that by adding greater and greater complications onto their mechanical basics that they can get greater and greater performance. And that isn't true at all.

When a communication line stops operating, just strip all the gadgets and things off of it and just put the straight line back and it'll start operating again. That's a truism mechanically. And it's certainly true technologically in the development of Scientology research investigation.

Now, by achieving a new, even more simple basic – those amongst you that were brought by the auditor and don't know much about Scientology just don't pay any attention to the next thing I'm going to say because it won't do you a bit of good. But the auditors will

understand it. It works like this: We could probably go to the moon and erect any number of batteries of flags with no oxygen masks or anything else by simply achieving a few more simple simplicities in Scientology.

You see, the conquest of the moon doesn't depend upon supercomplexities. It's much more likely to be achieved by our arriving at supersimplicities.

Now, for instance, we've had a map of the back of the moon for about five years. And the last map shot by the Russians when that thing went around back there – its photographic quality is very sour, but it shows that they more or less did send something around the moon. Everybody doubted it for a while, but they did send something around because I've got a chart on my desk that shows they're more or less correct.

The achievement of a simplicity is a greater goal in Scientology than the achievement of a super-supercomplexity that nobody can understand.

Now, the basics in Scientology can be explained to a little kid and he'll get them right away if they're true. The truths, the valuable truths, and the things that are really going forward in Scientology are that easily communicated. And you can always tell where we're just a little bit off the rails because a little kid can't understand what we're talking about. And if that's the case and it's gotten very complicated, we may be on the verge of a simplicity but we haven't quite reached it because we haven't achieved understanding.

You might say that all things worth understanding are infinitely simple. And all things which are very, very difficult to understand aren't worth studying.

Well, you take accounting. I'll give you an example, take accounting. Now, if you don't think organizationally around the world we haven't had trouble with accounting. In the first place – in the first place an Australian chartered accountant is at total odds on how to do it (you wouldn't believe this, but it's true) with a London chartered accountant; they don't quite talk the same language. Their columns of figures add up just a little bit different.

They get in a balance sheet in the London office and they read the year's report and so forth on it, and they say, "Well, the – eh – he shouldn't have added that up quite that way. That's not quite the way it's done." And down here I'm sure they do the same thing. And an American accountant takes a look at the thing and says, "Huh! Internal Revenue will never agree with that!" I mean, just does that automatically, it doesn't matter what you put down.

And you say, "No! No! We want this balance sheet for the Association Secretary. We don't – we want to know what the organization did. Not – not – not what Internal Revenue thinks about it."

"Oh, well, it's got to be for Internal Revenue."

And you say, "No. We want an accounting department that tells our own executives and people what we're doing financially."

"Well, I don't care. Internal Revenue, Inland Revenue, and your income tax and so forth."

You say, "Look, just – just drop them all out the window, will you? We want to find out what we're doing."

We actually have gotten to a point where if it gets – if an organization gets too big, we just set up a partitioned section that does the kind of accounting the government wants, and then just kind of forget them because somebody's got to keep us informed. And government accounting has practically nothing to do with what a businessman or an organization man wants, has nothing to do with it. He wants to know whether he's solvent; the government wants to know how much they can gouge him for. Entirely different thing just as any businessman here will agree.

Well, we had to realize finally that accounting was stuck someplace in the eighteenth or nineteenth century; it wasn't in the twentieth century because the governments demand certain things of you, and other people demand certain things of you, you have to know certain things, and no accounting system extant was giving us these things. And everybody was getting all tangled up with accounting! And anybody can tell you, I am sure, that accounting is a very difficult subject, very difficult! Complicated! Well, it's just complicated enough these days so as not to tell us anything.

So, every time we move into some zone of human activity we're unfortunately confronted with a muddle and if we go very far into that particular field we wind up having to straighten it out so that we can get someplace, and that's kind of the way it's going.

And we had to sit down, of all things, and find out the fundamentals of accounting. What is accounting? What does it do and how do you do it?

And we finally wound up with an accounting system that does what the government wants and does what the executives want and does what everybody wants and doesn't take any time. It's all very simple.

The government wants records, so all you do is file records and you've got a system that they agree with. And you put the records in file envelopes so that an executive can look up any person or company that he's doing business with – everything about the person or company is in one envelope, not scattered around anyplace; pick that up and he can look in there and he could read it all off.

