

Tone Scale, Effect Scale

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 8 April 1959

Thank you.

Today we have some very interesting material – material that has a great deal of meat in it. To pick up all the material you're going to get in this hour's lecture is probably humanly impossible, but who said you were human?

All right. Title of this lecture is *Scales*.

Now, it's all very well to anatomize, compartmentize, legalize and lawfulize and dissect life in all of its parts.

Along with Scientology there's a spirit of advance, of liveness, of doingness, of hope, of future.

And when you are studying these bare bones, remember that it takes a certain livingness to clothe them. It takes an intelligence to use them, but above that it takes a livingness to clothe them.

All things proceed from livingness. This is very true of scale. A scale, intelligently used, is a wonderful yardstick. But like arithmetic, you must remember that two apples plus two apples may equal four apples, but the fact itself is not going to do anything for anybody. You have to apply these scales to cases, to people, to things.

Now, I told you that the livingness aspect of Scientology is very great. As a matter of fact, that is tremendously true. When we break down a Central Organization or a clinic into too much straight doingness, without order, we have a confusion, right? But similarly, we can actually order the thing practically out of existence. That's something to know, you know?

You could get so much order into an army that it would never fight. That's true. When battle is joined, it is only the individual's initiative which whips the enemy from the point that battle is joined. Good planning, good foresight, a certain amount of generalship and organization and logistics and so forth all go into the winning of that battle. But once it is joined, the order goes to pieces. It's only livingness that brings about victory. It's the will to do, the will to apply, the will to use. Don't you see?

Similarly in business, you can do anything you want to in business to guarantee a wonderful order and success and proper invoicing and that sort of thing. But basically all a business consists of is the willingness of people to work.

When people are no longer willing to work, you don't have any business anymore. When people are no longer willing to be citizens of a nation, there's no longer any nation. The moment slavery enters – the moment total slavery enters, you haven't got anything – just nothing. Because with slavery, why, the willingness goes out totally.

Now, I want you to remember two things: that these scales are true, that they do apply to life. And unless you clothe them with some sensibility, unless you can use them while you're processing somebody, unless you can intelligently apply them and know where they begin and where they end and know enough to use your own good sense too, well, you'll find them very useful – otherwise you won't. They're just nice mathematical arrangements that are very pretty.

Now, these scales were gained from an observation of livingness. And the first scale was the ARC Chart of Human Evaluation that you find in Science of Survival. And that chart is just as true today as the day it was written.

It's a fabulous thing that we have so many constants. It's a rather surprising thing. When people go around and tell you that we change our minds all the time, those people don't know. They really don't know what we haven't changed our minds about. And we really haven't changed our minds about any fundamentals.

We are still trying to crack the same problems that were observed years ago. And we're only advancing in the direction of a simplicity of application. How do we handle those things? And it might surprise you that the ARC triangle was formulated in July of 1950. It was in fall of that year when that Chart of Human Evaluation was written. There's never been any reason to change any line of it anywhere.

That's been with us a long time and it is the primary yardstick that you use to evaluate not only preclears, but processes. When processes violate the ARC triangle, the definitions of ARC, the interrelationships of ARC and when they do not improve a preclear up the ARC scale, they're no good. A process that doesn't do this is worthless.

Now, ARC is a triangle, interrelated, and to move any part or corner of this triangle, it is only necessary to move one or two of the other parts of the triangle. To change any corner of the triangle, you need only change any other corner of the triangle.

Therefore, to change human beings, all you really need to know, to know whether you've changed them or to know how you've changed them, is that ARC is the basis on which they operate.

Now, I can give you some brand-new rules with regard to communication, some brand-new rules with regard to reality, a brand-new Reality Scale, new definitions of affinity. These things all exist, but none of them violate this basic concept of ARC. It is very stable and very standard.

A is affinity. Affinity – lot of people think of affinity as love. Well, maybe it is but affinity also includes hate. You might say it is any attitude, particularly emotional. Affinity. It is monitored by the consideration of distance, it's monitored by identification. Two things occupying the same space are generally considered to be in affinity. Total affinity. But that's a

total identification, isn't it? And you find that a fellow in jail does not like being in jail. So it isn't the final criteria of likingness to be occupying the same space as.

