

## A REVIEW OF STUDY

A lecture given on  
22 September 1964

Thank you. All right, I like you, too. Thank you very much. And this is the what of what?

Audience: 22nd of September.

Twenty - second of September AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. Is that correct?

Audience: Right.

All right, today's lecture is a review lecture on the subject of study - a very rapid review lecture - and it doesn't mean that if you hear this lecture, why, none of the other lectures need be listened to or something like that because this lecture doesn't necessarily contain all that they contain; but I want to give you a fast review of this subject called study.

I've been meaning to write a textbook about it and I will do so in the very near future, but the textbook for this is not the type of text that you just dash off, because if I do a good job of writing this textbook on this material we now have here, you recognize that it goes into an area where there is no textbook or data or technology of any kind, which is study - how to study.

Now, you can look in vain up and down the corridors of the libraries at big universities and so forth for a book which simply tells the student how to study. I know that sounds, sounds fantastic, but that's all they teach, basically and foremost in a whole course on education, but they haven't got any book on it that says how to study. Not even in their - than their major courses of education do they have this textbook.

But here are all these poor blokes sitting around in a university being told at every hand that they don't know how to study, but there is no textbook on the subject.

Now, what do you suppose is going to happen with a textbook like that? If that just - textbook just sits down very calmly and goes about the business of what study and education are all about and how to study and how to approach this subject and what the bear traps are in it and what to avoid and what a good textbook is and what a bad textbook is and all this sort of thing, and if it just took this thing up, chapter by chapter, and shook it all out very nicely with no fancy terms and said, incidentally, as it went along, that this was data derived from the subject called Scientology, where do you think that book would land? Probably land in the hands of every student who enters a university anyplace.

Courses of education would have to be pulled down and thrown away, because they haven't got a course of education. One of the things wrong with education of children in the United States right now is there's nobody has any technology of education. It's something on the order of trying to fix radios when you have no instruction book of any kind and you don't even know what it is. And trying to fix a radio in that state of mind would be a rather exasperating situation since you wouldn't even know what the radio was supposed to do if you did fix it.

To show you that the technology is out in schools and universities, a series of tests were given to children over a number of grades in school. This happened in Johannesburg, accidentally, and it - children in one grade and in the next grade and the next grade and the next grade, in various groups, were given graphs, and it was very apparent that the longer they went to school, the dumber they got.

Now, I couldn't figure out why that was, except I could figure out there must be something unknown about all this, if this could happen and nobody was doing anything about it. And sure enough, that was - that was the data that emerged from it. In other words, the longer they went to school the stupider they got.

Well, what's this about "education is supposed to make bright people"? Well, there was obvious stuff there that it wasn't true. Here was the grade for the eight - year - olds and they got a certain IQ and a certain graph, and here was the grade for the nine - year - olds and they got a certain IQ and a graph, and the grade for the ten - year - olds and a certain IQ and a graph, and the eleven - year - olds, they had a certain IQ and a graph. And after these things were already graphed out and the factor was added that some of them didn't know as much language as another and that sort of thing, it made a terribly steep curve. Their IQ was going downhill.

The highest IQ that we have ever registered on any student was on a schoolboy in Johannesburg who was twelve years old. It was not on Oppenheimer or Einstein, see? It was a twelve - year - old kid - highest IQ ever registered. Well, that's an optimum age. He knows enough language so that he can read the test and he doesn't know so much language that he can't understand it.

So this showed me clearly that there was something amiss in the field of education if the longer you studied something the more stupid you got. Well of course, the longer you study something, we know now, the more chance and opportunity you have to run into words you don't know and there we go.

Now, in the field of the arts it is peculiar - well, it's just the longer you study the more chance you have of running into words that you aren't acquainted with and can't get defined.

So in the fields of the arts - since it is just misunderstood words which bring about this condition - in the field of arts particularly - and this is a field with which I'm very, very well acquainted - the working, workaday artist, the boy who's out there making his coffee and cakes with the drawn line or the airbrush or the paintbrush or something of the sort, you know? And whether he's selling it to Mr. and Mrs. Gotbucks or whether he's selling it to the local studio or he's making a sidewalk exhibit someplace or another, that's immaterial. The point is this boy is in the workaday world; with the writer, similarly; with the - oh, heavens! - poets; even - you could even include various of the fine arts: architecture and that sort of thing. All of these boys have certain peculiarities which I never quite understood.

Peculiarities were these: When you reviewed a tremendous number of writers who were pros and who were good, and who were landing on the mark every time, you found nobody who had graduated from a course in writing. But nobody! I mean, this isn't - this isn't even the exception that makes the rule. He just wasn't present.

I remember sitting up in Riverside Drive at one time - sitting in a big, swanky apartment - Riverside Drive, New York - and the whole place, the whole salon of this apartment was jam-packed with some of the best stellar names in the field of American fiction. There they were - all of them, practically. And scattered in amongst them were some of their agents, you know, sort of keeping to the background and trying to look like the radiator or something. And this subject came up, not just the subject of writing but the subject of education in general.

And a census was taken on the spot and noses were counted on the thing and nobody there had ever finished the university amongst those writers - much less writing. They had never finished the university. They had all been kicked out - almost uniformly had been expelled - or they'd never gone near the place. And that was it, and then a check - over demonstrated, clearly and conclusively, that not one of them had ever taken a course in writing, from anyplace, from anybody about anything.

Well, this was also quite startling, too, and it's not something that you would write in a writers' magazine about, because it would be very unpopular with the magazine because of its advertisers and their fond ideas they have and their advertisers who sell courses in story writing and that sort of thing. So it isn't the kind of thing you have written up.

And I was about ready to dismiss the whole subject, you know, and say, "Well, that's it," because I had been sitting there keeping the notes for two or three other eager beavers who had been taking this over. And I was saying, "Well, I guess we've just about got that taped" or something like this you know, and everybody was laughing about it.

And all of a sudden here was a very faint voice over in the corner that said, “Well, your figures are not quite correct.”

“What?” you know? “Wha - wha - what? Who was that?”

And “Well, I - I have a P - PHD in literature, and a - a couple of other degrees, and finished - fini - finished the university and several other universities, and I’ve taken a lot of courses in writing, and - and so forth, so it’s not true of everybody in the room.”

And everybody turned around looking at this guy trying to find out who it was. And of course, it was a literary agent! He wasn’t a writer. He’d never published a line in his life. All he did was sit around and tell other people what was wrong with their stories. But he had tried to be a writer and he’d failed.

So about this point I said, “There’s something very peculiar going on here. There’s a bunch of swindlers selling courses in writing that don’t teach people how to write. Won’t name any names because you don’t have to. It’s every blig, brassy university in the United States. What’s going on here?” Well, could have been a lot of things, could have been a lot of things going on.

But in the years following I ran the subject down. I got that interested in it that I ran it down a bit further, and I found out that no writing course teaches writing. They don’t teach writing. I’m not sure what they teach but none of the technology which they employ and say is a writers technology, is the writer’s technology. You get the point? See, they say there is this piece of technology but it isn’t that piece of technology, you see? Writers don’t use this technology, period!

