

## STUDY: EVALUATION OF INFORMATION

A lecture given on  
11 August 1964

I'm sorry to keep you waiting today, but it was all Reg's fault. We were testing out the walkie-talkies we will not use on London Airport. Imagine, using walkie-talkies on London Airport, you know, with their radio control tower. We have a rig-up so that we can handle photographic flash lamps at a distance with a little walkie-talkie—very tricky. And we're really getting very cunning. And I can just hear it now though: "Impact pictures coming in for a landing on the north runway. What is our aperture, please?" Very funny!

The difference between professional and amateur photography is a chasm wide, and you have to go at it in particular wild ways on the professional front. It requires permission of nobody less than the Ministry of Aviation, and that sort of thing, in order to move, practically, in the vicinity of aircraft in England and so on. Have to produce credentials, you know, like a deck of cards, and all that sort of thing. The Ministry has granted us permission to go up and shoot the incoming landing of a hypothetical student, you see, so that all of your views of the airport and what you saw of England, and so forth, that's what I'm going up and shoot in two or three weeks just for fun. So those snapshots you took that didn't come out, I can give you some copies.

That's snide, you know? I'm showing you the proper Scientology attitude toward a learning or beginning Scientologist, you see?

All right, what's the date?

Audience: August 11th.

August the 11th, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Okay. And we're going to resume our lectures on the subject of study, and the more I talk about study the better your grades get and so this is very fine. This is one of the most successful lines of lectures I think I've ever engaged upon, most productive of cataclysmic and colossal results—really fabulous. So that I have not sweat through "You take the sodium bichloride and you put it into the bichromate and you get bisulfite because it precipitates negatives," you know, and so on.

I remind you that about late spring I decided to study and find out what study was all about, and so on, and go on along this particular line.

Your grades keep going up the more I talk about study.

The cases belly as the hootch dancer said, is a very, very deep seated thing called words. But of course, all GPMs are composed of words. They're actually not composed of English words; they're composed of significance's which are connected to masses. These masses are very capable of pushing somebody's head off.

Now, you really shouldn't be terribly concerned about this as a Scientologist. The electrician gets used to handling 10,000 volts, the circus performer thinks that it's quite nothing to pat lions on the nose; and I call to your attention that the public at large look at an electrician handling some voltage lines, or something like that, and they're horrified, see? And you look at a lion trainer in a cage (they hate to be called lion tamers because those lions are never tame, a tame lion is the last thing you want around, you see, so they want good savage lions) patting those on the nose and so forth, the public looks and they say "Aaghhh!" But as a matter of fact, they would feel rather uncomfortable if they didn't have some big cats around to snap whips at, you know? I mean the lion trainer would. This is the life he lives, and the

public at large, not being initiated into this, of course is horrified and properly stunned by the lion trainer's association with the big cats in the cage.

Clyde Beatty, for instance, used to fight 40 lions and tigers simultaneously, mixed. And I should imagine that he—lay off of that for a few days, why, he would have felt very, very poor, you know, he would have felt bored and life would have seemed uninteresting to him.

Now, there are many other professions and many other activities, and so forth. You wonder how in the name of God a dentist can stand there pulling teeth day after day after day after day. Fantastic, but he can. You wonder how a surgeon can stand there cutting out guts and throwing the offal in the garbage can hour after hour, you see, year after year. How come? What are all these things? Well, these things are what is known as professional familiarities. And if you get familiar enough with a particular subject, it may look terribly dangerous and upsetting to somebody else but is not really dangerous or upsetting to you. This is quite remarkable; in any particular field or activity one is apt to become quite superhuman.

That is what's being demanded of you in Scientology. I'm not talking about whether you get better, or whether you become clear or OT or anything else; I'm just talking on a very down to earth, rock-bottom sort of an approach. GPM words are the lions, the high voltage, the various other professional danger points with which you live in Scientology—the words, the words of the GPMs, and that sort of thing.

Now, you take these words and you go out and throw them in the teeth of the public out here, see? You can actually watch somebody turn green, and all of a sudden he'll start going "Yuuh-uh-uh!" Well, he goes, walks out someplace and falls on his head, true! And he's liable to get quite ill, and that sort of thing.

All right. Well, he's just not used to lions, do you see? He couldn't even trace it back to why he feels so ill; he knows nothing about this. Well, this is a rather happy area to be a professional in; because life consists of livingness, and livingness has a lot to do with the mind. In fact there wouldn't even be anything here to live in, or any living to do, unless a mind was around, you see?

So the business of being in the business of the mind, and so forth, has liabilities but it has, of course, a great many things that are very good. And when you start fooling around with GPMs, you know very well you can knock your head off; you know very well that this is not something to lightly fool with; you know very well what they can do to somebody. You see somebody around on crutches gimping around, he's got arthritis —arthritis, exclamation point, you see, and so on. What's the matter with him? Well, he's just all wound up in a GPM someplace; that's really all that is wrong with him. Even if it's an engram, why, it's held in place with a GPM. That's the way he lives, that's what it's going on with.

You've heard people go around and say, "Well, it doesn't matter, sticks and stones may break my bones, but words can never . . ." Oh, yeah?

Now, the professional liability of the Scientologist is the fact he's dealing with significance's and he's dealing with masses; and you connect the right or slightly wrong mass with the right or slightly wrong significance, and you get this mismatch one way or the other and you get catastrophe, and that's the way life she is lived.

And you want to know about "What is human behavior? What are the basic elements of existence? What makes matter stay here?" The physicist out there, he is busy studying conservation of matter— or conservation of energy, rather—he's busy studying conservation of energy, conservation of energy. He's just going on with this, on with this, on with this, and he's riding himself into the ground. Sooner or later, why, he's going to strike "to kill all energy" or something of the sort, as his interpretation of a GPM and build an atom bomb, something like this. He's got to do something, you see, in this particular line. He becomes obsessed along the line.

Now, the psychiatrist and psychologist, and so forth, are very busy in the world today on the field of motivational research, what they call motivational research; very interesting subject! I recommend to every Scientologist, and particularly people who are engaged in promotion activities, something—in organizations, to read a book called Hidden Persuaders. Now, that is a very interesting book. Although it tries to make mock of the idea of hidden persuaders and so forth, down in between the lines, it gives you a very thorough dissertation on the techniques now being used by modern advertising agencies and other people engaged in reaching the public. And they hire, these days, psychiatrists and so forth to do motivational research and find out a bunch of goofy facts. Well, most of their facts are goofy because they don't know why people are. They don't know what make people tick, and that sort of thing.