There are many considerations which monitor this thing affinity. Affinity probably even at this late date is the least known of these three corners of this triangle. Probably still the least known. A tremendous amount is known about it, but more could be known. And that probably will be the case for the next few millennia so we're not going to strain at it. We know so much about it now that we can use it easily and that's all that counts.

Now, under the heading of affinity, we actually have the emotional tones. Why do we call these things tones? Tones had to do with physics, they had to do with vibration, they had to do with corresponding vibrations – things like this in the physical sciences. And from this we sort of get the idea of tone. It's as good a word as any other word, but it merely means a condition.

Now, the Emotional Scale really belongs under the heading of affinity but is best located by communication and reality, the other two corners. But we can directly express this Emotional Scale and, as time has gone on, it has achieved things above and below its level.

The original scale had at 4.0, which you'll find in Science of Survival, enthusiasm; at 3.5, conservatism; 2.5 you'd find boredom, 2.0 you found antagonism, 1.5 you found anger, 1.1 you found covert hostility, but at 1.0 you had fear. At 0.5 you had grief and at 0.1 you had apathy. Zero of that scale is death.

Now, it's tremendously interesting that, looking at the center of the scale, that there was more scale to be looked at. There's a zero Tone Scale. A thetan can go down scale from being a body. Now, we said zero – meaning death – that's actually body death. And a thetan can very easily go below body death.

He goes off into forgettingness when he goes below this level very far. But as we go over these levels – there's a correction on that scale, that's 3.0 at conservatism according to the old books. When we go very far here, we discover that a person can very easily be below apathy. And this was a great discovery in 1954 – a very great discovery – because people would get apathetic under processing and we thought we were making them worse. We weren't, we were making them better. They had to come up to apathy. And there are many engrams and many incidents that you run on a pc that he'll run like a little piece of wood.

And you just run him, you know, run him, run him, no emotion, no emotion. You should realize where he is. He is either clear up at the top or he is below apathy. And this wooden response of the pc is something you must beware of. Any individual who is woodenly responding, with no change on the Affinity Scale, is not improving. You have made a mistake. You have chosen the wrong terminal. You have done something incorrect. Because all change in a pc is monitored against this *Chart of Human Evaluation*, the ARC scale.

Now, let's go below 0.0 here and take a look. In *Scientology 8-80* we find minus 0.2, being other bodies. Well, we'd say at once that's out of valence. Another identity than his own; being another body. He's in one body and he's being another body. Minus 1.0, punishing other bodies – that's a big game. Minus 1.3, responsibility as blame. Minus 1.5, controlling bodies – total fixation on just controlling bodies, lots of them and so forth. We saw this in Hitler's regime and so forth. The total anxiety was just controlling bodies – no reason, just a

big anxiety about controlling bodies. You know, they're liable to do anything or fly out – arms are liable to fly off or something of the sort.

Minus 2.2, we have protecting bodies. Minus 3.0, we have owning bodies, minus 3.0 – that's old body in pawn and that sort of thing – we find that sort of thing. Minus 3.5, approval from bodies. Minus 4.0, needing bodies and minus 8.0, hiding. And from there on down, it's hiding.

Now, all of those states occur below death. A thetan can be alive below body death. That's what you should realize and when you reach most of the aberrations on cases you'll find these people below body death.

So let's add in our very latest Tone Scale here and we find that we have minus 1.3, responsibility as blame – is what it says here. There is an emotion, there is a new emotion at that. There's also another emotion at 1.0, another emotion at 0.2 and another emotion at 0.0 which you can spot since we're running processes today and you'll be running processes in this course which turn on these peculiar and particular emotions.

And we've for a long time known about shame, blame and regret. Shame, blame, regret.

All right, at 0.0, we have failure. It's an emotion. It's just a little bit below apathy. It's a realization that one has failed. And you know that's awfully high for some people around? They'd have to go way up scale to realize they failed.

You'll notice this in processing. After you've processed a terminal with him for quite a while, they will – it'll come up as a big cognition. They'll say – even you will – you'll say, "Well, I come up to – I realize now that I failed. I failed to help my mother or I failed somehow or another." And it's a sort of a feeling.

All right. Blame is a very interesting thing, it's simply punishing other bodies. You find that one at [minus] 1.0 blame. And it's not just a state of postulate. There is an emotion that goes along with blame – one feels blamingly at something. It's part of the Emotional Scale, these – man hadn't well spotted these things before.