If any of you have ever taken a writing course, I’m sure you heard about foreshadowing? And I’m sure you’ve heard about other writing gimmicks of one kind or another? And writers don’t use them, and when they do use them, they don’t call them that. Do you see here? There is a technology, then, which writers use but it is not taught in universities and it’s not taught in courses in writing.

I remember with a horrible start one time, getting up to make a talk to a short story group, and I was about ready to draw a long breath and say, “Well, ladies and gentlemen, how are you this evening? Is there anything I can tell you about?” So I was just - and right in front of the desk, lying there, was one of my stories, wide - open, which they had been using as a text. And every paragraph of it had some weird symbol or word written opposite it to show what I was doing at each one of these points.

Why, I would have wrapped myself around four telegraph poles if I’d ever tried to think of all that at the same time. This area was a foreshadow and this was a characterization and this was a this and that was a that, you see, and it was a tzsa - tzsa - tzsa and it was all supposed to have been laid out. It just stopped me cold, see? And I found myself looking at a piece of technology which I never used. And this was the pretense, you see? And here were these poor blokes trying to study writing, you see?

Well now, there is a subject called “writing.” There is such a subject. The trouble is writers are professional liars and when they start telling people how they write they just go on and create.

The most weird dissertation I ever read in my life, I think, is by Edgar Allen Poe on the subject and it’s used in every textbook, I think, in short story writing I have ever collided with, and I think it’s Poe writing about how you write. Why, I think it’s the most marvelous piece of stuff you ever read in your life. If you want to read that - I did one time, just for kicks. And you don’t find anything in his stories that agree with what he said.

They either want to be the only ones and cut down the competition or do something, but they never really say what they do.

So no technology is - exists in this particular area, but there are a lot of pretended technologies in this area. I’m just talking to you about a field which is offbeat which I happen to know well and which is a noncodified field which is one of the arts. And there’s that field, completely uncoded.

Only when it starts to descend into technical application, like the graphic arts; the graphic arts are just a cut down from the arts, you see? They're the mechanical representation of the arts. They're "How do you take a painting and how do you handle this painting in order to reproduce it in a magazine?" It's not a creative art, in other words; it's a graphic art.

Now, that technology - boy, boy! You start doing something a little bit haywire with that one or you start doing something a little bit offbeat in the way you take your separation negatives - you know, the red negative, the green negative and the yellow negative that you've got to take of this thing in order to get three printing plates to run through the presses, you know, so that each one superimposed on the other one and - ooooooh, boy!

You've got to have the patch of gray that can match from each negative. It's got to be on every negative, and it's got to be at least a quarter - of - an - inch square, and it's got to match exactly on a densitometer. Boy! There's technology there, man. Wow! There's technology. There's exactly what is the factors involved in this: there's the various types of ink, there's the various types of pigments, there's various color charts, there's various systems which are employed. There's all types of reproduction equipment on the subject of fine lines and dots and - oh, my, my, my, my, my! Wow! There's a terrific, terrific technology - the technology of the printer.

The technology of - well, you take retouching. Bears about the same resemblance into photography. There's somebody who can take a picture and he can take a various type of ink or sauce or something and he can take this photograph and he can alter the features of the person in it. He can do this, he can do that. Terrific technology involved. Applied art, but very applied. Big technology.

Well, how come you have to know this when right next door to it, the thing it's a cousin to, which is the original writer, doesn't have any codified technology. Has actually a false technology. And the second that this thing that is written or the thing that is painted moves over into reproduction, moves into the high channels of communication, moves over into that field at all, drops into one of the most complex and exacting of technologies. It gives one to wonder how these things are even cousins.

Here's this whole area of writing; there is no technology. Everybody pr - it's worse than that. Everybody pretends there's a technology, that if you just studied it real hard, why, you too could starve to death in a garret, see? So - and right next door to it, here's this other.

Well, it bears some kind of a resemblance between - I mentioned retouching. You take any photograph that is a portrait of anyone, I don't care where or who or how or why. The number of times you get a perfect negative that you can print and make a copy of, you know, and frame it or enlarge it or do something with it and enlarge it and give it to somebody so they'll say, "How nice Izzybelle looks these days." You have to retouch it and all your big studios retouch. Sometimes they over - retouch. Sometimes they practically take out all the features in their excess of enthusiasm to make somebody look good. But any picture you've ever had taken in a studio which was ever framed and enlarged and presented to you as a presentation piece, it had to be retouched. Well, this retoucher is not the photographer. They bear the same resemblance as the duke and a steward, see? The photographer's definitely the duke, you know? He's the boy who goes through all the stuff that gets the picture and so forth, and nobody much pays much attention to the retoucher. The retoucher is rather heavily paid, but he sits there quietly drawing his heavy pay, you see, with his very exacting work.

Well, the number of tricks you can do in retouching are absolutely almost unlimited. You can do one of the wildest things with retouching. You take this negative, you know, and you take a fellow who, or a girl - girl doesn't like to be plump, you know - and you can take this thing and you can thin her down, man. And this fellow doesn't like to look so old. Well, you can't take too many lines out, because his character disappears, but you can take a few lines out if you're very good - and boy, you can take about fifteen years off his age, you see? Thud! And he thinks that picture's beautiful, because he's - of course, the people who are buying these pictures are the people who are having them taken and naturally they only buy something that flatters them. So the whole world of photography is - in portraiture - is bent in the direction of making somebody look better - not more dramatic, but better - and because people don't like dramatic photographs, really; they like pretty ones.

I read a dissertation of why they don't let the public judge an art exhibit the other day. It's because the only paintings or the only photographs or anything else exhibited would have to do with cute little kittens falling out of baskets or wearing babies' clothes or little children with jam all over their faces and those would be the only pictures that would ever get a winning award. And they have another penchant: If it's not sharp - the public at large has an index by which they judge a photograph - if it's not sharp, why, it's no good. Well, think if you took an expert picture of a mist, a very misty morning. Of course, it's not sharp but it's a beautiful picture, and the public would turn it down.

So judging has been taken completely out of the public hands for these particular reasons, you see? But portraiture is never taken out of the public hands, see? So it's got to be retouched within an inch of its life. Everybody's really got to look prettied up, you know? Tsk! It's wild! Some of those pictures don't any more look like the people they're taking a picture of, you know, than the man in the moon.

Well, what about this? What's this relationship? How come? Well actually, the retoucher steps in when the photographer fails. You can do everything the retoucher does with your camera and the lights. You can do the whole lot with the camera and the lights. But when the photographer falls down, the retoucher picks it up.

Well, they have various things - not to give you a whole bunch of nomenclature; don't pay much attention to this nomenclature. It's just, it's just words. They've got things like barn doors - very expressive, beautiful word. They put them on the sides of a spotlight and - so the spotlight won't shine into the lens or so that you can flap them over and keep the light from hitting somebody in certain portions. And then they have things called headscreens which stand up here on a big - like a square cardboard - and that restrains the light from hitting somebody's ear, see? You can tip the edge of this board in so that this person's ear is not well lighted. You See, his ears are too big, let us say, see? Well, you can take that shadow and throw it just exactly across his ear, see? And his ear looks smaller.