But if a Scientologist reads that, particularly a Saint Hiller, and particularly somebody who is moving around in the vicinity of Class VI, see, he reads that— now, just reinterpret that whole thing. They've laid a foundation, they've got a beautiful piece of music; they got no words to the music, don't you see? They got a marvelous idea that maybe they can influence and affect people one way or the other, but they don't know what words to put to the tune. They're still groping around in their Freudian analysis and trying to motivate soap by getting a libido complex going on the age of three, see? They're trying to restimulate something one way or the other in order to sell their soap. And they haven't got the buttons. Let me put it this way, you see; they're playing a piano without any keys. They're still making noise on it. I don't know how they're managing it, but one way or the other they're making noise on it.

Now, actually, that is one of the highest paid activities in the world today, is the world of advertising and merchandising. That is one of the highest paid activities in the world today. They are pouring out a terrific avalanche of money into the pockets of psychiatrists, and so forth, these days in order to find out what makes people tick. Of course, they're not on basic, really basic research. They're still flying around in kindergarten stuff, don't you see? But here these fellows are, trying to reach the public, trying to sell products and so forth, and they have turned to the psychiatrist and psychologist in order to give them the answers. Well, they turned the wrong way; and like any other boot soldier in an awkward squad, why, they'll probably get booted for it. They lose money on this every once in a while and they make mistakes.

But you start adding that up, if you really know the mind, and you wonder then that anybody would ever have any difficulty with dissemination.

Now, this material, of course—I mean this type of use—is a debased use of this information. It would debase your knowledge of the field of the mind just to use it to sell somebody some preserved piglets or something, see? This is silly. This is something like using a Mercedes car to crack walnuts. This situation, then, is not recommended to you as an activity.

I'm simply pointing out some minor activity that's going on in the world today that is absorbing a great deal of money from the manufacturers, that has a tremendous bang from each magazine. You turn on the TV set, you are looking at motivational research. You open a magazine, you're looking at motivational

research. You open up a newspaper and read its ads, you're looking at motivational research. You can look at an election, you realize those candidates in that election are running by motivational research. As a matter of fact, Eisenhower won the campaign in the United States when he was elected President because of the work of an advertising agency in the field of motivational research; and they found that the country was starved for a father image. So they set him up for a father image and of course he got elected. Actually he was a pretty good father image, if fathers do nothing but read Western stories. But they set this boy up in that fashion.

Now, that's the way the world is moving. Now, if you want to know how to live calmly in the midst of a tremendous confusion, all you really have to know is the answers, the basic

answers; and if you know the basic answers, these things 90 percent of the time don't worry you, and the other 10 percent of the time you can do something about them. Do you follow me?

Knowledge is something that is achieved through study.

Now, the whole subject of words booby-traps a person's effort to find out what's going on, to find out what the world consists of. Words—it's a booby trapped line. Significance. What is this? How do you find out about anything? Well, you're going to find out something about something these days with words. Information is going to be relayed with words, you're going to find out about things with words, and those words are booby-trapped. They match up the GPMs, the woof and warp of the mind. They've got the mind push-buttoned.

Now, the mind is terrifically push-buttoned, so that if you are reading "The cat was black" and feel queer, or feel repelled by this statement "The cat is black," if you don't know what you're doing, you simply are repelled by the subject of studying cats or of studying or acquiring knowledge about cats, or anything of that sort of thing, see? In other words, you've got a barriered line; because you read the statement "The cat is black," you feel odd, therefore you say, "I mustn't study about cats," see? Actually-it has nothing to do with cats, it's the word black.

You nearly always find yourself assigning to the wrong part of the sentence, or the wrong part of the study material, the reason why you can't study it; because the other is something one isn't confronting and one doesn't feel he can confront, so therefore he disperses and confronts something else.

Now, that is the basic principle you should know about knowledge and study: (I) that even if you are simply looking at a tree to find out something about the tree, you are studying a tree. I don't care how briefly this is done; study isn't something being used here in connection with being very, very thoughtful, and thorough, and so forth. You look over this tree to see what kind of a tree it is. Well, in that brief instant you've studied the tree, don't you see'? In other words, you observed it to find something else out about it.

Now, you can pick up observation from the printed page. That's a secondhand observation, but it nevertheless is the route on which almost all knowledge travels; since if you, individually, were called upon to re-evolve all the knowledge there was from the beginning of the world until now, all by your little ol' lonesome, you'd wind up stupid in this lifetime. I don't mean to be harsh; that's true. If you were called upon personally and individually to evolve all knowledge there was about anything, in one lifetime, you would get so little way upon that route—you understand, that's without having any other person relay anything to you, without having at your fingertips any works, texts, any reference books of any kind, that you were just going to have to do it all on your little ol' lonesome by thinking it up and evolving it, and so forth, and you were going to evolve all the knowledge and you weren't going to have any receipt of information from any other secondhand observation.

In other words, you want to learn about volcanoes, well, you have to go and find a volcano. You would get so little done on this project that you would die stupid, I can assure you of that. Or you would be a ruddy fool and believe that you knew everything there was to know about the one room that you had been in that whole lifetime. Do you follow me? So there is a value to secondhand knowledge.

Now, firsthand knowledge, of course, is acquired by direct observation and experience. But even to achieve direct observation and experience, it is really much better to have the fruits of other observations and experience with which to profit, and only in that way can you maintain and carry forward a culture of any magnitude.

Illiterate cultures do not survive and they are not very high. The natives of the tribe of the Bugga-Bugga Booga-Boogas down in Lower Bugga-Wugga BoogaWoog are mostly no

longer with us, or they are around waving red flags today and revolting against their central government. They're having a bad time.

Well, the British Tommy that went down there with his Snider, or his Lee Enfield, and brought them higher education in the first place was only occasionally followed by anybody who taught them anything. And they didn't learn fast. Their literacy was not up to absorbing culture rapidly. So, of course, they can be victimized by anybody who comes along.

Once the line is open, if literacy doesn't follow and if secondhand observation is not available to a people, they stultify, they die, they go to pieces, they degrade. They are struck by this tremendous volume of exterior culture. They've been very happily down amongst the bong-bong trees, you know, dancing up and down amongst the bong-bong trees, and the highest level of their interest and so forth was their own back yard. They could tell you all about bong-bong trees, and they could tell you all about you mustn't step in bug-bug bushes because you step on a thump-thump snake, and this was their direct observation.

