

STUDY OF THE PARTICLE (continued)

A lecture given on 29 October 1953

1ACC – 43

03 44 22B 43 29 Oct 53 Study of the Particle (continued).

Transcript of lecture by L. Ron Hubbard AICL-44 renumbered 22B and again renumbered 43 for the "Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space" cassette series.

[Clearsound, checked against the old reels. Omissions marked ">".]

> Of all the people I've heard speaking of Korzybski, nobody notices one thing > he says all through the book. Don't think, read this. Go over it quick, go > over it quick, go over it quick, go over it again. It will fall on it's face. > Everybody who is..., he says, "Never quote." > Actually – actually Korzybski – this is the second part of this afternoon's lecture – actually, Korzybski is a tremendous study. There's no doubt about it. Any man who starts in on communication systems has got himself a – he's got himself a terrific subject. And he can beat this subject to pieces dozens of different ways.

The only thing that I have to – fault I have to find with Korzybski's work – I make this point very pointedly – is every time I'm having trouble with a pc of recent years, I'm having trouble – some trouble with Korzybski because Korzybski made this rather fatal error: instead of trying to merely codify communication, which in itself had not been done – it would have led him into everything – he tried something else. He tried a discipline-restrictive therapy and when this was applied, it put communication brakes on people's communication systems, which is the only place we fall foul of Korzybski. Actually, everywhere in Korzybski's work we are in total agreement. There's nothing... Some of his work is – the old man should have worked a little harder and a little longer, actually. If he'd worked a little longer he would have found a heck of a lot more answers.

It's the only worthwhile piece of work done. If I'm kidding Korzybski, it's in a much broader, more interested spirit.

For instance, I wouldn't even stoop to kid any one psychologist, except William James. And he actually is quite interesting. They call psychology a science; it would be a science if William James had been able to codify it for communication. Because as far as I can find out, he's the only source for modern psychology. He wrote a book, very nice book. Did you ever see his book – 1898, I think it is, something like that. Very nice little book. If somebody had read that they would have been in good shape, too.

All right. Continuing on this study of the particle.

There are an enormous number of therapies which you could employ which would have to do with only communication systems or lines – lines.

If you've got a preclear – if you've got a preclear that you just can't tolerate anymore, just start running lines on him. The genetic entity is entirely convinced that he is a particle on a line – he's a message going somewhere. He is the most convinced character you ever heard of. So much so, that the second you go into lines, the pc quite normally – this is not unusual, I don't care where he is on the Steps – will suddenly discover the line that the GE thinks he's traveling on through time and will find this line leading back through the genetic line (two uses of the word "line" there), right straight on back into graves, not his own as a thetan, you see, but graves of Grandpa and Great-grandpa, and back through time. And this line, as a line, has been going on and on, and it will show up as a slightly gold-colored, rather soft, expandable piece of stuff.

Once in a while, somebody runs into this when they're starting to run past lives or something of the sort, and they start to run out GE material madly and then are able to prove, convincingly and conclusively, that "I am my own grandpa." See? And that comes from processing a line.

They get the idea – as a matter of fact, this statement is made in Book One. It says, just for sake of illustration, with the limited communication facilities available there, it says as an analogy and for sake – supposing we were on a railroad track which started someplace and went someplace in time, and people don't know why they're going where they're going, but they know they're on their way somewhere; and everybody kind of agrees that this is his feeling about it if he thinks it over for a while.

Well, what are we going to do with this? We're going to find that any time the pc is a line, he is not source-point and he is not receipt-point. So, if he's not source-point he, of course, is unable to give himself commands because he can only give himself commands if he can make postulates. And he can only receive commands, adequately, if he is at the receipt-point of the line. And so we find people as out of communication as they are on or are the line and as in communication as they are the terminals of the line. Therefore, lines on any level of case process with the greatest of ease. You can process them almost endlessly. But they sure process and they sure are interesting, and they sure will spin a low-toned preclear.

But there is a process that you could employ on it. You could have the fellow mock up a line – "Now, get the idea that there should be something on one end of it and there should be something on the other end of it and should be something on one end, should be something on the other end, should be something on..."

And what are you doing there? You're doing Change of Space Processing and actually, just doing nothing but Change of Space Processing between two mocked-up terminals, and you're prying him out of being a line.