In other words, all we're doing now is assembling records and filing them, and you can file records in a certain way so as to give you any accounting answer that you want.

Nineteenth century said that you had to write it all down in books, which is an alter-is. Well, you don't have to do that because the government doesn't want you to keep books, they want you to keep records. They look at your books, you know, they say, "Ha, ha, ha, ha!" And you say, "Well, these are our books. They're kept by our chartered accountants and so forth." And the government says, "Yes, we know. Where's the records?" They know you can alter the books, but it's harder to alter records, so that's what they call for these days. So, it might as well be a record accounting system, and that's what we've invented.

It turns out to be a very simple system, but it had everybody in the organizations on their ear for just ages – accounting. Everybody going mad with accounting.

It's like that in any field of human endeavor. And when something is so complicated that you can't understand it, then don't you be criticizing you as not being able to understand it! Because you've been taught that when you see something difficult or incomprehensible that you can't comprehend, that therefore, you, not understanding it, you must be stupid! And you've been taught to criticize yourself as the first reaction to a complexity! Isn't that right?

Audience: Yes.

Well, we've got a new look at this. We find out this is just an operation. This is just a way to control people. Let's erect something here that has glittering metal bars and balls and transformers and dials and all sorts of things and then write a textbook that has to do with the quanta of the inverse electrode. Get the thing all computed out in compound calculus with analytical figments, get it put into the local university as a necessary subject if you're going to understand engineering, prove it all conclusively. Nobody understands it – "You're flunked! You're stupid! We of the great priesthood understand it. But you, you louse... Therefore, we are very great people. You owe us a debt. Look at all the work we go to understanding this thing."

Man, man has been falling for that one too many years. If you can't understand it, one of two things is true: You haven't looked through it to find if there are any simplicities in it that you can understand, or it is incomprehensible. See, one of those two things is true.

True enough, if there's going to be anything to a big machine or structure or something, there will be some sort of a simplicity on which it's based. And even though the thing does look imposing at first glance, if it contains truth and workability and has value, then somewhere in it there is a simplicity that you can understand, and on that simplicity you can simply build the rest of the mechanism and understand the whole thing.

It might be that you didn't do it in a second, but if it took you two or three days, begin to suspect that there's something phony about it. You see that?

Now, very often you'll come in late on a subject. The simplicities have all been bypassed. In other words, the simplicities are all taken care of, and somebody is using a language which at this stage of the game is incomprehensible. Now, that language means something or it doesn't mean anything. So, the thing to do is to pick out some of the words that are being used and find out if they are simple words in terms of definition. And if you can understand those words defined, then you can understand the subject. But, if you don't understand those words – if "telekinesis" is "the right bower of the vortical curve put on by God," you say, "Well, that's – I don't know about that. I don't know – Gee."

You're usually better off just by picking this subject up by the scruff of the neck and going... Because there's some hocus-pocus in it. Somebody is being quite unreasonable.

Now, I well remember in universities taking up the subject of physics. And physics is comprehensible as long as you're dealing with fundamentals, but some of the things they make out of the fundamentals are quite fantastic. You get up into kinetics and it isn't true. But oh, expansion of gases, for instance, something about gases expand or how you balance two things on a lever's arm or something of that sort. That's all comprehensible. And if you

understand that clearly and completely where they apply in physics you can understand all of physics and it's an A-B-C subject that even a little kid could understand.

Now, there's another method of obfuscating, a subject, one more method of doing it. And that's to take a subject that's basically simple and talk double talk on it so as to make it appear very complicated even though it's very simple. And perhaps many great truths have been lost to man that way. In other words, the truth was there and then somebody came along and "explained it" and somehow or another forgot to repeat the truth in the explanation. This is another operation.

But if you, on close investigation of a specific subject – like looking up the definitions of its various words or something like that, find that you can't understand it, certainly we can say one thing absolutely – that it isn't true for you. We could say that absolutely. But the probability is that it isn't true at all.

Of course, complicated words, communication barriers of one kind or another, specialized definitions and so forth, do occasionally give you a complicated-looking word. But, if you look around and you find the definition to that word and you find out that word does describe something that is true to you now, well, there's probably something there. But if you don't understand it, then there's nothing.