The second they're hit with things, particularly the abstract ideas of organization, the abstract ideas of political philosophy, the abstract ideas of, really, engineering—things of this material nature where knowledge is moving in close to the MEST, you see, where the significance is immediately, directly applicable to the manipulation of matter—when they move in on that, of course their culture fails. They are not able to turn out Lee Enfield rifles. They are not able to organize themselves into a proper democratic civilization, no matter how many lend-lease payments are thrust into the paws of their greedy politicians. They can be victimized, they can be turned into slaves, and they can be degraded.

What's happened? Well, they've been overwhelmed and presented with this tremendous cultural image. Here's this great, shiny civilization, you see? It's full of Cadillac cars and jet planes and electric razors and all kinds of wild things, and they look at this material animated world; they see people have conquered their environment to the point where they can live at leisure and where they can do various things, and where some girl with a few push buttons can control 125 horses as the most usual thing that she ever did in her life. You understand? In other words, she can drive a car.

All right. All of these miracles all of a sudden hit these illiterate fellows, see, all these things! They don't know the words, see? They see the tune but they can't sing it, and they go into just overwhelm—boom! They just cave right in, see? They just back right up.

Somebody who is fully trained in Moscow has also been trained: "Your brethren at home are pretty uneducated, and if you push this button and that button and that button, they will respond and all of a sudden bring down the house, and then we will be able to seize the whole place and get all the jute we need."

I mean, the ethical and spiritual nature of communism is very interesting, you know? They're out of jute, so they put their political mechanisms into run to get them some jute. Their interest in South Africa is simply and entirely the fact that they need diamonds and they want gold. I mean, it's very spiritual. They love mankind for what they can get out of him, and the way they play their violin is just about as cold-blooded as anybody ever did. But it's mainly based on the fact that people don't know the words.

And you look at a communist array of vocabulary, you look at a communist vocabulary, it's very interesting vocabulary; it's very tricky. Their technology, their political technology is worked out to one of the finest hair splits you ever heard of. Boy, they know how to talk to this one, they know how to talk to that one, and they know how to argue with somebody else, and they know how to put together this, and they know the parliamentary control of a small meeting. And they're taught to do this and they're taught to do that, and they know how to shove the motion down to the bottom of the pile so it never gets heard and only the motion which they want heard is heard. They're just taught this very carefully, you see? Technology! Technology! They're all taught this with words. They weren't in on the 1917 revolution.

They got the whole technology right straight on up the line by being taught it, by it being relayed to them with words, much as I'm relaying to you information and ideas with words. But it's all secondhand, it's all hearsay, and for those boys it really works. They are taking the world.

I see people standing around with their hands in their pockets in these Western governments, and so forth, not knowing what is going on, and it's something like a big, strong bull being chewed to pieces by a pack of small dogs. And this bull, he knows that a small dog can't do anything to him and so he's tried to ignore them, he tries to go on, he tries to do this. The next thing you know, he's going to be down with his throat cut.

Well, he doesn't understand what they're up to and he's above knowing. Something like this, you see? All kinds of attitudes mix into this. He's deficient in knowledge of communist technology, so therefore he is being defeated by communist technology. It's very, very interesting that this technology is relayed by word of mouth. It's taught. It's not by direct observation, but it's material that can be put into direct observation by the communist (trained communist) here and there.

The world today is being overwhelmed on the basis of illiteracy; the illiterate people of the world are being overwhelmed. It's always this, see? It's the fellow who doesn't know, it's those who do not understand, it's those who haven't got it taped who get knocked into the wastebasket.

The death of a civilization is based upon its accumulated not-understandings, not-knowings, its ignorings, its failure to grasp the situation. It can also drift back into too many yesterday's clichés, like "Well, the barbarians always come down on the northern frontier and go home at harvest time," you know? And one time they didn't go home at harvest time and that was the end of Rome, see?

Rome at that time was illiterate on the subject of illiteracy: the barbarian. They didn't realize that their people had become very effete. Part of their information was missing, that a people who wishes to be free must not just know about the latest wine; they've got to know pretty well across the board about most everything in sight.

The day that marks your death is the day that you sit back and decide you know everything there is know about everything there is around you, so there is no reason for you to observe anything anymore.

Now, between the two points then of "no observation necessary because I know everything," you see, and "no observation possible because I don't know any of the words," there is a mean which makes living livable. You get what these two extremes are now? Or is "I know there is everything to know. I know everything there is to know, I needn't observe anything. needn't really experience or do or look at anything because I know all there is to know." Now, that would be the end product of a dying civilization or a dying individual. And on the other extreme we have the "Don't know any of the words, don't understand anything that's happening in my vicinity," and so forth and that's a very fast route to death, demise and decay see?

So the thing to do is to know the words and to stay alert. That's the motto one reads out of this thing. An, you'll find out there's always some new technology being boiled up someplace. Well, be curious enough to find out about it, see? Stay alert, never become complacent about what you know, and you'll go right on surviving very nicely.

Now, this is particularly true of somebody who get up to a point of eminence or prominence, somebody who moves up to a point where he is superior to the ordinary or more average individual in his vicinity; he tends to become very complacent. A fellow is living in the vicinity of the natives of Ugga-Bugga, and he can read and they can't. Well, he feels very superior so he really doesn't even bother to read.

Do you see? Now, if Scientology faces any danger, it is that danger of stultifying because they no longer believe they have to observe, no longer have to apply; no longer have to get on the ball.

Now, you want to know what's the difference between the successful individual and the unsuccessful individual: It is just that one can understand and do, and the other one doesn't understand or does—there are two ways of not understanding, as I've just told you. One is to suppose you know all about it so you don't have to observe—that's one method of not understanding; and the other is just not know the words, you see? Those two extremes are there. So the individual doesn't understand; in other words, he doesn't understand so he quits trying; or he understands all there is—he thinks—and so doesn't bother to observe. Now, those two actions there amalgamate into a fellow who—either one of them—who is going to fail. This individual is going to go by the boards.

Now, who won't go by the boards, then? Well, it's somebody who can observe and understand and do, a person can observe and understand and do.