The only thing wrong with him, you might say, in – with regard to communication, is he is the message, not a giver and receiver of messages. And as long as he's the message. Did you ever see a letter write a letter? That's a communication lag; it's a letter writing a letter. A

letter is the particle on this line and he's got this and he's sizzling down this line and there he is but he isn't ever going....,

Try and get in communication with somebody driving a car while you're driving another car. He knows he's a particle and he's on his way. So, he's neither full or good source, and he's never full effect. In other words, he can't get good sensation, he can't get well and thoroughly betrayed. And he really can't well and thoroughly betray anybody. It's kind of a desperate situation to be in for a pc who is on the band which – where he has to destroy and he really can't get to the point of command where he can issue the commands to destroy, and he can't quite get to the place where he could even be destroyed. See, I mean, he's having a rough time of it.

Well, war does this to people automatically. Does it to them quite rapidly. The overt act-motivator sequence is also discoverable in here. But a fellow puts a rifle to his shoulder and fires the rifle and then he's at the other end and he receives the bullet. Well, doggone it, it's just not – for some reason or other in the basic plans of design, the body was not well constructed as a bulletproof vest and it just doesn't work like a good bullet absorber; it just won't.

You know that it'll take sometimes only one bullet, two bullets – not efficient. No efficiency in it at all and yet in War, people are expected to go out and put these bodies tip as the recipient of a missile which is above the tolerance level of that with which they're trying to receive it. So a soldier immediately starts going out of communication – just across the boards goes out of communication with the society, with his family, with the army. And eventually the army has got some kind of a....

You know, by the way, the way ants run is very interesting. They're run by an entity setup and the entity will run a lot of ants. You think of entity as – ants as individuals and they're not individuals in the sense of the word. They haven't got anything in them; there's nothing in their heads; they're just being run; they're manipulated entities. Very interesting little machinery. And they're being run very efficiently,

And a soldier finally gets to a point where the general is the brain and he is just sort of an automaton that gets put up and so on. You make a fellow who's been a private for years and years and years, and make him the command point, and a hell of a thing happens: He can't give any commands.

Now, we do something else. We get somebody who's been a corporal for a while, and the immediate thing he does is start looking around for the source of command. He hasn't got one, see; we make him a general and he starts looking around for the source of command and he just raises hell with himself. He'll look to his family or to God or to witchcraft or some other doggone thing.

Here we had both Napoleon and Hitler; neither one of them could issue a command that he knew was a command. To issue a command drove Hitler into a towering rage. He knew he couldn't issue a command, therefore he had to stop it before it started, which is anger. Stop it as it starts or stop it before it starts: that's anger.

So, we got this – you see now? When the fellow is a particle on the line he's always expecting a source.

Now, why do people keep wanting God? Because they're a message on the line; they're not the start, they're not at A – they're not at A. People only really want God when they're almost to B. Why is this?

Do you know, you'd take this A-B thing we've been using here – the one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. And we could actually mark it off exactly by the dynamics. And we'd mark it off on the dynamics from A down; we'd mark it off – we'd measure off – it's ten inches long, let's say – this – ten inches long this A to B interline, which is the message line and we'd mark it off in units of ten. All right, we've got the first unit of ten or one-tenth of the line. We'd go one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight in that first unit. And then we'd go, on the next unit of ten, oh, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight; and we'd go on, theoretically, down till we got to the fifth unit, the end of the fifth unit, and then we would mark it off on inverted one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. And then reinverted on the six-to-seven unit: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. And then reinverted on the eight-to-nine: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. And then from nine to ten we needn't bother because that's that. You see how this line could look and what this communication unit could be? All right.

People go around wanting to know what started them on the track. What is the reason why they are living? Pc comes to you and asks you the reason why he's living. He tells you, the second he tells you, he says, "I think of myself as a letter in a postbox." "I think of myself as a marble rolling down the street which has been sent by some small boy, and which is liable to collide with another marble someplace or another or maybe just the gutter." "I don't know where I'm going." "I didn't send me." "Here I am." "I don't know what's wrong with me." "Well, here I am, a sort of a message, and I just got sent up to your doorstep and I sort of fell over the doorstep." "I had a dream last night that said I should come to you." When they get real bad off and they're down there about the eighth gradient: "Last night I had a vision, and it told me that I should come to you and tell you that you were to help me."

Help him what? You know, you get an immediate response if you said, "Help you to get where? Huh?" You get an immediate response; he's a message. He's a Western Union telegram; he's a letter; he's a postcard. He's saying, "Having wonderful time. Wish you were here." And he's carrying this arduously through trillions of years of space and he hasn't anybody to deliver it to.

Can you imagine the postman down here with a bag full of mail and so forth, not knowing where any of it went but being forced to deliver it somewhere?