Now, minus 1.3 is responsibility as blame which we get as regret. [There is a](#) great deal to know about regret. Regret is what inverts the time track. One wishes it hadn't happened and so he tries to collapse the track on the point. This is an old observation. Actually, overt acts collapses the track, but the emotion of regret is experienced at that level and it's an actual emotion.

Now, how about minus 0.2, which is being other bodies? That's shame. There is an emotion of shame connected with being other bodies. One is ashamed to be oneself. He is somebody else because – and when you start to get him to be himself, he's ashamed of it.

Now, these little emotions here – regret is the lowest one we have as a true emotion, as minus 1.3. The next one, blame, minus 1.0. Minus 0.2 is shame and 0.0 is failure.

Somewhere in the vicinity of 0.1 to 0.05 – that's a zone – is apathy. There's another emotion here at 0.375 – these are arbitrary numbers but they give you the multiples and harmonics of the thing – is making amends, which is propitiation. You very often get a preclear

up to propitiation. He tries to give you his house and his car and tries to give you this and that. Well, you want to watch out because day after tomorrow, he'll want them all back.

At 0.5, we have grief. At 0.8, we have a higher propitiation. He – at 0.375, making amends, why, he just can't withhold anything, you see, but he can selectively give things at 0.8. 0.9 we have sympathy, 1.0 we have fear, 1.2 we have an emotion called no sympathy. "I'll not give them any no... any sympathy," you know? "*Rurrrrr; rurrrrr; rurrrrr.*" It's an emotion and it goes along with this. 1.5 we have anger, 1.8 pain, 2.0 antagonism, 2.5 boredom, 3.0 to 3.5 is conservatism, 4.0 enthusiasm, 8.0 exhilaration and clear up at 40.0 we have serenity of beingness. And you'll find a lot of people who are serene apparently and after you process them for a while, they start regretting it.

Now, this brings up the subject on this particular Emotional Tone Scale, it brings up the subject of harmonics. And these numbers are here more or less to give the space apart these emotions are or to give an index to their possible vibration because they are a motion. *A* motion – motion and emotion. They are *a* motion and that is why I suppose they are called an emotion. They're a little wavelength. They have a certain flavor and a taste. And people get all confused on these things because they'll hit the lower harmonic, and they think they're on the upper one. So that a person can very often – this – you'll discover often in processing people – they finally will find out what boredom is.

They always thought boredom was apathy. When they felt apathetic, they felt they were bored. But they get up scale and they eventually get to 2.5 and they say, "Well, I know what boredom is. Boredom is – well, that's a new emotion." You see, they haven't experienced that before and they thought that apathy was boredom.

Similarly there isn't too much difference between anger and conservatism, Anger is a really no move out, no move in. True anger is a sort of a hate hold, you see? And we get up to conservatism and we don't get anybody doing anything for us either.

True anger, no real action happens. Anger is a dispersal. It doesn't make much sense but it's a ridge.

Hate we call it when it's a total ridge and we move just a little bit above 1.5 and just a little bit below 1.5 and we get a dispersal of some kind. We either get a violent implosion or explosion. But at just exactly at 1.5 we have a total ridge which is hate. It's solid.

And so this whole scale goes between ridges and flows. You've got to know a great deal about ridges and flows because you'll be working with them.

What is a ridge? Well, I don't know; what's a wall? It's a standing, apparent motionlessness of some kind or another. An apparent solidity, an apparent no outflow, no inflow, you see? That's a ridge. And a flow, well, just think of a trickle of water flowing along and you'll get a flow. Flows have direction, ridges have location. And you'll find that some of these are flows and some of them are ridges. Some of them are very fixed, some of them are very fluid.

Fear, for instance, is a very interesting thing. A person in fear is doing a terrific inflow and is trying to get out. That is the emotion of fear.

Now, that may sound to you for a moment a little bit technical and far beyond it, but you'll see all these manifestations in a preclear. You'll see him sitting, rurrh and then you

process him for a little while and he's talking again and he's hearing you again and then after a while, he goes *hmnn*. And he's just going up scale between ridges and flows.