Any part you want to emphasize, you put light on, the formula is. The parts you don't want to emphasize, why, you just let it drift away, and the parts you want to practically take out of the picture, well, you just hold the light off of them and there they go.

And because photography, of course: photo - , light; - graphy, writing - it's just writing with light. And when you've written well with light you get a perfectly retouched picture. You can turn people in certain ways that make them much thinner. You can make their noses longer and you can make their forehead shallower and their chins stop jutting and so forth. Of course, you can just easily make a strong - jawed person into a weak - chinned person and so forth. You can do all kinds of wild things.

But when the photographer doesn't do his job, why then, somebody's got to step in and straighten it all out. And there's where the technology builds up. And the technology builds up in the area of correction.

So I think you'll find in the field - this is a broad statement and might be subject to a great deal of modification - in any heavy, heavy technical subject, but if very, very, very technical, I think the technology is built up around an area of correction. It's dissatisfaction with something and the correction of that dissatisfaction. Do you follow this now?

All right, the photographer doesn't do his job. He doesn't put the head screen over right so this guy's ears look like a pair of donkey's ears, See? Well, all right, nobody's going to buy that picture, so when the thing is all finished and so forth, well - I mean it's been developed rather, not completely finished - and it's in its proof sheets, and so forth; they don't even show him the proofs. They won't even show the customer the proofs.

Retoucher takes ahold of that thing and he cuts those ears down and he subdues those ears and he makes that look better and they reproof it. Then they show it to the customer and the customer's very happy with it. Correction. Correction.

Now, you can say when it isn't done right in the first place it's got to be corrected. And where it is going to be corrected a great deal of technology will arise. You follow this?

Audience: Mm - hm. Yes.

All right, if it was done right now, then there would have been no further technology. But where it's done right you would then have something moving along the line very smoothly and very easy to get along with indeed, if it was being done right. If you had the technology of how to do it in the first place, in other words, everything would move smoothly from that point there on.

But let us say there's a bunch of technology missing at this point or it is not known or it's not practiced. Now we're going to get a very heavy complicated technology arising just on the other side of this thing which we're going to call a lower - scale subject and it will simply be totally corrective of the upper - scale subject. Where you - ever you have tremendously heavy technology, then that is all of a corrective basis. In other words, it was based on a correction. There had to be something corrected at this point. It wasn't running right in the first place.

Now, let's get on this subject of bodies. Let's take it a - a finite line. All right, the photographer didn't do his job well and so therefore we had to pass it over into the hands of the retoucher. And the retoucher had to go all over this negative and take out pieces of it and do this and that before he printed it, and so forth. Well, let's not stop there.

Let's move over just a little bit further, and how about building these bodies? Well, somebody didn't build them right if people are that dissatisfied with them. There's something going wrong over there. And I'm merely pointing this out to you - there's no technology known there. There's geneticists, there's all kinds of "Eat Wheaties," there's various types of false technologies. But they frankly - there's a second dynamic Freudianism, and so forth, but they really have nothing to do with making bodies. I don't know what the second dynamic has to do with making bodies. It's just because they get connected and they are inevitable in sequence, but they do not necessarily proceed from one, two, see?

Now, what's all this? And we're into a totally unknown body of knowledge, aren't we? And there's a lot of false superstition and other things connected with it, so there's some bird down in Vienna in 1894 could say, "The whole trouble with the human race is they have no technology of building bodies," or "They've got it all in backwards," or something like this, you know? There's something wrong, see?

Freud, he builds up then psychoanalysis which has proven very popular. It isn't effective, it's popular. See, it depended upon the communication cycle of the analyst whether it was good or bad, not on Freud's theory. Surprise? If you had a good analyst that knew how to communicate with the patient and so forth, why, somebody would get better. Accidental though - they never studied the technology of communication. They didn't know anything about that and they thought they were dealing with the second dynamic. And they weren't.

Funny, you can read over Freud's records and you find out every time the guy got off an overt, he recovered. And you know, Freud never noticed it. You know, that's so remarkable. It will be buried somewhere in the notes, because it's not emphasized, and then he's - you're given the wrong reason for the recovery and that makes it very hard to relocate what was going on in this particular thing, and we're not riding a hobbyhorse trying to apply Scientology to it. It's one of the wo - it's one of the places we got the overt. And there seemed to be one present in every recovery; a disclosed overt and a recovery. They seem to go hand in glove, so a further study of this particular zone and area brought about a resurgence of technology in that particular field. And the importance of this thing was able to take place.

All right, but look - a - here, look - a - here. Here is the only thing I'm leading up to, rather circuitously, but to give it to you - more thud, to show you there's some background to it, with the idea of you understanding it a little bit better. Do you realize that all of education as it is practiced today is a complicated corrective technology? It's a corrective technology. It isn't education at all. See, there's no effort to relay an idea from point A to point B or mind A to mind B. See? There's an effort, however, to keep the fellow from or to keep him at it in some way or to do this or to do that. In other words, the educational system is built around the fact that education has already failed.

So you have this fantastic technology and some poor bloke could go to school for many, many years learning how to be a teacher and all he would ever learn is how to correct the corrections.

Now, it isn't that that data is un - is useless. Let me tell you, when an engine has gone into the ditch it's a very good thing to know how to operate a wrecking train to get it back on the rails again - very complicated technology, but it's a very good thing to know. But this doesn't make all of railroading lifting trains back on rails that have gone into a ditch, because railroading done right has the train on the rails all the time! It's only when railroading doesn't go right.

Well, so how about education where the students are committing suicide all over the place the way they do in France, and so forth? I don't - I don't know what this has to do with - education's somehow or another linked up with something or other and survival or something and they got it all in backwards and crosswise. And the poor students over there in France come up for an examination, you just start reading the roll call: "Pierre," you know?

"Oh, he's dead," and so forth. "He took cyanide last night. He couldn't confront it any longer."

And they have a heavy, heavy suicide rate, because apparently in France if you don't get through this particular type of examination, or something like this, they execute you anyway. I think you're executed socially or something, and France hasn't any colonies anymore to ship anybody off to so you just have to stay home, in total disgrace or something. Corrective.

Well, look at the amount of force and duress which must have been on this student. Terrific force, terrific discipline, heavy! To what? Well, to keep him at it and make him study his examinations. Well, I don't know, I never had any trouble getting anybody to study something they were interested in.

So I think that if this much duress can exist in a field to drive students to suicide - and very often in England and the United States they go off their rockers, and so forth - if there's this much duress to get them to learn, then I would say it must be some kind of a corrective technology that moves over into this field so hard only because - it moves over into this field - only because the students missed it all in the first place.

Now, what kind of duress do you think it would take to get Johnny to learn what B was when he'd already missed what A was? Now, you're getting accustomed to this in handling it with definitions and that sort of thing and I'm talking to a rather informed group here. Supposing, supposing somebody came up to take his examination to you and you were checking him off and so forth and you stuck in on the second paragraph. You couldn't get past second paragraph, he couldn't seem to remember anything in the second paragraph or so forth. Well, your technology now says that you should go back up and look just a little bit earlier to find the word he didn't understand. And sure enough, you'll find one just before he went blank, in other words - just before he went blank, there was a word he didn't understand. When we trace this back we find this word; we get this word defined and straightened out. All of a sudden, magically, he understands that paragraph.