Why do people keep pieces of paper? The first thing – first thing you – in – diagnostically it's very interesting: if the preclear opens his pockets and has – boy they're really just stuffed with old pieces of paper the like of which you never saw – old envelopes. Lady opens her purse and it's just jammed with old envelopes and old scraps of paper and old letters. I've seen people carry around in their purses as many as fifty letters, a terrific pack of letters, just never get rid of them. They're a message going somewhere.

People save scraps of paper. That's merely because in this society messages are written on pieces of paper. See, they're the message; they're not source for anything and they're not...

Now, if you suddenly were to take this person – this person might be very naive, might be very, very sweet, very innocent and something or other – and if you were to suddenly hit them, they would be rather confused, see. They wouldn't quite know why they were being hit because, you see, they can't receive anything.

So, it must be that you think you're hitting something else! Psychoanalysis. You see that? You slap this person who is a message and this person cannot receive anything, so it must be that you are actually beating up Mama or Papa in your mind. You must have a misconception entirely as to what you're hitting.

They will actually, occasionally, explain to you... One they will very often explain to you is they don't want to hurt you. Here's this character, see, no biceps, nothing, you know, and you cuff them or something, and then they will stand there and they'll look very, very confused. And you say, "Now get to work" or something of the sort; they'll still stand there. They just don't...

And you'll find out if you talk to them a little bit later that they didn't want to hurt you. They never received it at all. You see, they're more liable to receive than to hand out a message but they can't receive a message, they can't receive a blow. And there you have anesthesia. People are actually mocking themselves up so they can't receive these things. They know they can't receive these things, so actually, they mustn't feel them if they hit them. See, if they get hit by something then they couldn't have been hit by something because they're not at B; they're not a source; they're not a communication receipt-point. And if they're not a communication receipt-point, that must be your mistake, you dummy.

And with this, you get into all of the completely silly, stupid lines of conversation which take place concerning arguments, quarrels and so forth.

If you understand this and appreciate this and look it over very carefully, all of a sudden those things become very comprehensible to you. The fellow can't receive a communication.

And all he's doing is explaining he can't and he's explaining at the same time that he can't be the source of a communication, so all he does is explain to you, consistently and continually, that he didn't say that.

So, an argument consists of – is, "You didn't say that," and "I didn't say that." And you've got the model argument. Which is the same argument as, "I know you're not at A and I know I'm not at B because we're both particles." And the main part of arguments concern themselves with "We can't possibly be arguing, because there's nothing to argue about because we couldn't be in communication with each other, actually, because we're both particles."

If you want to really set somebody back on his heels, just explain to him on that routine, but quietly, without the emotion because believe me the emotion communicating a word, as a beam or something of the sort, is far more communicative any day of the week, far

more communicative than a word, anytime – has an energy slam – has a hammer and pound of energy, don't you see?

Now, the particle – you could call this "the particle theory of personality." (Somebody can write a book about it someday.) "Particle Theory of Personality: This theory was originally developed..."

Where is he on this communication chain? Because he will behave proportional to where he is. You could make up the most beautiful communication system that would illustrate this. It'd be – only be any good if it helped you with a case. Well, it happens that this really helps you with a case.

You ask this guy to put up some anchor points. Then you ask him to receive some anchor points. And eventually, the significances of – any significance merely has to do – "Why I am a message." That is significance – "Why I am a message." "Why I am not source." "Why I'm not receipt-point." "Why I am a message." You see? It's very simple. All right.

Now, any time, any day that you can get somebody, then, to send and receive communications and just neglect modus operandi to a large degree of exactly how he's doing it, but just steer him into some pattern or another that he will accept – boy, we're really cooking as a process.

Now, how would you do that? Sports will do it. Why is it that you get somebody out, operating in sports and so on... Well, there are sports that don't do it. Swimming doesn't do a thing for anybody's mind, not a thing. Muscles don't develop in swimming, other things happen that don't happen in swimming. A person gets very pliable; they get very limber when they swim; they get very easy to handle, too.

But the game of catch is pretty good. Why do people stand around and play catch just by the hour? That's self-explanatory – back and forth.

Well, now you in an office can do this. You can tell the child, instead of asking him to touch the room – he's making the room a receipt-point; he knows it's not a receipt-point too, you see, he knows it's not a source-point, not a receipt-point; if – he knows it's not a source-point because it couldn't be, because it must be on a line too, because he's probably in the wall. He's not responsible, is what it all comes under. He's not responsible as long as nobody knows where he is and after a while he loses himself.