Now, in view of the fact that the greatest body of observation is actually secondhand observation, realize that that is perfectly valid observation when coupled with understanding. But that is particularly and peculiarly liable to having to be understood. Now, the less direct the observation, then the greater the understanding has to be. In other words, your understanding has to increase to the degree that you're not directly observing. Understanding has to increase in the degree that the observation is indirect. If your observation of a tree is indirect, you'd better jolly well understand about that tree pretty confounded well. As a matter of fact, much better, oddly enough, than if you were standing there looking at it.

Now, understanding, then, is a substitute for mass, and you have the answer to understanding in ARC. Understanding adds up to ARC. In study, understanding is a substitute for mass.

Now let's go over that again: If you haven't got a tree to observe and you are being told about a tree, then you'd better jolly well understand what you're being told, otherwise you're going to misobserve the tree. Now, if you don't understand what you are being told about the tree, or you don't understand how the information is being relayed to you about the tree, you will wind up not understanding a tree and have been denied that mass because the information [was] received on a via. Do you follow this?

This is very complex material I'm giving you here, but it is quite useful. If you haven't got a tree to look at then you jolly well—if you are trying to study about trees on a second relay, then you damn well better understand that second relay.

Now, there are two things to understand about what you're being told, or what you are reading, or what your secondhand observation is. See, secondhand observation can be after the fact because of time, too, you understand that? You say, "There must have been a tree here because here is a stump," you know? "And there's going to be a tree here because here is a sprout." Do you see that? Your understanding also can go forward and backward in time, and it can be direct or indirect in terms of view. So understanding can be direct or indirect in terms of view. You can be there looking at the tree, or somebody can be telling you about the tree. There's actually several different understandings all in a packet.

Now, that's not our purpose, right now, to examine how many types and brands of understanding there are, but I'm just warning you on this fact with regard to study, and this is the only point I'm really trying to make to you. The others are just window dressing and cake frosting. It's interesting, the whole subject is very interesting, but it's this: If you are not observing something directly—if you are reading about trees, you got that?—you're not observing it directly, then your understanding has to be superior to the understanding which would be required in a direct observation. You've got to understand it better, otherwise you're going to lose yourself a tree.

Now, this is quite interesting because the difficulties of secondhand information are innumerable. You've got four men trying to describe an elephant, four blindfolded men that have felt all over an elephant and they're trying to describe this elephant, or whatever that old saw was, don't you see? And the wise men that give you all the dope of what an elephant is all about, you know, and they didn't observe the elephant because they were blindfolded and they gave the most wild dissertations on what this elephant was.

So now, let's realize that part of our understanding when we are engaged in secondhand observation, which is to say, study on a via or something—we are engaged upon this—then our understanding must include an evaluation of the reliability of the information we are being given. You follow that? Our understanding must include the understanding of whether this is good dope or bad dope, whether this is the straight data or this is data with a curve. In other words, we have to be capable of evaluating the truth of the relayed observation. Understanding, then, must include that.

And there is where the bulk of sentient beings (I won't just say man, because there are other sentient beings) fall down, and there is where they get crosswise, there is where they really have a time.

I'll give you a marvelous example: There are people walking all over the place today, and so on and so on, and they think that everything in the field of the mind is all cared for. "See, when a little child was three years old, why, he got excited about something or other, he's been sick, and that's why he's in the insane asylum; and doctors understand all about this, and everybody understands it and so forth, and the—yah, yah, yah, the problem's all cared for."

Well, we're in that state of the civilization where they're not only saying "We know," they're also saying "Somebody else knows and we don't have to know." Hey, hey, what's this? What kind of apathy is this? We don't even have to know anymore. It's all right that somebody else someplace knows, that there are some authorities someplace on this subject.

I quote Eisenhower. He always depended on having an authority. The best source of information was always an authority on the subject and he never did anything without he consulted an authority, and it went along with this that he didn't have to know a blessed thing about anything.

There was never even a communication Signal Corps unit to keep him advised on moments of national crisis or anything else when he was out playing golf or anything. There was no information lines ever run through this man. He got his national policies out of News week. He did! He'd gotten to a point of where the expert was a newspaper reporter. Well, I admit newspaper reporters are pretty good, and they all think that if left up to them they can straighten everything out in a minute; but it seems rather interesting to have newspaper reporter policy being the dominant policy of a nation. They might really be trying to sell soap, you see? It might be motivational research entering in here, see? He couldn't really trust that piece of information.

So part of your understanding is what you're understanding, the falsity or correctness of your data sources or what you're trying to understand.

So study has as part of it comprehension of the accuracy of your source of information, and you've got to have some idea of that. And that's an experiential line itself. You say, "Well, this fellow tells me what he believes to be true, and if he no longer believes it to be true or if he finds something else is true, why, he will tell me." Something like that.

You say, "All right. Well, that's that source of information, and that's a good source of information. There's this other source of information, if he tells me something, why, he's just confoundedly certain that he's got to shove it down my throat in some particular line. It might



be right and it might be wrong, but he will continue to tell me just because he has to be right.”  
Something like this, you see?

For instance, I’ve just gotten through three textbooks—three textbooks—written by a professor at Columbia University who never had a color film in his hand in his life, I’m sure, who was writing on color photography. I had to study these and I had to know my business. I was going to be examined on this. I shot more color film than this man ever heard of. But here was a case where I had to study something to get a grade. I understood that; see, I understood the fact that I had to study this in order to get a grade. You get the subtlety, then, of the study that went on.

Also began to be understood this guy loved to show off. He loved to show off. He would introduce some 90-dollar word of a technical nature, which wasn’t included in any dictionary, into the middle of a sentence where it didn’t have to be. Oh! Boy, if that doesn’t throw you! Now, right in the middle of that sentence you’ve got a word like colored couplers. He says, I quote, “We are now going to introduce a new term, colored couplers, which I will explain later.” He never explained it. You look up in the photographic dictionary. What is this thing, a colored coupler? You can’t find it. It’s not in there. You look everywhere and you can’t find it. What are you supposed to do? Just lie down and die at this point? No, your understanding has to embrace the fact that the silly ass didn’t know what he was talking about, if nobody can define it Well, maybe someplace somebody’s going to define it but it includes you don’t have to know what it is in order to continue.

Now, that is also a very interesting thing to do because you go past one of these points of understanding and you know you’re going to have trouble; but part of study is to know the technology of study and to know if you start developing a headache in the next half page it’s because you didn’t understand that word. Do you understand?