Now, in research it's my job continuously to suspect complications. Every once in a while, man, we'll find one that looks like it's going right on up to the stars, you know, it's just wonderful rationale; it just seems to work perfectly and so on, but it's pretty complex. It kind of takes an expert to get it crossways into his skull, you know, and he can still feel the points jabbing him a little bit.

And you figure it out in long formulas, and then you have to know this and that and the other thing and so on. Well, I'm too old a hand at it by now – I'll just carry one of these things down about half a column and say, "Well, I guess we better look a little bit further. Because I'd say about next Tuesday we'll find the simplicity that makes this whole thing fall apart." And we have just found some of these simplicities in Scientology research that have made a whole lot of things that were evidently a little bit complex fall apart.

Now, I still suspect a couple of the items in this new work because I don't think I could explain them easily to a seven-year-old kid. So, I'd say, "Well, I don't know, that's – there must be something wrong with them so there's something simpler to know about them."

Once in a while these things look very good and go very bad. But they only really go very bad if they're away from the fundamentals that we have known for years and years and years.

Somebody's always coming along and telling you, "Well, Ron's always changing Dianetics and Scientology. He's always changing it, always changing it." The person that tells you that doesn't know the fundamentals or simplicities of Dianetics or Scientology. It's very simple – the setup.

We're not changing that. We're trying to find something simpler than the simplicities we already know. It's been working for a long time. How does it work faster? How does it

work better? And you'll get shifts of emphasis on various types of processes, shifts of emphasis this way and that.

Once in a blue moon – I could say we make a mistake; I won't – once in a blue moon I make a mistake; I take full responsibility.

But the difference is, is I'm not so anxious to save my face as never to mention it. There are probably a half a dozen bloomers on public releases over the past nine or ten years, and I made every single one of them and corrected them afterwards and said so.

One of those was a thing called Step 6. That's a bloomer of vast magnitude. Just because myself and a half-dozen other people that were on the research lines and so forth didn't run into the solid bank phenomena, we went ahead and released it broadly. Just because a number of people were cleared using it, why we thought, "That's it." I did say at the time that it was only good for about 50 percent, but I didn't calculate what was going to happen to the 50 percent it didn't clear, and that was pretty grim.

You make a picture, a mental image picture, more visible and more solid for an individual whose engrams are still live with big claws. And this beautiful picture of the flowers in the field, it gets prettier – and prettier and prettier and solider, and the blades of grass finally get so he could practically feel them, you see? In the meantime there's something going further and further and more solid into the back of his neck. At the same time you improve the quality of any picture in a person's mind, you improve the quality of every picture in the person's mind!

Now, the mental image picture – the mental image picture is of course, by rights the subject of Dianetics. And that people had mental image pictures and that these pictures were the cause – the recording of them, the cause of the continuance of pressure or bad feeling or misemotion or something of the sort, we considered that by desensitizing or erasing these mental image pictures and taking the teeth out of past experience, in other words, we could bring a person up to more optimum operation.

Well, that was fine. And, I demonstrated it time and time again, did it often and – and it was highly successful, and even today you can take Book One and open it up, as I have had somebody do, read the "canceller" or something on it, you know?

I've had a person, by the way, read a session to me out of Book One. It's very amusing, you know? It's got places in there where your – the exact way you run a session, you know? Well, they didn't memorize these things. They were using Book One to audit with and they'd simply open Book One, you see, and read it off to the preclear. "Now, I duh-duh-duh-duh-duh."

Well, you can do that and get somebody to – on a couch and "Close your eyes," and all the rest of it just as it says in Book One. Return him to the incident necessary to resolve his case, run him from the beginning to the end of the thing through and through and through, make him reexperience the thing fully and totally and so on, and get rid of his sciatica or baldness or almost anything!

The things wrong with him tend to get right within certain limits by the erasure of engrams. The only thing that happens wrong in Dianetic clearing is the person suddenly runs out of havingness. In other words, his whole acceptance level was horrible engrams. And the only thing he could really have was gruesome, terrible, horrible mental image pictures! And you erase two or three of these, erasing the wrong ones, not the one that made him want them, and he would just – he just lost two or three perfectly beautiful mental image pictures, didn't he?