Well now, supposing we didn't straighten out the word and supposing we told him that he was going to be expelled if he didn't learn the paragraph. Now, supposing we compound this with about ten - somewhere between ten and fifty thousand instances and texts and we did this every time. I would say we'd have an adequate explanation of why the child at nine was dumber than the child at eight, the child at ten was more stupid than the child of nine, the child of eleven was more stupid ... See?

In other words, this amount of duress became necessary because nobody would ever have understood anything, they wouldn't have been educated at all and perhaps better than nothing - perhaps. I don't think so, myself, but you could add it up this way. And if every time this fellow hit a rough spot on the road you simply applied the lead boot or the pincers or the brass basket full of rats or some other interesting medieval torture and said, "Now, if you don't get that next paragraph, you're going to have had it, bud." Now, what do - what do you think he would finally wind up? Well, he'd be in - he'd be in an interesting state, wouldn't he?

He'd be far removed from any idea of what he was doing. He'd be far removed from the subject and he would be treating the subject as something entirely different than the subject, certainly. He - you know, well, he'd say: "Well, there's this thing called physics, and I'm just trying to fix these weights here, and

of course that physics, it doesn't have anything to do with these couple of weights I'm trying to fix on the counter here." It'd wind up in a nonapplication.

There'd be a - he'd have to short - circuit. He'd have to get all that duress out of his perimeter. He'd have to get all this stuff out of his circle of understanding. He'd have to move it all over here someplace and just squash it and suppress it and say, "Well, the devil with it. I'll have to make up my own mind about this," or "I'll have to try to walk my own way through all this," don't you see? You would leave him on a total only - one basis with regard to his subject matter and his information. And instead of helping him you would have taken away all the information that could have helped him. So I would say modern education was making it impossible for a person to utilize his training.

Well, this then should indicate to you that a decline of IQ could be expected to follow a misunderstood word. That sounds absolutely wild, but the longer you went past that and the more you had to know that, the stupider you could be expected to get. Do you see?

Of course, we have all the corrections for this, and so forth. We've got clay table and clearing and definitions and all that sort of thing now. So we're talking from a point of view of considerable savvy. But I'm just trying to show you what the world must look like.

Here you got engineers out here putting up skyscrapers. Man, I'm - after I've learned this about education and so forth, I hope they were put up by the foreman who was never near the college because otherwise I'd expect them to fall down on me head, I would. I don't think I'd trust one very good. I've noticed a peculiarity in this particular field to get unreal or kind of revengeful toward the subject or to do weird things or to slough off when they got near their trained area.

Now, here is another datum: How does the state suffer in various terms from miseducation? How does the state suffer from miseducation? Well, there's a country, you might not have heard of it, called Russia and it went by the boards a number of years ago and it imported a German philosophy called communism and it had a ball, and it nevertheless is trying to go forward and make something out of itself, and so forth. It probably would have gone forward as fast as the Western 'world if it hadn't adopted a squirrel, offbeat philosophy. The Western world has advanced exactly the same distance and further during the same period of time. See, they were not mechanized either back in 1917. They were pretty bum.

If you don't believe it, one of these museums, go into one of these motor museums and so forth; look at a 1917 model - stuff. Well, that's a modern Russian car. I don't mean to be catty; they did copy a jeep. They got a lot of jeeps in there during the war and they copied them.

But they're pretty corny; and what they're trying to do, over there in Russia, is spread a civilization out into a very, very, very backward Asian world. Russia is basically Asian, it's not Western. And I will say that with all their handicaps - political and otherwise - they are making some progress of one kind or another and they've got an awful lot of virgin territory to spread all of this into. They've got the whole of Siberia to spread stuff into it, see, and they're really in a state of a sort of a pioneer country. And people have said, "Well, they're really entering their Victorian Age," and I imagine that they are. They're way behind. They're almost a century back of anybody else. Oh, just because Great Britain sells them some machinery and they change the labels on it and export it to Japan as Russian field tools or something is no reason why they're good in this department. They're not.

These boys are up against a tremendous frontier, and they have the frontier of ignorance and the frontier of this and that. They've got a vast wilderness. They have millions and millions of uneducated, backward people to try to do something with, you see? Their problems are fantastic! They're trying to solve them with education, and here's the outcome of their solutions with education. Of course, you can imagine a Russian commissar operating over a Russian student. This would be pretty grim.

And the figures are these: That on - the - job training of a great number of students who were trained at the full expense of the government and the industry which was training them to take future key posts in there left it one hundred percent at the end of their on - the - job training period, which was a two or three year period. One hundred percent took no further activity in that plant or that line of work. In another plant and



an area - this is one specific plant - another plant, two out of several thousand did stay with the plant. And these are not just selected figures. These are the broad coverage estimates for the whole of Russia.

These are young people who have been educated under Communist duress and have been moved out into a plant to be given on - the - job training to take over future posts in that plant. And at the end of that time, because things are milder over there now, they had some power of choice as to what they did now. And they all left. That was the exercise of power of choice.

Now, if you know education - and you know our technology of education now - you will see at once exactly what must have happened. Way back here in kindergarten or someplace the Communist love of the reevaluation of words caught him. The favorite trick of the Communist is not to change anybody's vocabulary but to make it mean something else. They change the meaning of words so therefore everything sounds familiar. The next thing you know a person finds that the word means something else entirely different. I'll give you in lump example of this: Orwell's 1984, wonderful changes of semantics, the change of meanings, of words which went through 1984. "Freedom is slavery," you know?

Well, even Roosevelt was at it. We had freedom for a long time. Everybody knew what "freedom" meant. Roosevelt, he made it "freedom from." You had to be freedom from something. That was what - the freedom we were now fighting for, we were fighting for "freedom from." Well, that's an interesting way of looking at it. "Freedom from." Well, that means you must be fighting it so you couldn't possibly be free of it. "Freedom" means "freedom." It doesn't mean standing up against something and pushing it away from you or worrying about will it catch up to you again, or something like this, or working day and night so that it won't happen to you. That's not freedom.

So, here's a change of semantics. Now, the Russian, of course had this entire Asian population, this huge mass of people, 200 million - one of the bigger populations of Earth in one country, all divided up into different lingual groups and different customs and so forth - and he moved in on them and then he had to change everything in order to get it all lined up and get them to work together at all and he had to reevaluate all their words. So that in 1964 we find he's lost his revolution. How did he lose his revolution? Well, he trains several thousand young people to take over the Pujas River Project and they're going to be the executives and the big shots on the project and they're go - they too are going to be able to drive around in Model T Fords. And at the end of the on - the - job training they all leave the Pujas River Project. That means he's going to run out of people to run things.

Material which we've got right now in Scientology, oddly enough, was of great interest to the old man Stalin himself because he smelled that it might exist in the studies which I was doing and was - I was in contact with Amtorg in 1938. And the whole line of - is, "How do you evaluate the relative ability of a person to work? How can you find out which person will produce more than which person?" And I was engaged in a study of that at that time and had some rather revelatory information regarding it. I was extremely pleased with this information and it got noised about the Explorers Club. The next thing you know, I was backing up at a mile a minute trying to keep my foot off that boat of going to Russia and talk to Stalin about it.