In other words, your understanding of understanding can get very subtle indeed. You can get very, very tricky. You are reading about the engineering works of the early Egyptians, which have been written by a modern engineer who is also a lecturer at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and should have been flunked for English. He can’t write; maybe he can build bridges, but he can’t write. (If he’s teaching at MIT, he probably can’t build bridges either.) But anyhow, there he is, and you want to learn something about the bridge building of the early Egyptian, see, and this thing is strewn with words that have to do with stresses and strains of various kinds, and torsional —gahhh! And then when he really wishes to be clear, he all of a sudden gives you four paragraphs of solid integral calculus, without giving you what any of the letters he’s using in the integral calculus refer to.

I’ve got a book on color reproduction upstairs, written by some Englishman that did this. Marvelous! You get simultaneous equations, of all things, in calculus, and this is supposed to explain something. Of course, what I did was not worry about the fact that I didn’t understand it, I just laughed in his face via his textbook. In other words, I wasn’t so obsessed on the line that I couldn’t skip it, and I was sufficiently informed on the subject of study that I knew if I ran into a liability of having skipped it, I knew what the liability would be, see, so I could go back and run it out if it got in my road. In other words, I could walk through this bunch of bayonets. Do you understand?

Well, you could get that clever about study.

All right, well, that’s actually going to high school before you get to kindergarten, really, on the subject of study, but I’m showing you about where it extends to. You can get clever enough to read an MIT lecturer’s dissertation, in full panoply of engineering terms, on the bridges of the ancient Egyptians, without actually looking up a single blasted one of his confounded technical terms, and survive right on to the end of the dissertation and—what do you know?—know something about the bridges! Now you’re clever.

The latest editions of the Encyclopedia Britannica require this as a fine art, because all they're doing is showing off to the people of the profession. They've been so criticized by landscape architects for their articles on landscape architecture that they now have written a professional piece on landscape architecture. Nobody can understand it but a landscape architect. Well, a landscape architect isn't ever going to look it up in the Encyclopedia Britannica. And that applies to nearly all of their very professional dissertations. They've changed their style.

The modern style is to become incomprehensible and to say somebody else knows about it, and then try to impress it and leave it all skipped and then, you know, say, "Well, if you're not an expert you're nothing, and there are experts around, so we're all perfect . . ." It's all kind of a mish-mash—decadence is what you're really looking at.

I use an old 1890 edition. You read about landscape architecture in the old 1890 edition, and it knew it was written for some fool that didn't know their nomenclature, see? You can find out what you want to know; but later editions, you can't. Soon that 1890 edition will become so antique, why, it won't be of any use anymore, and then I won't have any encyclopedia left, see?

I'll have to do something desperate by that time, by—I don't know, substitute for it with some vast library of stuff. Oh, oh, yes! I know. Quentin's getting a whole bunch of textbooks and I'll keep collecting those. I've just solved it. He's getting all kinds of textbooks: The Boy's Book of Electronics, you know? The Boy's Book of something or other. And you open these things up, it's actually "Integral Calculus Made Easy for 6-year-olds," you know? Actually, they're way over his head. I don't know how anybody did that, but he does all right with these things. Crazy business! Yes, they've got a penchant going that it's all right to make it easy for children to understand it, so I can collect a child's library and I'll be all set, that's what I'll do. Maybe the children can't understand it, but I will be able to.

Anyway, sources of information all add up, then, to comprehensibility; and words form the woof and warp of any professional or technical area. Specialized words are used for specialized observations. And we move off into the field of specialized observations, as a specialist, which is perfectly fine. But where you are lightly tapping some field for just a moment's understanding and you collide with specialist vocabulary, you are lost at once.

Now, it gives you an idea at once of the very unserious student of Scientology. One of the first things he does is complain about the nomenclature. Well, frankly, we have less nomenclature than we're entitled to as a specialized field. Because nobody understood anything about the mind, how could they have any vocabulary about it? And they didn't have any vocabulary about it, and if we'd used their lousy vocabulary we would have misunderstood everything because those words meant other things.

So actually, this bird stands around and starts complaining about our vocabulary. Now we know at once that he's not a serious student of Scientology. That's the first thing we know about this person: he's not a serious student of it. He's a dilettante, he wants to hang around the edges and pick up a few scraps. You recognize the brute now? He wants a few scraps. He really doesn't want it, because you've got to sweat for nomenclature; because the nomenclature is carrying with it a specialized understanding; and unless you've got that specialized understanding you will never get the technology.

Now, there's the difference between knowing about something and being a pro. There's a vast difference. And there's many a chap today walking around who is pretending to know a great deal about something, who oddly enough isn't even vaguely educated in that particular field, and so forth. But it's sort of a "thing" to be a sort of a dilettante; that's a modern trend.

For instance, what's a medical doctor but a dilettante in the field of the mind? Very much so! He's just superficial. The effrontery of them! Six hours of lecture they get up here on some hospital alongside of the Thames, as I have mentioned before; and this is their entire

education on the field of the mind. But because they have a general practitioner's license it gives them carte blanche in the field of the mind. It sounds crazy, but it is true. That's what it is. So, the society at large is not—has gotten so dispersed that it doesn't mind calling somebody an authority who doesn't know anything about it at all. Because that is the authority on the field of the mind; he was taught for six hours.

This is their skeleton in their closet, by the way. This is why they raised the devil with us for so many years about how well we were trained, and so forth, and we actually—in any given week an Academy student anywhere in the world was learning more about the mind, in that week, per hours of invested time, than a medical doctor got in his entire career. In one week!

Now, the effrontery of these boobs in trying to tell us this, you know, trying to tell us that we were untrained in the field of the mind and so forth. No, no, we are not untrained in the field of mind; we are practically the only people who are trained in the field of the mind.

Now, there are other fields that are trained in the field of meat, or neurones, or something like this, as in psychology or brain surgery or something. But they are trained in the field of meat, they are not trained in the field of mind. Now, I'll give them that, they are specialists on meat, all right! Somebody gets a bullet in his skull, and so forth, they can probably do something about it. Well, all right. Let's not though pretend, because we can take a bullet out of somebody's skull, that we now know about the mind; because in the first place it didn't go into his mind, it went into his skull. Now, this was a slight difference, you see, in nomenclature.