And if you erase them wrong way to and so forth, people get upset because they're possessions. They're possessions that can never be replaced.

Now, engrams have teeth and claws and all sorts of things.

I had an attorney one time – he said to me, "Oh," he says, "you're that guy – you're that Dianetics guy." I said, "That's right." He said, "What's the good of that stuff?" He – "Would it be any use to me?" I said, "Well, how would you like to be able to snap your fingers in front of a witness in a chair and say a certain magic phrase and have the witness curl up in a ball and roll on the floor?" "Aw," he said, "that would be terrific." He said, "But you couldn't do that. Show me!"

I put him in a prenatal and he rolled up in a ball on the floor. I never saw that man afterwards at a club or on the street for what he didn't say, "How are you today, Dr. Hubbard?"

The horrible part of it is that a mental image picture will obey the other fellow before it will obey his possessor – its possessor. One's own mental image pictures mind the other guy better than they mind the person who has them because their common denominator is other-determinism.

Now, where auditors have had difficulty making Dianetics work is they think the preclear has some influence on his mental image pictures. They think the mental image pictures do what the preclear says. In other words, he says, "Go away. Come back. Change. Turn. Run this way." See, they expect the preclear to do it! The responsibility is being assigned by the auditor to the preclear!

The reason it's a picture in suspension and is still there hanging fire to the end of time is because the preclear has no control over it. It's an other-determined thing!

There's this picture of a fellow being beheaded, you see, and the pc, when he gets a little tired or something like that will notice kind of, you know, that he has this picture of this fellow being beheaded, you know? Has nothing to do with him. Thinks it's something he read out of an old book. Maybe he saw it in the movies. Sort of stuck there, you know?

He'll be sitting there, won't be thinking about anything, and... Well, that doesn't bother him, and it has nothing whatsoever to do with this horrible pain he gets across the back of his neck!

Well, everybody has mental image pictures, but some people have found them so painful that they have gone mmmmmm and have squashed them down to an invisibility. They either made them very furry or quite invisible. And you say, "Close your eyes. What do you

see?" Such a person says, "Oh, nothing but this wide – you know, just nothing. Ha. don't see anything. No, nothing. Ow!"

And some other people have decided that the invisibility itself was still too terrible, so after they've squashed their mental image pictures down to an invisibility – those that are chronically stuck – then they get some black paint and get it all nice and black!

And you say, "Close your eyes. What do you see?"

"Oh, nothing. Just this blackness. Ha. Doesn't bother me – cough-cough-cough-cough."

And some people, believe it or not, still feel so insecure that they take the blackness and alter it to something else. And when you start to – run these people, you start to run the something else. You get – all of a sudden it's something else, like little rockets or something like that.

"What do you see?" you know. "Close your eyes. What do you see?"

The fellow says, "I see these little rockets. Rockets going across. That's all." Yeah, that's all. When you run that you'll get blackness. And when you run the blackness you get invisibility. And when you run the invisibility you'll get a picture, and there's this headman standing there with his ax. The fellow is just – his whole action toward it was not to take responsibility for it, but to get rid of it in some outrageous way that didn't get rid of it at all. And that's about all the responsibility most preclears take for their mental image pictures. You know – squash!

You walk up to a psychologist, you say, "What do you know about mental image pictures?"

"Oh, you're talking about Dianetics, aren't you? Well, they don't exist. Oh, we knew about that years ago. Nobody has any."

You say, "Well, do you have any mental image pictures?"

"Nah. No, I don't." And he just... And you say, "Close your eyes. What do you see?"

"Oh, just these little things going this way."

The general – the general status of people's minds varies, of course, according to their pattern of experience.

Joe here has not led the same life as Isabel. And so Joe has one set of pictures and Isabel has another set of pictures. And then these pictures are more – have been more impressive to Joe, let us say, than to Isabel, so Joe's pictures are more not-ised or scrunched up or squashed or done away with, you see, than Isabel's.

So, Isabel has a picture of something or other that she can see; Joe has a picture that he can't see. So, you get these variations but you get the common denominator and simplicity that people have pictures. People have pictures.