Now, the lower we go on this scale, the more condensed things get. The closer they are together. It's a sort of a geometric progression, you see? So that you can be into the apathy area and have other emotions sort of apparently turning on. You're getting down so low here and things are so close together, that various little aspects of apathy turn on, and there are probably a great many of them. I had one – somebody say one time, "the anger of apathy." He was apathetically angry and he was boredly angry and so forth. He – in other words, these things can become compounded but they're only compounded very low on the scale.

Well, that's because we're working downhill toward a total identification. All emotions are no emotion. If you go into an insane asylum and shop around, you'll find that the biggest complaint is that nobody can experience any emotion anymore. That is the biggest single complaint of people who are psychotic. Can't experience emotion. Well, all emotions are one emotion. It's all kind of solid and it's all kind of flowing and it's all kind of nothing and they don't feel anything from it and it's pretty wooden. Now, that's their biggest complaint. As we go up scale we get greater and greater fluidity. And if you think that a person at – is going to get stuck at 4.0 and will after that only be enthusiastic, you have another thought coming. As a person goes up scale he becomes looser and looser on the scale, don't you see? It's only people low on this scale who are totally stuck.

Now, you try to process an apathetic preclear sometime and you'll find out that he's very hard to get out of a total apathy. It'll take you an hour or two of hard slugging to move him anywhere at all or get anything – you throw in a big ARC break which triggers some apathy. Something like this and then you try to get him out of this. Oh, it's real grim, real grim.

What's he doing? What's the matter with him? Well, it's because the lower he goes on the scale, the more fixed he gets, the less likely he is to change. So that your toughest case, of course, is low on the scale and as you start getting a person up the scale, he changes more and more readily. The upper part of the scale is quite flexible.

Now, there's the mockery of harmonics that you must beware of, just as I've been explaining to you here. You're all out to make the human race better. Perfectly worthy action, a perfectly good, clean fourth dynamic. And then you see some spinning psycho who is out to save the human race. He's a sort of a total criticism of everything you're doing.

I had a horrible experience one time. I was already involved, actually, in doing something about a governmental program. The government had asked actually for a suggestion and I was involved making a suggestion. And a psychotic walked up to me, totally non sequitur, but possibly hitting some kind of a harmonic of what I was thinking about because if there's anybody in telepathy it's a psycho. People who are in total telepathy are either the total bottom of the scale or the total top of the scale, you understand? At the top, they don't make mistakes; at the bottom, they don't know who's talking to them. That's the difference. And he walked up to me and he was all set to save that particular nation and government and he was going on and on how I had to do something for him so he could save it all. And you know, I felt as cheap as a broken up halfpenny. I just – I just felt, you know, I must be nuts thinking I could help this government and so forth and it took a little while for me to kind of shake it off. It's a

mockery. It's a mockery. You have to watch that because there is no emotion or state of mind that is sane that cannot fixedly and singly become an insanity.

All insanity is, is a specialization of; and a total exclusion of all else, of just one point of sanity. You might say every insane person is totally sane to such an extremity that nobody can stand it.

Now, there is no sane manifestation that you will not find in an insane asylum. And every person you find in an insane asylum is manifesting something that maybe in another environment, another place would be totally sane.

See there are no special characteristics which are insane characteristics. This is the lesson that psychiatry never learned. And so they could never diagnose. And it stayed as a total barrier across all of their diagnosis and assessments of people. They thought there was a peculiar thing called insanity and a bunch of states of mind which were insane. No, there are a bunch of specialized sane states of mind which, sufficiently specialized, drive a person straight around the bend. Got the idea?

I'll give you an idea. This individual is sympathetic. Now, there's nothing wrong with being sympathetic but this individual is totally sympathetic. He is 100 percent sympathetic and he is only sympathetic about earthworms. Of course he's crazy. Get the idea? And all you have to do is superspecialize a sanity, compartment it and totally fixate it. Get all the intention [attention] units of the person totally fixed on this one point of sanity and you have an insane person.

Similarly, you can find – you can find an insane person almost anywhere on this scale if he's totally fixed on the scale, but if you look at him carefully, he will be on one of the lower harmonics of the scale. You see, he falls away from the sane expression and he goes down scale and he only expresses an insane version. Got the idea?