He had problems. He had worries in 1938 - plenty of worries. He was looking for help from anyplace. But where was his missing technology? The missing technology was "How do you get people to understand something and how do you get people to do things?" Those were his areas of no comprehension. How do you get people to understand things, how do you get people to do things?

Well, he thought he had solved "How do you get people to do things." "You set up enough machine guns in front of enough walls and give them enough examples, they will work." Only you can't keep it - keep at it forever that way. That'll play out sooner or later.

Now, when you start working that along an educational line, you run out of educated people fast. They just get stupider and stupider and stupider and stupider. So that I think that the way the leisure class and the upper class was wiped out in England and suborned was not through any political revolution. I just think they educated them to death. I think actually they got too stupid to hold their position. Something to think about, huh? I mean, as a class they were just educated to death. Everybody had to go to college.

Of course, what did this leave? This left a bunch of commoners around who didn't have to go to college, so it didn't matter about birth or anything else. It left these boys who were on the outside smarter than the guys who were on the inside so the guys who were on the inside lost. I mean, it doesn't take much to understand that. That must have been what happened.

So we can make a further point; we can make a further point here. We could say, then, that the continuation of a culture is entirely dependent upon possessing a technology of study. Russia is going to lose hers!

We have an example of the upper class of England having gone through Oxford into oblivion. We have examples of - all around us - of changing face of Earth and so forth and that hinges basically on people; the future of the human race hinges oddly enough on people. And if you don't make people who are good people, you're going to have trouble.

And in the field of study if you don't have any technology of study, then the poor little bloke who goes into Kindergarten and who starts running into incomprehensibles and who then is threatened with being flunked or shot or whatever they do to children in kindergarten if they don't get their blocks piled up in the right pile, moves on into the first grade and here he is shown a word which is cat and he says it's tac and everybody looks sad; the teacher paces up and down, writes notes to the parents, the father goes into a decline, holds his head in his hands for a half an hour, you see?

This is the standard accepted procedure, you see? "What is going to come of you?" you know? That is the question which is left burning in the middle of the air, you see? "You will never succeed in life," and all that sort of thing. Why do they have to put this much duress on? Well, it's because they don't know how to teach the kid to read cat instead of tac.

So you get this terrific cultural pressure. You get a bunch of cultural technology on "How do you keep a kid in line?" Then you hire a whole police force all over the nation to try to sit on him when he becomes a teenager. And then you have a real ball, now. You get the Mods and Rockers and so forth and your this and that. Well of course, these people by now have been taught thoroughly that they're no part of anything and that's the way they act. They act as though they're no part of anything, they don't own anything and that's it.

It's quite interesting to watch some young boy and so forth who's been catapulted out into the responsibility of the care of a family or something like that at ten or eleven, twelve years of age. It's very interesting to find. Today you can - in spite of child labor laws - occasionally find such a specimen. And he bears no more resemblance to the modern teenager, and he won't because he's already had to wrap his hands around this thing called life, you see, and carry on somehow and he hasn't had time - all the time necessary to sit in school and be made stupid and he's liable to become quite a success in life or something weird like this is liable to happen to him, unlooked for.

They're trying to bring in law and order while operating in the schools to create illegal activities and disorder. They're operating in schools to create it. And the last person in the world that would stand up and take any responsibility for it is Miss Prince - Nez, there at the - Public Local Number 18: "Well, we just try our best," you can see her now, you know? "We just try our best." Christ! Why don't they hang a sign across the door and say, "Juvenile Delinquent Factory"

Well, all right. So once more we have this experience in Dianetics and Scientology in this line of work. Once more we have this experience of colliding with a zone or area of the society in which there's a pretended technology where actually there is none. It's not only that - it's absence, it's - there's a pretended technology sitting in its place.

Now, I don't think, however, you're going to have too much collision with it. I don't think there's going to be too much upset, but I could foresee there's going to be some upset about it. Anything we write on this subject is sooner or later going to be challenged in some quarter or another. But this isn't a codified field that is returning a great deal of money. Teaching is not really a vested interest because it doesn't make enough money and that's about the only reason why.

Medicine, however, is a vested interest and drugs are a vested interest because somebody is making money out of it. The multibillion - dollar drug empire and healing empire and so forth will be defended to the last stethoscope, see? Those guys will be standing around there - you'll still - I mean, twenty, thirty years from now there'll still be some bloke down here trying to cause trouble, you know? He says, "Rowr - rowr - rowr."

And you say, "Well, you don't understand some word in healing."

"Yeah, I understand all the words in healing."

"Well, you don't understand some word in Dianetics and Scien "Oh, yeah, I understand all the words in Dianetics . .

"What the hell's the matter with you?" "I'm broke!"

Well now, the teacher doesn't make any money and the school contractor doesn't care what's built in those buildings that he's contracted to build and the state doesn't really like to shell out this much money, because kids don't vote. It's not an area where you can buy many votes. You can buy them - buy the votes of their parents somewhat but people really never connect the school to the administration. They're always somewhat disconnected. So you have no active vested interest there to go up against and I believe the whole area can just be gobbled up because nobody has ever seen it as a profitable area.

We're not looking at it as a profitable area, but they won't defend it because they don't see it in a profitable area. If medicine were a lot less profitable today, we would have no trouble taking over the field of healing. It's just the self - interest in the thing which keeps the opposition raving. I don't say that bitterly. I mean that's just a completely considered statement.

There isn't such an area in the field of education, so therefore I think a proper textbook which just goes down the line rat - a - tat - tat and doesn't find any fault with anybody and doesn't shoot anybody down in flames, you know, but just goes right down the line and takes up the whole subject from the word scat and carries it on through - why, it's pretty hard to get over the chapter of how you can reduce IQ in a person because somebody would take that as accusative, but I imagine that that can be - not glossed over, because it's a piece of the technology that'll have to be presented. But it'd be presented gently enough so that it won't have people fighting that point.

And the next thing you know, why, you'll be in another business. But it's not in another business that you've ever been absent from. Your part of the business is making people brighter, you see? Processing people, clearing people, that sort of thing. Well, that fits hand in glove with this particular type of activity. Then you have Scientologists to teach so you need the technology and that was the only reason the technology was developed in the first place - just to make it easier to teach more Scientologists - that was why it was developed. But it's going to go further than that, you watch it.

Now, if we don't take some responsibility for how far it'll go, we're liable to be in more trouble than if we just released it and forgot about it. Therefore, I'm not releasing any small book on the subject. I have to release a definite text. And I think you will find out that gradually, as this starts to roll, that it will be necessary for you in your area to make it possible for teachers, on a Saturday and a Sunday or something of that sort, to drop around and have some lectures on this subject. And I think that you'll find that it sort of will tend to stand separate and distinct from anything else which you're doing, and you will say, rather faintly, "Well, you know, we can raise people's IQ."

"Oh, yes, yes. Now what did you say about...?" and some educational question will come up, you see?

And you say, "Well, you see, you can process somebody in order to..."

They'll say, "Well yes, but now in teaching a child, do you . . .