Now, what I'm trying to bring home to you here is there are various grades at which a subject can be approached. You can approach it as a dilettante: "Oh, well, I know all about painting, yes. Yes, I had a course in art appreciation in junior high school, one whole semester, and the teacher stood up and showed us pieces of lithography on a piece of cardboard, and I got so I could call Rembrandt nearly every time. I got very clever at art appreciation, so I know a great deal about art." Well, that must have consisted of what? One or two or three hours a week, for maybe—I don't know; what's a semester? Sixteen weeks, something like that? Which made a total—he looked at pictures for 50 or 60 hours, and now he's an art specialist. Well, of course, that's better than somebody out in the street that never heard of them; not much, but it's better. But it gives somebody the interesting idea that he now knows something about it, when he doesn't know a ruddy thing about it. It gives him a curious and very dangerous attitude to his own future knowledge. It gives him a false understanding. He now thinks he knows something about it. Now he knows the nomenclature of pictures. He doesn't know anything about art, he's never been taught anything about art. Nomenclature of pictures was what he would know.

It isn't really the amount of time invested that gives you this, although I've been mentioning time. It is more the seriousness with which it is approached. How much do you want to know about this? Do you want to know enough about this so you can talk about it, as would be very common on a Park Avenue debutante, don't you see? She could discuss art—how cute! At her coming-out party, if somebody happened to say "You look like a Madonna," why, she would know they weren't necessarily talking religion, you see? See, art, see?

All right, now let's move a little bit further into the field of art. Now, how seriously do they wish to approach this subject? Do they wish to understand something about this subject so that they just won't appear to be a dummy, or do they want to understand enough about it so as to do something with it? Do they want to know how to use art to decorate a home? That is to say, how do you choose and match and hang pictures and, you know, what do you do with these pictures, you know?

We could go, not necessarily further in that direction, but along another path: A guy wants to know about art because of the threatened inflation of the world, see? Threatened inflation. You can buy land, which isn't very movable, and you can buy gold, if you can get your hands on it and you're not an American citizen, and it will grow in price as the money of the

community inflates. Or you can buy art. And art, today, is big business amongst people who know nothing about it as an artistic activity, but as a financial investment. And you would be amazed how big this business is. Well, does he want to know enough about art so that he knows whether or not the experts are cheating him? That's how far that fellow would want to go, see? He'd have to know enough about art to know who knew about art, so that he couldn't be tripped up in the field of art. Otherwise he'd lose his shirt, you see?

Or do you want to know enough about art to move over into the field and maybe teach people art appreciation? Let's go a little bit further, we'd have to know a little bit more about art, wouldn't we? Now we're getting the lower grade instructional levels. Or do we want to know enough about art so that maybe, if we were very good, we could sit down with a piece of charcoal and a piece of paper and draw a vase with a narcissus in it? Now we say we've started back at the beginning again, because any kid in kindergarten is trying to draw a vase with a narcissus in it. We're back to the area of doingness.

I'll call to your attention that that little kid in kindergarten almost never connects. It's wildly wonderful what comes up, that was supposed to be a vase and so forth, but they have what is called an artistic talent, or they have this or they have that, and nothing is more easily destroyed, because it isn't based on knowledge or understanding. This knack will leave him. It will fly out from underneath his fingers if he does happen to draw something; very easy to trip him up.

A thetan is very naturally creative, but he's actually handling certain media that he doesn't know much about.

Now, you go into this again and you take yourself up a piece of black charcoal, you take yourself a white piece of paper, and you set yourself down to draw a vase. Now your education begins. You know that if you change the position of your paper and the position of your head while you are doing that, you have changed the proportion of the vase. Well now, that takes some knowing, doesn't it? In other words, if you look at a vase close and then draw it for a while, you'll be drawing a big top, let us say, and then you sit back to relax and do the bottom and you've now got a small bottom; big top and a small bottom, and it doesn't look right. But it looked all right to you. Well, your education on the subject of art began at that point: You 'old your 'ead still! "That something has to do with the point I view from, and the distance I view to has something to do with what I'm doing over here on this sheet of paper. Yeah, all right." Now you are heading for the long run, and you actually at that moment have begun the path of becoming a pro. Now, even if you did it for fun, you would still be on the path of becoming a pro.

What's the next thing you're liable to learn on the thing? Well, you're liable to learn that if you draw one-for-one, it's dead easy; but if you try a reduction or an increase in size—that is, if you draw size-for-size, if you draw the vase on your piece of paper the same size as the vase you see on the table, this is pretty lousy easy. But how do you make a one-for-one? Well, you mustn't change the relationship of the paper or tablet to the table. It's easy as that, you see?

Now, most people can't draw still life's for very interesting technical reasons: They are trying to do a reduction. They are trying to draw a big vase while looking at a little one, or draw a little vase while looking at a big one; and as they shift, they swivel their eyeball from the big vase to the drawn vase; they don't get a one-for-one size. See, they look at a big vase and try to do a little vase, and of course they can't get the proportion because the size is already wrong and this throws them. They don't know the easy route out. They don't know that "My God! That requires all kinds of wild mechanical and mathematical actions to take a big vase and to do a little miniature vase of this big—" oh, man! Now, you are getting creak-creak, see? Ah, dead easy. You set a vase over there and you get your paper here, and you get—so the paper looks now the same size as the vase, and you take out your charcoal and you draw the vase lines which you see there the same size as you see here, you keep your 'ead where it belongs, and you keep your tablet where it belongs, and you keep your vase where it belongs,

and you go scroomp-scroomp, put in a couple of highlights, scroomp. And if you're not shaking with palsy, you will wind up with a nice sketch of a vase.

I'm just showing you there's these little pieces of technology, don't you see? Well, you're now on the route to being a pro.

So you might say that study which winds up only in understanding is not without value, and is a large part of the cultural pattern which a society has. Study with no activity, let me put it that way. You don't intend to do anything about it, you're not going to do anything about it, that's just cute, that's interesting, isn't that nice? A tremendous quantity of the culture in which you live is understood to that degree, and it's nice to know those things, and you've got to know a lot of those things. For instance, you don't have to know how to prepare or do the action of preparing an automobile in order to know about automobiles, see? But you jolly well better know something about the action of repairing automobiles before you start paying somebody to repair the automobiles. In other words, you're at a point of regulated doingness, don't you see? Your understanding of it is sufficient so that you won't get gypped buying a "Mona Lisa" because Joe just bought it yesterday, see?