Don't look for a special thing called insanity. Just look for totally fixed sanities and you've got it, you see? Naturally, the fellow who takes a piece of paper and puts it on every door knob that he opens and won't touch a door knob, is doing a sane thing – maybe in a leper colony. But he's doing it everywhere, don't you see? And you say, 'Well, that fellow's pretty batty.' You're absolutely right, the time and place is wrong. But a person who is totally fixed has no time and place, you see? And that's how he can be so insane.

We get into the whole subject of attention units, the whole idea of attention units. A person's total attention is on one thing or on a very few things. And he can't span his attention easily. He has no breadth.

Now, I talked about the dynamics – his attention withdrew off the various dynamics and inverted on them and became very fixed. Similarly, with this Tone Scale his attention can be fixed along with these various emotions. And he gets one emotional response: everything is bad. Or, the way to do everything is to protect bodies. See, he's just totally fixed. He's just going to protect bodies.

You'll find that if you work this out yourself, you could work out quite an insanity that a person could go through simply protecting bodies. You know, he could insist that everybody stand in the middle of the street very still with concrete walls around them. Then the body

would be totally protected, you see? Try to make this into a law, or something like that. You'd say this fellow would be totally batty.

Well, actually people in societies have gone totally batty on the track with this and we call it bodies in pawn. They put everybody's body in a can and put some preservative fluid in on top of it. Quite interesting. You run pcs back down the track. I am responsible for what I have seen on the track and where my responsibility exists, it exists. But I'm darned if I know why anybody would want to be responsible for setting up bodies in pawn or even carrying mock-ups of it around.

What you find on the total track is not necessarily what you were taught in the best academic textbooks of this century. Man has been a lot of wild things. You'll find it, but you'll find various insanities, whole cultures practicing insanities which are just sanities carried to a total extreme – low on this Tone Scale.

Thus, you have a good method here of understanding. And ARC always adds up only to understanding. Did you ever hear an angry man tell the truth? I don't think you ever did. Well, his reality is very poor.

Now, it falls away from an angry man down into the lower parts of this thing. What do you think the reality of somebody is lower on the scale than an angry man? Well, it's pretty poor. And the reality goes fight along with the A. The emotion he experiences is hand in glove with the reality he conceives.

So if he's in total propitiation all the time at 0.8 or can't hold back anything of any kind from anybody – he's just above apathy – what do you think his reality on almost anything is? It's almost gone. It's nothing that you would call reality.

Now, fortunately for us, his communication level follows the same course. The communication level follows this same course of the reality and the affinity. And you get this triangle, A-R-C, being all in a plane. A-R-C, at any given level. And if you can find what a person's reality is independently on things, you would know, of course, what his affinity is and you can estimate his communication. You listen to a person's communication, you will know – that is, whether he can or can't, how he handles communication – and you will know at once what his affinity is and what his reality is.

And that's just about the biggest doggone fact that you'll run into in estimating cases. It is so tremendous that a Scientologist practiced at this can talk to a person for about five minutes and slap him on the Tone Scale and predict his future behavior just zip.

A wonderful exercise is take the Chart of Human Evaluation out into the society, call on a bank, call on a greengrocer, talk to a policeman, stop a casual pedestrian. Listen to the communication and look at them on the Tone Scale; see about where they are. You won't have to go into very much examination of their past, present and future life to know what they're doing, what they think, what they react to, what they like, what would be their solution to any given problem.

Until you do this knowingly with this ARC triangle and the Chart of Human Evaluation, you sometimes have a very bad time. And you have a very bad time because somebody is talking. Obviously this person is talking. You ask him a question and he answers it. And

you say this fellow is all right. But if you were a little more experienced when you asked the question, "Now, Mr. Jones, how many feet is it from the top of the monument there down to the walk?" and he said, "Five hundred and seventy-five" promptly, you could make the mistake of merely saying, "Well, this fellow knew his business. The other fellow didn't know. He's not in too bad a shape."

Now you ask Mr. Smith, you say, "Well, Mr. Smith, what is the distance from the top of this monument down to the pavement?"

"Well, now, let me see. Uhmhhh, I think – huhhhh-well, uh-huhmm, hummm – I don't like to be inaccurate about this, but uh, well, it says somewhere in the guidebook here... Why do you want to know that?" Fellow's sane but he's not in very good shape.