And you'll say, "What the hell, which way is this cat jumping." Well, I think you'll eventually see which way the cat jumps, and the way the cat jumps is the fact that they want to know all about education. And

you better let them walk all the way through education before you start showing them that they actually have entered the field of philosophy.

And I don't think they'll route any other way because in education what you're actually studying is the difference between a Level 0 and a Level 1. And what sits there is this band called "education." And that's what's been established here is - that's of importance to us intimately and immediately. All these other ramifications, all these other complexities of education are not terribly important to us.

So the society of Russia will not be able to perpetuate itself. I'm afraid that would cause me to yawn almost wide enough to dislocate me jaw. So it won't be able to perpetuate itself in history. Too bad! Oh, that's terrible! The various other political regimes and so forth won't be with it. I'm afraid I just - that the state of mind I'm in with regard to these blokes, I'm afraid that I wouldn't even pick up a shadow for them if they dropped it. They're just not important.

But people are important and their systems are not important. Now, when their systems are built on lies, those systems must therefore be destructive. And the whole educational system as I see it of total duress, of total squash on the individual, in view of the fact that it's a system that's full of lies, I think it's about the most destructive thing you could have around at all. I think it would be very rough to have to live with this kind of a thing. It's definitely incorrect - wrong.

But you're going to find yourself in this business and the only real point I'm trying to make to you here is: don't then consider - because you can't talk to them about processing when they're busy studying study - don't then consider that you have moved them over into some other field. Recognize that you're moving them up through the top of Zero into the bottom of One. Recognize that this is a necessary step. These people are not bright enough at this particular time to even sit down and wonder how come they've got this technology. You know, they've put it on some other basis entirely.

So you come in and talk to a group of them and you say, "Well, study is so - and - so and so - and - so and so - and - so - and the IQ of your child could be increased by study, not decreased. And you could have a brighter child," or something like this or, "Your school could run with less upset," or to a group of police, "Juvenile delinquency is caused by miseducation. Proper education would reduce juvenile delinquency."

This will all sound to them like good roads and good weather. And they'll be very happy to cooperate upon this particular line and so forth. And you don't have to say anything else. And they won't really ever wonder, "Now, how the devil does this person know all this? Yeah, where is this information from? What's this all about?" Unless, of course, they're totally ARC broke and then that's out the other end. But it never really occurs to them to ask intelligently, "Ah, what part of the information and so forth? It says throughout this textbook that this is part of a body of information called Scientology. But then it just says 'Scientology' and everybody knows what Scientology is. It's a study of science, of course, naturally. Truth, and that sort of thing. And it's so on and so on and so on and . . . " See, they wouldn't even think about it.

And why wouldn't they think about it? I want you to get so you can see this one little point. They can't think about anything! See? You're wondering why a fellow with blinders on can't see. See? What you haven't recognized about this individual is the most fundamental thing about this individual, and that is he can't see at all.

So you ask yourself, "Why can't Joe and Pete see this and this and this?" You see, you're asking yourself too complex a question. See, you're asking yourself, "Why can't Joe and Bill see that so - and - so, so - and - so, so - and - so? And why do they always argue, and so forth and so forth?" Well, you yourself are just being too complex with your question. Your question is based on the fact that you haven't recognized that they can't see! Do you follow this?

You're trying to stretch it out into, "Why can't they see something'?" see? Well, your basic thing is, is just, "Why can't they see at all?" Well, they can't see at all because they've never been - they've been trained into stupidity. And you're talking to blind men, that's all. Well, how do you talk to a blind man? Well, you talk to him damn carefully! You get smart about it.

You know this guy's blind, so you - naturally he's sitting there, he can't see at all, and you're trying to talk to him about the rose garden, which you can see right outside the window. Well, you say - you wouldn't say to him, "Well, you silly ass! Why don't you look outside the window and look at the rose garden?" Well, you wouldn't say that to a fellow who couldn't see at all. See, you wouldn't.

You'd say, "Well, over there to your . . ." You'd have to think it over, you see? You'd have to say, "Well, over there to your right there are a certain number of windows. You possibly can feel a cold draft coming in on you occasionally. Well, that's windows over there and there's light which makes things visible and show up so that you can see things back of things. Like, you hold your two hands together, you see, like this. Well, the light would fall on the first hand, but wouldn't fall on the second hand, so you'd see the second hand, you see - you'd see the first hand but you wouldn't see the second hand because there's no light on the second hand. Now, you can hold those up and you can feel it that way," and you gradually infiltrate it into his experience, don't you see? And you'd have to sit there and figure for a while on "How am I going to give this guy some dope so that he can get some idea of there's a flower garden outside the window," see? And you gradually build it up, and you'd say, "Well, outside the window there's a lot of space. You know, the last time you went out of the room, why, you walked for quite a ways before you got into another door. Well, that was all space and that's the outdoors. And you've noticed sometimes that you've gotten rained on and so forth while you were in under some spaces, but not into other spaces, see?" You know? And you take it up like this, "Now, there's a big wide space outside the windows."

And then you'd probably recognize, "Good God! The next thing I'm going to have to explain to a blind man is the aesthetics of color. Ooh! Well, let's see. How can I do this," see? "Well, all right. Be brave. Let's do this. Let's attempt it." You get the idea?

And you eventually find yourself - and the guy would be sitting there saying, "Yeah, you know? Yeah, yeah, yeah, well I now know what a flower garden is," see, something like that. You really would have communicated something because you recognized in the first place you were talking to a blind man. But when you fail to communicate, you do so for one big, awful reason. You don't recognize that you're talking to a blind man.

And when YOU start talking to people about Scientology, you are actually talking to them above the strata where YOU should be talking to them to. Somebody says, "Well, on this new PE Course, how do we get in ARC?" Well, you don't! ARC is too high. That's very advanced data; you've got to undercut this.

You've got to give them the idea of a datum and you've got to give them the idea of the comprehension of a datum and you've got to give them the idea that there are data in existence. You've got to give them the idea that they can learn something. Sounds incredible but this is your leg up, this is your edge in.

Then you can give them the idea that there is knowledge, because 99 percent of the people you're talking to have had the experience of "The technology taught did not operate." Most of them do not expect anything to happen even if they know the technology. So they're not able to give that extra little push that makes it work. When you run into these failures it's because of this, see? It's that little extra thing. They don't expect - what I'm trying to tell you is they don't expect anything to work because nothing ever has. So they really - don't really know what knowledge is.

Knowledge is some sort of a fakery that people think is, see? If you gave them the task of describing what is knowledge, you're liable to run into something like that. Well, these people don't know there's anything to know.

Look at the arrogance of the medical profession. They don't think there's anything to know about the subject of the mind or the spirit or healing. They brush all this off, they - wow! You know? The arrogance of these fellows! They're not producing any results, yet they think they've got it all wrapped up. Well, where do you suppose that comes from but Latin? Imagine, starting somebody to handle the human mind by getting them to go over into the next county for some word of a dead language that has no resemblance whatsoever to anything he has any experience with and say, "That's where you begin on the human body," and then you wonder why in the final analysis this guy is so eager to carve up human

bodies and choke people off. Well, he wouldn't ever do anything else, don't you see? You've said, "This is the tibia," and you've looked for where the tibia is. It's this word in the book: tibia.