So, you could have some kid come in and you weren't able to do anything much with pictures or something of the sort and you would take this little doll like this, and you would say, "Catch." That's it. What do you know? It's processing. See, "Catch."

Now, the funny part of it is, is he's probably (if he's in there seeing you) further down toward B, than he is distant from A, so he's trying to prevent catching more than he is trying to prevent source. So, if you were to give him a bunch of BBs and a BB gun and have him stand up and fire at a target for a long time, he'd probably feel wonderful – he'd just probably feel grand when he got that through.

Or if you were to give him a deck of cards and have him put his hat on a chair, and throw the cards into the hat – there's a very definite acceptance level there. How many cards

can he get in the hat? It's a game. He'll stand there and pitch cards into the hat and pitch cards into the hat and pitch cards into the hat. You're making him be a source-point for particles.

Now, another thing happens. A fellow – there is a point of the case where an individual decides he's got to be a source-point. This is the last ditch. He's at the wrong end of the line when he's doing this ordinarily but he's got to be a source-point, so therefore, he's mocking himself up on a circuit bypass, which is going all the way from somewhere near B, but not at B, clear on around to A and he eventually winds up kind of talking to himself but he knows he's got to be this source-point.

Now, he can – theoretically could shuttle himself around to that source-point but it requires that he be at B and then at A, and A and then at B. And so he gets a one-way flow. He is near B, but he's trying to be A, and he just keeps on doing this. He's near B and he has to be at A. So, he has got a circuit mocked up so that – to reposition himself at A. And he's just got that circuit there and he's just got that circuit and he's just got to shift himself around to where he can be up there at A. He's got to – somehow or another.

And of course, the more velocity – this is the horror of it – the more velocity he puts on the communications at A, insisting that he is at A, the more hit him at B. That's real grim; the more he's hit. Anything he does will recoil on him. Why? Because he knows he's at B but he knows he's got to be at A, but he knows damned well he's not at A. After a while he'll start to blame it all on God, and angels are talking to him and giving him the hot dope before he passes it along.

> That's the church. They do that wonderfully. The church is down there in the > ninth portion of the track. Somewhere in that vicinity. Ninth and tenth > portions of the track on this little analogy, that's him. And these people > will always tell you, "We carry to you the message of god. And we're against > idols. That's why you've got to come in and worship at the feet of the cross." > I shouldn't have added that, that sounds sarcastic. It sounds as though I have > something against the church. And I have nothing against the church, because > it actually can't receive anything. See? It would really protest if you really > tried to give the church anything. >> Same way, you try to give ... > Do you know one of the most maddening personalities to be up against is a fellow who realizes he's about to arrive at that horrible place B and has got every brake set, the emergency brakes set, gravitrons set, skyhooks set, grapnels set and repulsors charging full speed at B and detractors and so forth and you try to give this fellow something. He can't receive anything. He can't receive and this is terrible. And that to a large degree was your parents.

You come in with a stone, you come in with a word, you come in with some advice, you come in with a helping hand to push the car tire around to the back of the car after the tire's gone flat and so forth, and "Now, be careful of the tire." You of your own good free will have decided to put the tire away, you know, and help them out, and pick up the tools, and "Be careful of that and do this and do that and do something else." They can't receive it without jumping into source-point. Do you catch? Typical. Little kids are the most desperate kids whose parents could take nothing. And they never realized this about their parents. A preclear will realize this on Acceptance Level Processing.

"Now let's See mock up your parents and have them accept something."

"Ahhhh!" Just the thought of the parents accepting anything will sometimes blow off locks just by the ton "My parents accept something! Oh, no!"

Now, why is Acceptance Level Processing such an interesting process? It's trying to determine – it's trying to plow somebody out of that position which is close to B, by permitting him to accept something. And one breaks that up by showing him that somebody else will accept something too. But if it just goes on for its own sake on the hope that by some necromancy something weird and terrible and wonderful is going to happen, it'll fail.

Now, notably lacking and never mentioned in SOP 8 is "source level." What is he willing to be the source of? Just never mentioned there. But of course, it goes along hand-in-glove at Step IV. At Step IV the person is not getting there because he's so afraid of receiving something that he can't receive any good benefits from a process, so he will block all of these and if you do process him, they go out and waste it.

You know how they waste it? Just get the idea, now, of being processed up into beautiful condition. Now, go getting sick. See, that's wasting processing.

Now, get the idea of being of – in beautiful condition and telling the auditor it didn't do you a bit of good. That's much less vicious; in some way the same thing.