Now, what if you said to Mr. Snide, you said, "Mr. Snide, how far is it from the top of the monument down to the pavement?" And he said, "Hmhhhhh. Very few cats wear green ribbons." You'd know you were dealing with somebody who was batty. But it escapes your attention when they are almost on the line.

"Mr. Georges, how many feet is it from the top of the monument down to the pavement?"

"Hmhhhhh, that pavement is terribly hard isn't it?" It's almost an answer. And you listen to people talking to people sometime and you'll find the one in the – in the group that causes the most trouble, answers the least directly and is the most non sequitur. The communication isn't hitting.

Now, here's an example where you can see the communication showing up the reality factor directly. What's the reality factor of Mr. Georges about the monument? That you fall off the top of monuments, of course. That's his reality factor on monuments. That's kind of a funny reality factor, you come to look it over.

Some students in some classes, time to time, have gone out and talked to people on the street and have asked them certain questions just to test their communication lag and so on. One of them ran into a very well-known commentator one day. Student hasn't read his column since. The guy's stark, staring mad. He couldn't talk, he couldn't answer questions, he was over the hills and far away and actually in direct contact, he knew from nothing. This is quite interesting and yet this fellow very wisely informs a large part of the world what to think on political subjects. It's all chop, it's all very snide, it's all very mean, but it's obviously information. But having talked to him and listened to his communication level, we don't know what his reality is on all that now. We just haven't a clue. And we – you'd dare say that his information is usually false. There's something wrong with that information. Reality level is too poor to actually pick up an observation because as the communication goes out, with difficulty, so it has difficulty coming in.

And we run into another scale and that is called the Effect Scale. Now, the Effect Scale is about the briefest scale there is. Now, although I've just gone over the ARC scale, don't you go forgetting it. And in Science of Survival there's that Chart of Human Evaluation. And the use of that scale directly in processing is with a modern process, if the worst PC you has doesn't raise one tone level totally in ten days of auditing, boy, are you losing.

A good PC will raise one tone level on the Chart of Human Evaluation in about one or two days of auditing – the whole behavior of the pc. You understand? They're very important. That's how you evaluate success – the emotional tones and changes. And they change in just that order, not some other order.

All right, so let's get on to this Effect Scale. This is a way of gauging the ARC scale – is gauging the pc and measuring how much effect you're having on the pc. But when you start to measure how much effect you'd have on the pc let's not you make the mistake of being yourself upside down on the Effect Scale. The only people who never produce any results in auditing are haywire, upset, all out of gear, mishmashed on the Effect Scale.

What is the Effect Scale? Very handy scale. At the top of the scale, the individual can receive or give, or not receive or not give an effect at will. So it's an effect.

Now, as we go down scale, the individual becomes more and more anxious about producing an effect, and more and more leery of receiving one.

Now, look at the *reductio ad absurdum* here. A fellow could get to a point where he's totally anxious to produce an effect on that curtain or wall. Totally anxious to produce this effect, but after he produced it, he himself, unwilling to receive any effect, cannot tell whether or not he did produce an effect on the curtain or wall. You see that you'd have to observe, in other words, be willing to receive the effect of observation, in order to know whether or not you'd produced an effect. You understand?

Well, about the last point on a scale where an individual is able to do this – actually it's 2.0 on the ARC scale or thereabouts – is the point where he departs from sanity and goes around the bend.

You wouldn't call anybody below that level sane. The individual cannot perceive whether or not he's produced an effect and yet is totally anxious to produce an effect. That person's crazy. He daren't be reached himself enough even to find out if he did produce an effect and yet he must at the same time produce this tremendous effect.

The only person that has any difficulty auditing, and there are none present, must produce a total effect on the pc – all at one fell swoop-boooooom! See? But never at any minute would he ever be able to notice whether or not he had.

So what do we get? We get a chopping session where the PC is being sawed up, cut up, having holes bored in his head, anything and everything – and no matter what happened to him, the practitioner would not be able to find out whether or not it had happened. Do you get that very low-scale reaction?

I am not necessarily describing psychiatry, I'm not necessarily describing generals, I'm not necessarily describing governments, I'm not necessarily describing insane inmates of other institutions. But I certainly am describing just this – an Effect Scale.

Now, about halfway down the scale, an individual begins to be selective about his effects. He does not like to have his head blown off with a shotgun. He's said, "There is something about this which I find displeasing." So he begins to select out effects. Well, the final result of selecting out effects on self is to select them all out. – That's it. You just select out all effects on self and you go down below 2.0 and you've had it.