Actually, education is getting worse and worse. In desperation recently, Great Britain has taken a fantastic turn in the field of education, about which you're not reading any articles and with which you're - probably aren't getting much data. You've probably heard something of this, but I've just been getting it hot and heavy over the lines because I was working out to find out where Quentin could go to school and what he had to do to figure out some various things, so of course, typically me, I just got in touch with everybody on this subject and got the gen down.

A lot of interesting data is pouring in on the lines. The British college does not expect, within four years, to teach any degree course which goes consecutively to school. They want nothing to do with it. They consider this is a total failure and they want nothing more to do with it. And they tell you consistently, "You want to know what the expectancy of enrollment is in 1968. I wish we knew, but one thing..." one or several have said, "...that we can tell you for sure is the courses which are now available to enroll in will no longer be enrolled in."

"Sandwich training" is what they're using today in all technical fields. They say, "The arts - who cares? Any of these old, dead - language subjects, and so forth, and dead degrees and so forth, who cares about those? But we have found out that our engineers can't build bridges and we're jolly well doing something about it. And we're upset in the field of education, and we're just tearing it to pieces."

So all the big companies and the governments and the local councils and everybody else who can put his shoulder to the wheel is knocking out anything that has resembled engineering education in the past here in Great Britain. They are just knocking it in the head left and right. They found the school room was no place to make any engineer, and the future of this culture depends completely upon the quality of their engineers. They have recognized that entirely. So they're just reforming the whole thing. And by 1968 it won't even look the same.

They'll go six months to school and they'll work for six months. That's what's going to happen to the student, and he's going to go six months to school and he's going to work for six months. And he jolly well, damned better be working in the subject he's studying or he can't enroll in it.

A whole new face has been given to the field of education. Well, that is a corrective measure which is a recognition of the fact that educational methods have failed. But it's a corrective measure in the right direction and we may even have had something to do with it because, remember, we've been teaching an - we used to teach an awful lot of teachers up in London, and it was our idea of the familiarity of things and so forth. We may have more to do with the evolution of the culture than we believe. Perhaps we could overestimate it, but I think we commonly underestimate it. I see a lot of things happening. I noticed the other day something or other happening. It was straight out of our textbooks.

Oh, yes. There's somebody drew up the profiles of Home and Heath and whatever its name is - Mr. George something - anyway, drew him up and printed our personality analysis in The Guardian, and plotted these boys on our personality analysis, somewhat altered - ised. But they never took one of these things down and gave it to somebody - typically the psychologist at work - never gave it to poor Home or Heath or Wilson or any of the boys, see, but went around and asked some students what they thought of these fellows and put that down as the results, and then advertised this as the actual graph of these people. I think it's very interesting. It's only something that they would do in the field of psychology. You understand what I mean? They just asked some people their opinions of whether these fellows were, you know, this or that or up and down, you see? And then they put down whatever anybody said and then released to the public that this was the personality of these blokes. I thought it was fascinating. But nevertheless, that was our graph sitting there staring us in the face.

We've already infiltrated this field to the degree that they're already out the backdoor and playing in the yard and don't even realize that we're sitting in the parlor twiddling our thumbs. That's about the way the situation is as far as command and knowledge and technology is concerned. But we are at a very - we're a very unreal group to these people and we're unreal because any further knowledge is unreal to them, don't you see? They recognize instinctively that there is knowledge somewhere, and when we talk to them

they recognize that we are talking that way, but it's all on a sort of an unconscious basis. And then they don't really connect this up and they're sort of hunted about the whole thing, and we make them nervous.

But frankly, our command value over such a person is rather fantastic. It's almost an hypnotic command value which is sort of interesting. They recognize that you're talking the truth but they are not quite able to add you up to it, so the words which you're saying as you speak to them are engramic, almost, as you speak them. It's all very interesting. Scientology could be in this state and simply put the whole society into some kind of an obedience basis without even trying. But that isn't what we're trying to do.

The way that you would follow this through - you'd have to get somebody into a state where he could learn. This is the way you'd bring somebody into Scientology, see? You'd get him into a state where he could learn and you'd show him there was something to be studied and then you would show him that there was a body of information about study and then you would show him that there was a body of information to study. And it's about in those - in that sequence that you would make a big win.

And you have never really tried to approach it from this particular angle. Your normal approach to the individual is, "We can help you, we can make you smarter, we can do this for you, we can do that for you, we can make you well." We have tried to talk to him and so forth and we're talking to somebody who can't learn.

All right, if this individual can't learn, why, then of course he can't learn even the words we're saying to him. So he's in a nonreceipt. It isn't that we're even talking dully or uncleverly. He's simply not receiving. See, if he can't learn in general, why, he couldn't receive your - even your sentence.

So your approach isn't failing, it just isn't reaching. Big difference between those two points. So all you have to do is move the person up to where it reaches. See, you take your first step first. You pull him up to where it'd reach him.

Well, so he'd be very happy to learn that there was ways of studying. He'd be very happy to learn this. He'd be very happy to learn there was ways of broadening his information about the world, about things.

But right away, of course, you recognize you're dealing with a present time problem. He has a lot of things that he is having problems with, that, if he could learn more about, he would be able to handle his problems. So you must be at that point colliding with a present time problem on the part of the person you're talking to. Do you see that? His basic present time problems have to do with not knowing. See, if he could just learn more about women, he wouldn't have so much trouble with his wife. I mean, let's get it down to that simple an index, see?

But of course, it never occurs to him that there's any way to go about learning that he isn't going about. So if he were just to know that there is some way you could learn more about women or learn more about anything or if there was some way of approaching this field of gathering data or becoming more learned on certain subjects and so forth, why, boy, he'd be on your side right now because he would be applying them to his present time problems, not on a direct processing basis but on just a direct indoctrination basis.

You say, "Well, there's something you can do about your life. There is some hope for it."

"Why?"

"Well, you can find out more about it."

"Is that so?"

See, not that you become clever or anything else, but "You can just find out more about what's going on around you."

"Oh, I can? Isn't that interesting? Hey! How do you do that?"

“Well, there’s techniques, various techniques of learning more about things that are quite surprising, quite surprising, and so forth. And one of them is to observe.”

“Is that so?”

Well, you get how fundamental this gets? You observe. You think you have to be clever to teach somebody something like this. No, just be obvious; observe.

“Now, you - you say you want to know more about your wife? All right. Now, there’s a good example. All right. Now, has it ever occurred to you to observe your wife?”

“No.”

“All right. Now, I’ll tell you what you do. Your first lesson in learning something about study is to just learn how to observe. Just learn how to look at something. Just - that’s it. All right, how do you look at something’ .?”

Well, leave him wallow in it, man. How do you look at something’ .? Hell, you look at it! That’s the answer. And that’s the answer he’d finally come up with. But how does he look at something? Well, he looks at it, see? And that would be his problem for the day, you see? He’d think there were trick ways of looking at things. Do you look at them through various colored glasses, you know? Do you look at them cross - eyed? Do you use eyeballs? All kinds of things, see? Let him solve that one. How do you - how do you observe something’? Well, let him draw up systems of observation. If he wants to know more and have less trouble with his wife, well, he’d better learn how to observe his wife.