Now, therefore your understanding widely in life can embrace a great many things which you never intend to do. There's nothing wrong with that. But don't make a habit of that, see? Don't make a habit of that. If you're going down some line, go down some line, see? Don't let some student—let me talk about Scientology for a minute—don't let somebody who walks into your PE, and so forth, keep standing around the edges of it. You'll find out they'll go hold meetings and they will talk endlessly about Scientology, see? They couldn't define an engram if you held a pistol on them, but they'll talk endlessly about Scientology, see? In fact, there are groups all over the place that do nothing else. They never audit, they never go into action of any kind whatsoever. Their command of the subject is merely an interest. Now, this is perfectly all right, perfectly all right, but don't leave them in a state of believing that they now know the subject.

That would be the cruel thing to do to them. They don't, and they get confused to the degree that they think, now, if they do so-and-so and such-and-such, why, then this somehow or another fixes them all up so they know all about it.

Now, it's at that point that a person's education starts to break down, because these people have dropped into what trap? It's just that one trap: "They know all about it, see, so life can go on. Well, they don't know all about it, they don't know your level of understanding of it. My God! You've been grinding away at it, and slamming away at it, and delving in it, and getting comprehension's of it, and so forth, and you know how much there is there to know, man! And this character is saying, "Well, I—" so on.

Well, if you followed through some of his logic, you would be fascinated. If you followed through some of his think and some of his statements and some of his doingnesses on this subject, if he did do anything on the subject, you would practically cave in with laughter at times, because it's so far away from anything you could imagine anybody interpreting anything like that as. It's just a gone proposition.

Somebody will say, "Well, I settled the dog, and I was using Scientology processing and so forth, you know? I beat him." How the hell did we get over there, see? It's that goofy. But to let that person go on believing, now, that he knows all about it so therefore does not have to address it directly and seriously in order to achieve any doingness level in it, would be a very, very cruel thing to do to this person, because he'd just have nothing but a failure. Here's this broad subject which is there, which, if he did it at all properly, would give him results and he could go someplace and he could do something with this, you see? But to have him sit there and think he knows all about it when he doesn't know anything about it, of course is letting him fall into this other category.

Also, to put him in the position where he thinks he can't know anything about it because it's so vast and so difficult is equally cruel, because you've artificially created the two reasons for the demise of an individual or a civilization. You've put him into a state of "He is not only illiterate, but he is going to go right on being illiterate."

"Well, of course only a specialist could know that, and so forth. And I don't see why you're asking for the definition of a word like that, because it really doesn't apply to what you are doing anyway. This is all pretty difficult, you know."

I never follow such an approach. Some guy—if some guy comes up and asks me hostilely about something or other, I can't guarantee what he'll get back. It all depends on how I felt right at that moment. If I felt puckish about it, he's liable to go off packing a headache.

But if somebody asked me, and they really want to know something, of course—you know me—I'd tell them, bang! like that, the best I could. Even though I didn't have any hope of their really understanding what I was talking about, I would still give them anything I could tell them that I hope might assist their information or understanding of it. Always do something for them this way. And usually, if somebody's just asking for information, why, let it go at that; but if they're asking for help and so forth, I always give them something to do—not only give them a piece of information, or an insight into it if I possibly can, but I always give them something to do too, you know? And you'd be surprised how workable this type of an approach is.

Of course, if they ask you something hostilely or be nasty, or something like that, why, just pull the trap, you know? I don't care what you do to them. Nobody demands of you that you be polite. Don't compromise your own communication lines.

The only time I ever get embarrassed, or anybody would get embarrassed, is this person was asking me a silly question which sounded like a hostile question but they really meant it and they were quite serious about it; and then you find yourself immediately in the position of having been very nasty and very mean back, don't you see, when they didn't intend to be. You sometimes can get that one crossed up. That's rather easy to do.

But doingness requires of course much, much, much more understanding than just lookingness. Doingness requires an awful lot of added understanding, and when you go into doing a subject it is sometimes very, very disappointing, your first results, very disappointing. Your understanding wasn't up to match the doingness that you were doing, you see, and so forth. And

what you should learn out of it is that you should understand more about it in order to do it, you see? That's the lesson you should learn; and the lesson you shouldn't learn out of it is "It's just too difficult."

But on some subject lines there is another lesson you could learn, is that it never worked anyway. Oddly enough, I don't think that is applicable except in the upper levels of super education. In the upper levels of super education they've got a lot of stuff that doesn't work but is just hoped for, you know, which they're putting straight across the line. It was never intended to work; it leads to no final result at all. I mean that sounds rather peculiar, but it is true.

It's like doing the equations of aircraft propellers, or buggy whips—about the same category today, propeller aircraft and the buggy whip—with integral calculus, and painfully sketching out all of the various contours and curvatures of aircraft propeller blades, or buggy whip curvatures, with integral calculus. Why would you do such a stupid thing? Why, for instance, learn the tremendous complications of some very esoteric activity, on a doingness basis, which hasn't been used for three centuries, just to do it?

Well, it sometimes doesn't work at all. Sometimes nobody ever did it. That must enter into your calculations, too, when you're going up at that level of things. Maybe nobody ever did it, see? Maybe it's too tough. Maybe it isn't too tough, maybe it just isn't, see? Maybe there is no integral calculus curve to a buggy whip, you know? You could go that far, that silly about it, you see?

This sort of thing is all part of your understanding of the subject of study. Where are you going with this study?

But if you're going up the line with any study on a basis of doingness, you should go up the line on a basis of gradients. And my first lecture to you on this subject had to do with gradients. And you will find the first time the individual's doingness caved in was right after, right after he had hit too steep a gradient. He didn't cave in on the steep gradient, he caved in instantly before he hit the steep gradient. I'll talk to you more in a later lecture about processing people using this exact principle of too steep a gradient. It's quite interesting. But it'll be the gradient that he failed on was the gradient which came after the gradient he hadn't understood. He's one step late in recognizing this thing, see?

Now, what you want to do is give somebody a series of doingnesses on a gradient, that they can do and that they can achieve. And in Scientology you have a rather marvelous thing called a Touch Assist, and it is so workable that some people sort of park right there with the Touch Assist; and that's only one little level of doingness which, if they do, why, it gives them some confidence and they can go on to higher levels of doingness, you see? But it's something like having invented too good a kiddy car. You know, this is too good a kiddy car; and you'll find it's sometimes hard to move people off onto the next step. But a confidence and understanding goes along with the doingness, so a doingness is just another method of achieving understanding. In addition to accomplishing something with it, and so forth, it's also a method of getting understanding. Doingness is a method of achieving understanding. And if you find yourself too bogged and so forth, well, you want to go do some of it, and that sounds rather interesting.