We were also talking about they waste energy. Determined that a line – having a communication line is wasting energy. See? That's the way you'd waste it. And then having a MEST line would be wasting actual communication lines. So, anybody that's using MEST lines is actually wasting communication lines but they're already there because the fellow has to waste energy. Isn't that wonderful?

All right, do you see a little plainer now what this communication source setup is?

The first and foremost thing is, for your preclear in this universe, space – first and foremost thing. Is he willing to be the source of no space? B is not necessarily, by the way, a condensed area of space, but he has begun to believe it is. Is he willing to be condensed space or is he willing to condense space? And you'll have to get him out on the basis of "is he willing to make space?"

Now, it tells you that the closer one is to B, the more he is liable to condense space. And this is borne out in actual processing. You know, none of this material would be worth a nickel if it didn't get borne out with examples themselves.

You'll find out that people who are shortest on space are the people who are in the seventh, eighth and ninth gradients. And the people in the ninth gradient, as I've just drawn up this little line for you, they're really so short on space that they will get violently sick at their stomach sometimes when you ask them to mock up something. And I would say, that would be the – actually, that condition would be the beginning of the tenth gradient – the last gradient. See, they just get violently sick.

Now, a good condition should be that a person just goes from A to B and back to A and is liable – and can go to B, and go to A, and go to B, and go to A – people get real sick if you start shifting positions in space.

What's important about all this? Is the line important? Is that gradient I've been giving you so carefully important? No, it's only important so that you have a graph with which you can communicate. You can see something and if you can see this graph, you see, you've got a communication standard, just like the Tone Scale chart – you can see this as a communication standard. That makes for communication because communication depends upon agreement to some degree.

All right, if your preclear is sitting in a fixed attention position or an unfixed poten – attention position, follows that he's neither at A or B.

Now, A and B are not absolute points, and we come right back to what I was talking about first – zero – the gradient scale of zero.

Just to be very extreme, you could consider the whole universe a gradient scale of zero. If your preclear wants to see the whole universe, he enters it at a point so close to an absolute zero, when he's only looking at the MEST universe with MEST eyes and you're utterly astonished how close he is to an absolute zero, what there is to see. Gee!

And as he goes up on the line, far from being only empty space, the amount of something in this universe is fantastic. It's almost jammed from anchor point to anchor point. It's crowded and that's the main trouble with it because of course, you see, it's only a concept of space.

Now, the universe, this universe, is incapable of receiving anything; it's very close to a B universe. See. It can't receive; it mustn't receive anything. But boy, it'll certainly conserve energy; it'll sure save it. It's the one thing that it's agreed upon on every hand is, it's got to conserve energy. Your preclear is right in there pitching on that because it's so close to zero so close to an absolute zero. All he could see of it, you see: it's so close to an absolute zero, there's no abundance of anything. So, he's got to be awful careful and everything's got to be saved.

Now, we go back up scale and we start looking, and looking, and looking and, by golly, there are more fascinating things to see than you ever heard of.

Now, the one prohibition is they've got a reverse vector going in this universe and that means simply that they say, "Insanity is seeing things." That's not true; insanity is not seeing things.

Now, where is zero? Where is nothingness? Man in his words, words themselves, is unable to define a "nothingness" without defining it in terms of a somethingness. So it's just a relative value – things are motionless. Nothing itself is no-thing. Nothing is defined as an absence of something.

It's inconceivable, then, that there could be an existing state of; actually, really nothing – not even an absence of a thing. You see? The language – I just suddenly slam into the end of track on language. Limitation of viewpoint of the language itself is right there.

Just try to express in MEST language "no-thing."

Male voice: Just ask the person to get a concept of his raw material.

And what's that? Nothing?

Male voice: That's right.

It doesn't work on me; I get the whole universe.

Male voice: That's right.

Hm?

Male voice: That's right.

Oh, I thought you were asking for a concept of nothing.

Male voice: Not necessarily, what's the whole universe?

Well, it's a thing.

Male voice: Gradient scale of nothing.

Hm?

Male voice: Gradient scale of nothing.

Mm. See, you can look at this either way and it'll come out the same way.

But if you think there's an absolute something, you're in for a grave surprise. You think there's an absolute nothing, you're again in for a grave surprise – terrible.

Your preclear, being a message going from a thing to a thing through nothing, of course, is in for a grave surprise because he's no such thing. He's source- and receipt-point. Closer you can get him to these two points, the better off he's going to be, the more able and the more motion he's going to be able to go into. But don't think that motion is the end of theta, it isn't – motionlessness is.

Okay.

[End of tape.]