And the only people who could have pictures and not have them be a total liability would be a Clear, because the difference between a Clear and a person who is not Clear is not

a total absence of pictures, as everybody tries to define it. A Clear can have pictures, but a Clear can do something about them! And the person who isn't Clear can't! It's degree of other-determinism effective on the individual, if you wanted to be very technical about it.

And the Clear can determine his pictures. If he wants to see again his being beheaded, whenever it was, he can mock it up, and look at it and even put the pain into it and go the rest of the way through the thing again. After he's gotten rid of a picture he can put it back there again. That's definitely a Clear's relationship to mental image pictures.

But, another person who isn't Clear is in this terrible condition: that the pictures don't obey him. They obey anything and anybody else – particularly headsmen.

Auditors very often miss when they're very young in their career and don't know their business. You know, they're just fumbling around and trying to get there somehow. They miss this terrible fundamental. And this fundamental is with us today in Scientology as it's never been before. It's a fundamental.

It's degree of other-determinism effective upon the individual, and it's represented in his own control over his pictures. But that person learning to be an auditor who doesn't know his business yet, actually believes that the preclear is being a bad pc and is being upsetting and is being mean and is being stupid and willful if he won't go ahead and handle his pictures. And he keeps trying to get the preclear to handle his pictures!

And the only person that can handle the preclear's pictures is the auditor – that little simplicity there.

Now, as the auditor starts handling them, the preclear finds he can start chipping in. And after a while finally comes up to a point where he can determine something about the picture. And when you're handling pictures directly that's the only thing that happens, is the picture goes from totally other-determined to self-determined. That's all that happens with pictures.

And in clearing people you are not trying to erase every picture and every possession and every everything that the poor preclear has. If you take away all of his aches and pains and all of his mental image pictures, all of his own physical possessions and his body, according to some people he would be very Clear! Well, he isn't Clear; he was robbed.

The only thing an auditor can do in the final analysis is to restore other-determinism into self-determinism. In other words, he can make the pc able to control his existence rather than existence controlling the pc.

Now, that tells us where we are in relationship to Wundtian psychology which was invented in 1879 in Leipzig, Germany on the premise that man is an animal that reacts on neurons and synapses.

Once in a while an auditor hears a lecture by me and I tell them about psychology. I define psychology, or tell them about psychoanalysis and define psychoanalysis and tell them the facts, you know – brrrrrrrr – and they're this and that and so on, and so it all adds up this way and so forth. They think I'm kidding them.

Then they go out to a meeting of psychologists, they go out to a meeting of psychoanalysts or they read a few textbooks. And they come back and they tell me I am very guilty of understatement. It's much more so!

But, psychology believes that the individual must adjust himself to his environment to be happy. Anybody that knows that subject can tell you that's absolute fact. That isn't all! I mean, there's more. But he has to adjust himself to the environment!

If a fellow becomes the effect of all dynamics, he would be happy! Is there anything wrong with that? If a fellow becomes the effect of everybody he knows, then they will all like him. Is that true?

No. A fellow has to come over to a point where he can be cause over his environment and the dynamics and so forth – not obsessive cause, but just be cause over these things in order to have them in some relationship to himself that isn't harmful to himself and others.

The only thing wicked about this universe or this world, the only wicked thing would simply be this: That it is so other-determined where each individual is concerned, that much evil can result since evil itself would be just random chaos never determined by anybody. And I'm sure that would be evil. I think anybody would agree that would be evil. That's all anybody ever really objects to is just chaos just going on, nobody doing anything about it and everybody being subject to the chaos. And if a steamroller gets its motor started somehow and starts down the road it just runs over people. You know, that's the way it should be.

Well, if you followed through the basic goal of psychology you'd have that kind of a world.

Well, that isn't a good enough goal or isn't a good enough level. So, in Dianetics we had to find out what was it that kept a person this convinced that he couldn't do anything about anything. And it's simply the other-determinism character of his mental image pictures. And all the mental image pictures that do him harm are the pictures of things that happened that he thereafter couldn't do anything about. It's things he couldn't do anything about. And the common denominator of all mental image pictures that are harmful or overwhelm people simply is that – he can't do anything about them. They're other-determined. So, after a while, people turn around

(incomplete)