Now, you're not much interested in effects on self because you never audit in that direction. The definition of Operating Thetan, is a person or being who can be at cause over life, matter, energy, space and time.

And he is processed – that's a technical definition, by the way, and when formulated produced tremendous gains in Scientology. It actually produced the lower-level Clears. But that is a definition of an Operating Thetan. You'd say that's also the definition of God, that's the definition of a lot of hopefulness, but that is the technical definition of Operating Thetan. A person or a being who can be at cause over life, matter, energy, space and time.

Well, that means he could mock up matter, you see? And that means that he could at least do something about approximating some visible livingness. You see? I don't say he could mock up a thetan, but he sure could mock up something that would walk like one. You get the idea? He could undoubtedly pump life into matter to make it look alive.

But at cause, that's the thing that we are looking at here. We're looking at cause. Well, the Effect Scale measures effects that an individual is willing to receive. And the odd part of it is, the individual who can cause anything is willing to receive anything. And an individual can cause none of those things which he is terribly afraid of receiving an effect from.

You get an individual going just so far on mocking up money. This is a very funny experiment. Now, there's an old test process on this – this is not germane to anything but I might as well mention it in passing. "Get the idea ..." (It's one of these "Get the idea ..." conceptuels which are not terribly effective.) It's quite amusing. "Get the idea of mocking up money so that anybody could see it." Now we shift over and say, "Now get the idea that would spoil the game and don't do it."

Now, the individual will actually walk upstairs toward a willingness to really – and he'll suddenly realize that it's within his capability to actually mock up pound notes or dollar bills. He'll get up just that far and then the second postulate kills him, see? He says, "Oh, man," he said, "would that spoil the game." Yes, that would spoil the game and he won't do it. He just says, "That's it!" you know? Well, that's the limitation of the process is what keeps him from going any further upstairs on this particular thing. Because he realized then he could – if anybody could mock up money, the money is of no value and so why mock it up? His rationale – this way. But he is not willing to receive the effect of everybody being able to mock up money, don't you see? So, he stops himself from mocking up money. Now, if an individual's not well, it must be because he's not willing to make other people all other people – totally well.

It's a very valuable scale, this thing. It tells you how much cause the individual dare be, by measuring how much effect he's willing to suffer. If an individual is unwilling to receive certain effects, I can tell you that he is unwilling to cause those effects. And because an individual is unwilling to receive the effect of having his head blown off by a shotgun, what do you know? His head can be blown off by a shotgun.

But if a person were totally willing – this is where your problems of comparable magnitude that sometimes solve things on a very broad perimeter on all the dynamics. We start running somebody – we start running the husband on the subject of the wife. We don't process the wife and the wife gets well. You get the idea?

I mean, we start in and we start operating up the dynamics with just one person. We're running into this phenomena, right – this whole package of phenomena.

An individual who is willing to receive an effect suffers no ill from it. It's kind of amazing, see? If he can change his mind.

Now, we get this: that everything or anything, to be injured, must first give its consent. So, the Effect Scale is a measurement of how many consents an individual has given to being injured. This is how often and how many times he's consented to certain things being injurious. Got the idea?

Until we get down to bottom scale and there everything is injurious everywhere. That's a total identification, everything is injurious. It goes from just one little old thing being injurious so as to make a game, on down scale to everything and anything being injurious. Therefore he must receive no effects of any kind. Now, if he must receive no effects of any kind, he obviously must feel that there's something imminently trying to foist effects off on him, right? Well, if this is the case – this is the case, he's defending himself against things he can't see. In other words – in the ultimate – the ultimate is that the individual dare not confront things because if they – if he confronted them, he would be receiving an effect from them just perceiving them. And he knows they are totally harmful, so therefore he mustn't see them.

This Effect Scale becomes very valuable and very prominent today with the emergence of Confrontingness as a process and the terrific value of Confrontingness Process. And we can understand Confrontingness as a process if we just look over and understand this Effect Scale.

So at the top of the scale, the individual can give or receive any effect. And at the bottom of the scale, he can receive no effects, but he still feels he must give a total effect. Get the inversions here?