Now, that would be a primary method, then, of handling his personal affairs and his personal life. That would be right there or right down the middle of Main Street. He’d learn all kinds of things that just never occurred to him before. He’s taken it for granted that observation is going on, don’t you see? You’ve taken it for granted. You say, “Two people are living together, they both look at each other.”

The only time a wife ever looks at him is when he comes home with a smear of lipstick. She can see lipstick. She puts it on her mouth all the time.

In fact, she put that lipstick on him that morning when he left for work, but she’s forgotten that so now she has grounds for divorce: He came home with lipstick on his face. All day long nobody happened to tell him he had some lipstick on his face, see? But she can observe - lipstick on his face. End product.

You talk about observation. In any very big city - in any big city you can pull some of the wildest tricks to demonstrate nonobservation you ever cared to have anything to do with. The wildest things go unobserved in large cities. You wouldn’t believe it. I, myself, used to make a gag out of this. I used to make a very amusing gag out of this; it paid off in many ways. Why, I used to tell some girl - if I were ever walking down Broadway in the vicinity of 42nd Street, you could always count on me to tell the girl I was walking with, you see, “Do you know that New Yorkers never see anything?”

“Oh? No!”

“Oh yes, you can do almost anything. I mean a fellow could drop dead out here, somebody could pull a gun out of his pocket and shoot somebody dead and the passerbys wouldn’t even pause in their stride. You’d have to actually actively block the pavement. If there was a fight in progress, they would only stop if the pavement got blocked so they couldn’t go by and then they’d stop and eventually watch the fight. You can excite curiosity by blocking the pavement and looking up, but you have to block the pavement before you look up and then they will also look up. But it’s very, very funny but they never see anything. They don’t pay any attention to you and if you don’t actively block the pavement, why, they never notice.”

“Oh, I don’t believe you!”



You see, you get some girl from the Corn Belt or something like this. "Do you know that I could stand right here on the corner of 42nd and Broadway and kiss you and there isn't one single person would even glance in your direction."

"I don't believe it!"

"All right, I'll show you!" Yeah! Never failed, never failed. Wonderful technique. Yeah, there'll be a fee if any of you young fellows try that.

Anyway, the score is that you take such - take such very unexciting words as "observation" or "inspection" or "familiarity," you see, the very unexciting words. You can actually build them up into mountains. They become very, very startling indeed! And when you're teaching somebody about this, what you want to do is take the obvious and expand it. Don't go going overboard to give them all - well, were sitting in the driver's seat now. We've got the technology of education, do you see. It's contained in these lectures and so forth. There hasn't been very much to add to it, either. It appears to be quite complete.

Now, you're going to say, "Well, am I supposed to teach somebody education, huh?" Oh, no, no, brother. You're not supposed to teach anybody your technology of education. Let's teach them the introductory aspect of education. Which is what? How do you learn about things? Well, you could sit down and ask yourself that.

Well, how do you learn about things? Well, you learn about things by looking at them, by feeling them, by hearing about them, by reading books about them, by seeing what they relate to. You could lay all this down very easily, but of course you get out of it such things as "feel" and "observe" and so forth.

Now, if that's the breakdown that you make on your very, very introductory and elementary approach to learning, you see, if that's the breakdown which you make, realize that all of these things can be applied to all of the problems which any person at Level 0 or Level I has. You could give all kinds of gratuitous information about all kinds of gratuitous things which are being brought up with regard to this. Let's look at that.

So, it isn't for you, then, to say, "Well, let's see. I'm going to teach this fellow about Scientology. Well, there's such a thing as ARC. That's affinity, reality and communication and they form a triangle and so forth, and so on..."

"Where am I at? What - what's going on?" see. Well, he doesn't know there's any knowledge in existence anyplace that he doesn't know. That's one of the first things he doesn't know. He thinks everything in the world has already been found out. He doesn't know that the society is in anyway deficient. Look at the way somebody out in the street will complain about a past life or complain about a something or other.

You can take some bird who's howling like mad about the fact that there's no such things as implants and start to say, "Well, say this word," give him an item in a Helatrobis line plot, and the meter goes bluu, and he goes bluu, and give him the next item, "Say that word." Bluu, bluu. Well, if there's no such thing as an implant where's all that coming from? Meters don't run for the fun of it, see? But to teach him something like this'?

So what you in Scientology are up against is actually not the meanness of the society or the cussedness of the society nor the unwillingness of the society to be helped or any of those things. What you're - you're not even up against the ignorance of the society; you're actually up against the incorrect study technology of the society, which prohibits them from learning what you're talking about and prohibits them from learning that there is more to know. A technology that stultifies the intellect, that freezes the individual into a noncomprehension of anything, which puts him into a woodenheadedness the like of which nobody ought to be put into.

In other words, you're talking to a stultified even ossified individual who has been carefully and systematically - but accidentally and unintentionally - destroyed since the first day he set his foot on his mother's knee and said, 'Mama, what's a cat?'

And then she said, "Don't bother me now."

"Let's see. Cats are 'don't bother me nows.'" He's the product of an educational system which has threatened to shoot him against the social brick wall with all the social machine guns if he doesn't get "A" in every subject and graduate out of the top of his class where he didn't even understand what the word "school" meant.

Everything has militated - everything has operated against this individual ever becoming brighter or more educated. And now you expect to come forth with a great body of knowledge that this individual would welcome with open arms.

Well, in the first place, he's been shot down in flames on the subject of study to begin with and this would just mean more study to him. Furthermore, you couldn't possibly exist because all study materials are bad because you get shot if you don't know them or something weird like this will be going on in his head. In other words, the communication line is jammed. What's the communication line jammed on? The communication line is jammed on study. So this is study in dissemination.

And do you see that the study itself is an excellent dissemination tool and would work like a shot and I'm sure that you will find yourself, if you start to use this, being pulled in faster than you know.

And I will only give you one little caution with regard to it, is don't get too studious about study in your address to the subject. Just pick the very obvious points of study and make them very studious points because it doesn't matter how studious you get about the obvious. A person can still see it. Do you see?

So that you say - you - some person, he wants to get things built up into some tremendous tower of complexity on this subject. Well, you just let him build it up on the subject of observation until it likes to reach the sky. He isn't going to get anyplace but observation, is he? He's going to get, in the final analysis, the fact that you observe by observing. This is what final conclusion he will have to reach. No matter how many systems he develops in order to do the observation, he will eventually reach that point.

He can't help but learn things and learn things about learning if he observes things. So you've got any broad, fabulously simple point of this character which, if you put across and got it across, you would all of a sudden get tremendous agreement with. And you'd get that little "Hey! What do you know?" you know? "What's - yeah! Yeah! If I observed my wife - ah, yes! What is she doing How does she look when I'm talking to her? Why, I have to check up on that." And by the very familiarity of reach and withdraw by observation of his wife, he'd have less trouble with her. He'd become more familiar with her, he'd understand her better. You're talking to people who have withdrawn totally from life.

Study, of course, is one of the best methods in the world of bringing them out of it.

Thank you.