Now, I know, myself; I have just gotten through three books of archaic yesteryear's color films, studying color photography on textbooks that even though they are written by this institution, and so forth, have long since antiquated. They are dead, and there's very little left of the actual materials they are talking about. And it was written by a professor at Columbia University who probably had never done any. And the directions, and so forth, were mostly taken out of the literature released by the companies that manufactured the stuff at the time. And they intended just a happy result which they didn't ever think anybody would have any trouble with.

The net result of this amounted to a tremendously interesting, basic theoretical approach which was absolutely vital to an understanding of a subject, which departed wildly onto a series of doingnesses which were no longer of use and were completely disrelated. So if this wasn't the world's worst mish-mash I ever had anything to do with, I'd like to know about it. A real mish-mash! Here's vital basic technology, basic historical technology, basic put-together, basic chemical technology; all of this stuff is not only true now, it's going to hold true from here on out in this particular field, don't you see? Basics, fundamentals, and so forth.

Well, I got those down with spikes in spite of learning them from a professor. And the next thing, all of a sudden you collide with films you will never shoot, and which you have to know all of the literature concerning. Oh, that's pretty grim, because in the first place I have already learned that a manufacturer's table of use on the subject of any piece of film, much less color film, is something that you carefully don't litter the street with. You put it in the garbage can. See? It's useless! Forget it! He isn't the user of the film in the first place. He's the seller of the film; not just its manufacturer, but he's selling this stuff, so he wants to put a very happy face on it. So he says its speed rating is up in the stars, when it isn't. And he says

it won't do this, when it does. And all of this stuff, and how this stuff is handled, and all of this—not even germane.

Why would anybody have even included it in a text in the first place? He already knew that color was an advancing field. It was advancing so rapidly that to expect of the individual, without modernizing the text, that he would have to know all about auto chrome—haven't had any auto chrome since 1920. It didn't even take a picture then. Whoever heard of this stuff? Well, it's nice to know that they had some film like this and what its basic theory is, but now to go and get the lens stops and settings for auto chrome—oh, come now! Well, what lens stops and settings for auto chrome? In a camera system, perhaps, that isn't even used anymore. That's just gobbledy-gook then, isn't it? Well, your understanding has to embrace this fact, and you somehow or another have to survive through the subject and still retain intact the basic technology and the vital fundamentals of the subject which you have learned, without being so upset about the later enturbulences which you got into, because that's now been overridden.

Now, you are all faced with that merely because of the advancing line of Scientology. I've just experienced it in the wildest way possible. The third book was totally devoted to printing methods, and I wouldn't be seen dead in a color darkroom anyway. See, I—blue! Who wants to doodle-daddle like that, see? Well, there are lots of guys around that like to doodle-daddle like that, and I'm happy there are because they're going to do all of my doodle-daddling! All I have to know in that is also an understanding of what I have to know. I haven't got the time or the inclination to spend 40 or 50 hours on a salon exhibition print to get it registered properly. I haven't got the time or the inclination. Who would do such a thing? One of these doodle-daddlers. They'd work happily! Marvelous, couldn't live without it! Don't you see? Well, I have to know enough to know whether or not they know what they are doing.

That's, once more, an understanding of what I need the information for, an understanding of what I'm going to use this information at, an understanding of its value and precision; understanding of what I have to have out of it. It's an understanding of what do I want; it's an understanding of the proper, practical use or application of this information; and if it's for drawing-room conversation, you would study it entirely differently. If you were studying art for drawing room conversation but not commercially, I assure you the thing to do is to get ahold of a catalog that was published at some outrageous long date ago, that lists all sorts of painters of the period of van Dyck, or something like this, and get all the contemporaries, see, get all of those and what they were noted for, you see, and memorize—just grind, grind, grind, like you're memorizing an amateur play script—all of this stuff, you see, and so forth. Drawing-room conversation: kill everybody dead! They say something about 17th century painters, you know, and you say, "Like van der Dobin."

And they say, "What?"

You say, "Yes, van der Dobin."

In other words, you can play one-upmanship with this thing, see? Mow 'em down, you know? "Well, Hobbema, after all—too blue."

And everybody says, "Gee, boy! He's in the know."

So anyway, the nonsense that you could run that one into in the various lines is still included under the heading of "What are you going to use this information for?" What degree do you have to know even inside one single subject?

Now, of course, some of the teachers I had on the subject of antisubmarine warfare were busy teaching me how to build (how to build, if you please! There was a war going on. I didn't have any time to build anything. I tried to explain it to them) a QCB-I antisubmarine electronic echo device—an asdic. "QCB-I. This is the way it is built."



Fortunately, it was a lovely, lovely warm classroom, and I was shipped for a very short time down into the south of Florida to learn about this sort of thing and that's one of the things they taught me, and boy, was I able to catch up on my sleep; because I just knew somehow that out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, with my hands full of Jap submarines, I was not going to have to build one of these things. I was merely going to have to know how to use it and at most repair it, and to know when it was in operation, when it was out of operation. I figured that would be about all, in the middle of action, that I would be able to need. That's all I would need to know about that equipment, so I had myself a nice sleep.

But the evaluation of what you want it for, how are you studying it, which direction it's going, and so forth, is all part and parcel to the whole subject of study. And if it is not included in the field Of study, why, your use of the information is minimal, and you can become very stultified, and you can become very horrified, and you can hang up on a lot of words and things that are getting in your road and upsetting you and that you don't understand. And you get into an obsessive "I've got to understand everything I read perfectly or I will hang up," and this is taught to you by the fact that if you don't understand what you read, a half a page later you're going to get a headache. Well, you also must include the idea that after you've read that half a page more and gotten a headache, that you've now got to be smart enough to know there was something back of you, find out what it was, spot it, get it out of the road. Say, "Yeah, that's a word I don't know," and go on reading.

In other words, in order to study, you've got to have a lot of the technology of study, or the use of the information which you are getting is going to be minimal.

Now, I've given you a lot of stuff in this lecture today that is largely theoretical, and that sort of thing. All of this, however, has very practical applications, and it has a practical application to what you are doing right now. So having increased your grades very, very nicely after every one of these, why, please increase your grade again.

Thank you very much.