Now, midway up, the individual could give or receive quite a few effects. He could cause a lot of things, a lot of things could be caused to him. And this is about the plane in which life operates. Very successful life operates in selective giving and receiving effects.

You every once in a while will find a pc, that as long as you keep your voice loud, will not do your auditing commands. But you start to whisper them – he goes boom! He'll do them right away. Very soft voiced. Now obviously, the way to produce an effect on the world is to scream and rant and turn on sirens and blow whistles and fire off rockets and cause a lot of confusion and so forth, and we wonder why some people doing this never succeed. In fact we look around and find those people who are doing this the most, succeed the least.

You see they can't receive an effect so they could never get paid for it, and they wouldn't even find out if they'd ever succeeded. The individual who promotes too hard can't even receive any money from his promotion. Get the idea? He can't receive any kind of an effect from his promotion and yet he's super promoter. And how often have you seen an apparently very good promoter totally broke?

Well, he's just got to con – too much effect, see. He's got – nnnruhh and that – right along with that goes, "I can't receive any effect" he says. "Nothing can ever come back to me."

This Effect Scale in auditing is best seen in the early TRs. You'll find people in the early TRs – they're in there pitching, they're in there sweating it out. And they'll say to somebody, "Do fish swim?"

Now you get them the next TR up the line and the other person said, "Good." You know, something like that. And they said, "Hm? Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh yes – yes." You get this reverse factor at work here? This is very useful, very, very useful to an auditor. It goes as an explanatory note from Axiom ten of the Axioms, into the ARC triangles. So you'll see that an individual cannot have a concept of reality if he cannot receive an effect.

An individual will not or cannot communicate with things that he thinks will affect him harmfully. So the more he thinks will affect him harmfully, the less he can communicate, don't you see?

Now, it also tells you that his affinity for things must get poorer and poorer and poorer and more and more choppy and more and more push-offy, and less and less anything to do with, to such an extent that he becomes what he hates the most.

It's a very low scale manifestation. It isn't broadly true that an individual always becomes that which he detests. That is not broadly true at all. But it is true that an individual going all the way down Tone Scale on something, on one thing, at the bottom of the scale becomes it. That is true, but he's got an awfully steep, long fall before he gets into such a thing.

Go around and detest all the things you want to. That has nothing to do with it. The best way to detest something is just to make up your mind to detest it, however. Don't even have a reason. Just say, "Well, I detest it" you know? It gives you a game.

Now, the ARC triangle, at this long look after all these years, is still as valid as it ever was, but we see it best through the Effect Scale.

An individual's fear of creating bad effects, an individual's fear of receiving them – all of these things compound into communication, into reality and into his, general attitude toward the world, which we call affinity.

The Effect Scale is hand in glove with this. So is the Reality Scale which you will hear more about later. The Reality Scale is very simple, it just parallels the ARC scale. All of these scales are more or less parallel.

The affinity scale is graduated in emotions.

The Reality Scale is graduated in manifestations. Want to give you the Reality Scale very rapidly. I'll mention it later but to just show you, up here in the high emotional levels, the Reality Scale permits experience. An individual can experience a terminal, he can experience being something.

As we go down scale he can merely confront it, usually with some trepidation. He can just confront it, that's all the better he can do. That's pretty good – being able to confront something – you understand? You can go easily from confront to experience.

Now, as we drop a little bit more down scale, he not-ises it to a point where it becomes invisible. And when he can no longer make it invisible he makes it black. And when he can no longer makes it black, he puts something else in its place. And that we call dub-in.

And from 2.0 down, it is all dub-in. Individual looks at a wall, sees a castle. He looks at an engram, sees a rhinoceros. He looks at a small bird flying through a picture and he at once wonders desperately about a ham sandwich.

Now, the Reality Scale – there's also a communication scale, how a person handles communication. And that graduates on this same number scale. And the Effect Scale graduates on this same scale. And all it is is man's progress from the sublime to, you might say, the insanely ridiculous; and in Scientology; the measurement – assessment and measurement of a man's progress from mud up into the dear, blue sky again.

And we can measure that, we can see where man is, and we can push him up scale and this is the scale he goes up on. And this is the ladder he climbs. It takes great intelligence on your part to evaluate cases. This doesn't make the scales different or changeable or wrong, but is something that has to be clothed with livingness in order to be a measure of livingness.

Thank you.