

Bethesda, July 2, 1950

Dear John,

Your coat and Leslyn's were both hanging in the part of the closet where I seldom penetrate in summer, with the result that I didn't find them for several days. I shall try to get them off to you if you need them. I wish I knew whether the matter is urgent with you, because if it isn't I should far prefer to take them up to Flemington the next time we go, which will be before the end of this month. Wrapping bundles and taking them to the post office looms large in my mind as a problem, silly as it seems.

There was one large item arising from our talks last weekend which I didn't take up with you because I wanted to think about it some more. You said approximately the following, "A clear will lie and cheat and steal in a good cause." I think that remark shocked me far more than anything you said which might have sounded more "shocking" on the surface. Because I am convinced that something has rotted in your thinking if you are really convinced that such is the case. Elenid Kochnig and Mrs. Davis were equally shocked, I think, and demonstrated it by avoiding the subject very quickly. Elenid only interjected the reply, "But that's the Jesuitical approach, that the means justifies the end." And so it is. It is also the prime hypothesis of the Communist creed. It seems to me that the only major difference between us and the Communists, us and the men of the Inquisition, us and any tyrant, lies in our disavowal of bad means which may seem to be justified by the end in view. "This man is a sinner. We are against sin. Let us extirminate him so there will be that much less sin." or nowadays, "This man is a representative of the wicked bourgeoisie which has enslaved the world. We want to make a better world, where every man can live and work in peace, plenty, and without a master, therefore we must eliminate this man who is blocking our way to a classless society."

"We have the final good of the world at heart, therefore it is perfectly justifiable to lie and cheat and invade and steal." One lie is justifiable for it is in a good cause. A bigger lie is all the more justifiable, for it achieves bigger results. Truth is unimportant, what matters is our glorious aim." "It is reasonable and logical for an intelligent man to sell his country's secrets, to live a double life, to cheat his compatriots and lie continuously in all his daily life, if he is convinced he is doing so to further good and legitimate causes." If you say that one man may lie and cheat in a good cause, you must allow any man to do so according to his lights. You cannot say that only the men in the right may do so, for every fanatic is a fanatic because he is thoroughly and completely convinced he is dead right and all those who disagree even partially are dead wrong. Every cause is the true and good cause to its adherents. A Russian clear who had never left home would have a standard memory bank crammed with horrible examples of the iniquity of the Western warmongers, the capitalistic exploiters, etc., and if you think he would suddenly and mysteriously see the Light From the West upon becoming a clear, you are ignoring the data with which his analytical mind has to work. If you think this clear would still be willing to lie, cheat, and steal in a "good cause" you are in complete agreement with Uncle Joe, Ignatius Loyola, and Torquemada. You

-2-

will be putting yourself squarely in a position where you will have to argue it out in your soul with such men as Socrates, Jesus, Boethius and Joe Doakes. The persecutors of all these men respected them highly, were sorry to have to do what they did, but were ~~xx~~ firmly convinced that the ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ end justified their admittedly unfortunante means. They were not interested in the Truth, nor in abstract concepts of justice, nor in copybook maxims. "Always tell the truth, no matter how it hurts," is for children, they thought, and still think. I don't. And I hope you don't, really.

A good cause, a really good cause, needs no untruths to make it popular. It doesn't need to cheat to get its way. If it feels a necessity for lies, there is something wrong with it. The more lies it needs to support it, the more inherent wrong is in it. If it has to cheat, it is cheating itself somewhere. If it indulges in bombastic tirades, it is because the simple truth must be avoided for some very good reason. A man who lies does so because he can't face the truth, doesn't want the world to see him as he is. He hides his lie as well as he is able, because the most unregenerate liar knows somewhere inside him that lies are dirty, and the truth is always clean. A man who cheats hates to admit it to his own conscience, and makes up elaborate justifications. I think that the nearer a man came to being a dianetic clear, the less he would want lies and unfairness around his life. The proof is that the best men have always abhorred lies, and always avoided cheating means. You would probably say that the best men in the world have always been those who were naturally fairly well "released". A lie is an offense against society, a means of gaining your personal survival at the greater or lesser expense of society and mankind in general. In your own terms, it seems to me that a liar and a cheater is blocked in the third and fourth dynamics. If a clear should lie or cheat, he is not a clear, and something has been missed in therapy, perhaps something that the auditor himself was unable to see as an aberration because as the old man in Athens said, it's hard to find a completely honest man. We have all lied and cheated, but the more insight into higher planes we have, the more we hate ourselves for having done it, and the harder we strive to find the truth and seek to gain our good ends by fair means rather than foul. Our most precious possession in the West is our sometimes bumbling, sometimes stumbling insight into truth, justice and fairness. It's hard for aberrated men to hold on to such an abstract thing as truth; it's inconvenient, very often, to use fair means when cheating would seem to be so much quicker and easier and even more logical; it's frustrating to see bad men get the same slow, abstract justice that innocent men are allowed to make use of. But that's the only major difference between us and our worst enemies. I talked with Ambassador Heath a month ago. He was in the Balkans when the Nazis were there, and then became our Ambassador to Bulgaria until relations were broken, and he is now taking up duty in Indo-China. He and his wife had to communicate with each other by notes which they promptly flushed down the toilet after reading, all during the time they were in Sofia. In his opinion the Nazis were far worse men than the Communists are. The Nazis did bad because they felt like it and rather enjoyed it at times. The Communists, said Ambassador Heath, have the good of mankind at heart and are devoted fanatics in the service of the

-3-

their fellow men. They want the end of poverty, the end of sin, the end of disease, the end of slavery. But they are aberrated! They see truth as multi-faceted, instead of unitary. They see force as the only purifying method worthy of employing, and their eyes are directed so far in the future that they are blind to present suffering. They have pity for the deviationist as they put him to death for the great good of mankind. And above all, they have taken over Hitler's technique of the Big Lie in the service of their "Good" cause. In my opinion no lie is justifiable, no cheating justifiable, no injustice justifiable, in any circumstances whatsoever. If you don't agree with me, I'm pretty sure it's because you haven't thought it out properly, or as you would say, are aberrated somewhere, by something. Naturally I don't say I've never lied nor cheated, but something in my analytical mind has been pointing out constantly in recent years that those means of achieving ends are contra-survival, and I'm pretty sure that this is the better part of myself at work.

One of the most irksome things that stands between me and the good relations I feel I should maintain with mother is that she has no feeling for the truth, except that hypocrisy which according to Saint-Simon is the tribute vice pays to virtue. I never know whether what she says is true, or a device to insure some aim. Like the rest of us, she sees the greater beauty of truth, but feels that lies or subterfuges have greater survival value. I'm sorry to have to admit that my early training didn't equip me to use the truth at all times, but a less aberrated person would have fought clear of her early training sooner than I began to fight. Naturally, I haven't won the fight at all, and it's a constant battle, an every day affair. I just hope I can keep on fighting when the battle becomes more heavily weighted against me than it now is. It's pretty easy for a happily married person with enough money to eschew cheating and adhere pretty closely to the truth. My real test may yet arrive, and I can only hope that when it does I'll be strong enough in my better part to keep up the hard fight. But I am sure of one aspect of this whole problem right now: A lie is a lie is a lie. If you let in one little lie his big brothers and sisters begin arriving before you have finished justifying the first lie. If you punch one small hole in the dam holding back lies, the walls will begin to crumble around that spot and you'll get a flood of lies, in every case. If you cheat just once, for a wholly fine and good reason, you can patch that rotten part of yourself with the most modern and logical patching plaster justifications available, but you'll still know within yourself that you have cheated and the sheating is still there under all the patches and spreading out fast. Because there is no justification for cheating, and your justifications are only lies: in the greatest part, they are lies you make to yourself, which are the worst and the most aberrative.

And that's why your remark shocked me into silence. If you have a good cause in dianetics, as you certainly do if it's true, you simply must stop a moment and think about abstract truth. Had you thought about it at all previously, you couldn't have said what

you did.

-4-

Virginia Davis and her friend Elenid are going up to Pendle Hill next week some time, and have asked me to loan them your book on "Dianetics". It seems that the people up there are very interested to hear about dianetics, and the two women are going to read the book and try to explain the matter to the best of their ability. I don't know whether or not you are familiar with Pendle Hill: It's a Quaker establishment, where the Friends go to discuss religion, philosophy, and any related subjects which enter their heads. Fritz Kunckel is going to be there this time, and apparently it is he who is particularly interested in Dianetics. It seems to me you would do well to contact the people at Pendle Hill yourselves, for they are in intelligent group with open minds. It is somewhere in Pennsylvania near Philadelphia. They have intellectual influence disproportionate to their numbers. If you do, I hope you will bear in mind that they are not fools even if they disagree with you. Knowing all about the subject yourself, it is naturally hard for you to understand that other people don't know about it, and still aren't fools. In my own case, while I should passionately like it all to be true, and my aberrations capable of being erased, what is difficult is to take it all "sight unseen". I have never seen actual dianetic therapy, I've never seen it contact a genuine "pre-natal", I've never seen someone who is insane become suddenly sane. I can believe in electricity because I've seen it work, but I've never seen dianetics work. The same applies to everyone when you first contact him. I think you've been dealing so long and so intensively with the subject that you have forgotten completely how incredible it all sounds the first time you hear it. And for heaven's sake don't speak in hyperbole with people like those in Pendle Hill. Bear in mind that none of them has ever been sold a bottle of Snake Oil, and they tend to prefer understatement at all times.

While I'm at it, I'd like to advise your friend Ron Hubbard to stick to subjects he knows about. Apparently he has read very little history, for his reference to the revulsion of Christianity from anything Roman in their first centuries was ridiculously erroneous. The contrary was true, as far as things are "true", historically. The reason the first centuries of the triumph of Christianity saw a reduction in the number of baths per capita per diem was that the water supplies had deteriorated, the public baths fell gradually in ruins due to poorer and poorer administration and more frequent barbarian onslaughts, galloping inflation which rendered it more difficult for municipalities to repair and maintain the old baths or build replacements, and the increasing influence of the Near East, which in large part had been unable to afford baths and therefore hardly gave them a thought. The influence of the barbarians had the same effect, for the same reason. The memory of Roman greatness lasted for centuries, and Rome was revered to such an extent that the completely dominant and independent Eastern Empire in Constantinople still called itself Roman when it fell in 1453. The Holy Roman Empire's very name refutes Ron's basic tenet. The relatively insignificant See of Peter in Rome won supremacy over the more important bishoprics largely due to the almost superstitious reverence the Dark Ages had for anything Roman. You run into foolish difficulties when you assume that because you know a great deal about one subject you inevitably know a great deal about all subjects.

A kiss for Leslyn and Peede!