THE PARTICLE WITH REGARD TO TIME

A lecture given on 30 October 1953

1ACC – 44

04 45 23A 44 30 Oct 53 The Particle with Regard to Time [46 23B 30 Oct 53 Consideration, Extent of Viewpoint, Step III Commands – maybe in above?]

Transcript of lecture by L. Ron Hubbard AICL-45, renumbered 23A and again renumbered 44 for the "Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space" cassette series.

NOTE: Old AICL-46 (renumbered 23B) "Consideration, Extent of Viewpoint, Step III Commands" is not included in the "Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space" cassette series (see Master Tape List) but might be the second half of the transcript given here since the old reel for AICL-45 ends in the middle of the clearsound version at the point marked "%".

[Clearsound, checked against the old reels, omissions marked ">". Insertions marked "%".]

> And this is October the thirtieth. Let's see, thirty days has September, > April, June and November. Thirty one have all the rest, now let's see, did I > say October? Did I say October there when I said... I guess then October has > thirty one days. A good problem, huh? Of course, there's a calendar in the > next room. And I'd better not take a glance at it, because that would be > looking. > > OK. Having figured that out, it's > % Okay, this is [substituted in clearsound version]

The first morning lecture of October the 30th, and this bright morning I would like to just start right in fairly low gear with you and have you pick out several points behind you and on – above you and on either side of you and in front of you, just several points. And now as we – as we go through this little process, I simply want you to put each one of these I give you in a new point – each time, remember, a new point. All right.

"There's not supposed to be action there." Put that at one of the points.

At another point: "There's not supposed to be action there."

Another point: "There's not supposed to be action there."

Another point: "There's not supposed to be anything there."

At another point: "There's no action there."

Another point: "There never will be any action there."

Another point: "There never has been any action there."

Another point: "There always will be action there."

Another point: "If I can't stop that one moving, I don't know what I'll do."

Another point: "There must be action there."

Another point: "There must be action there."

Another point: "There has to be action there."

Another point: "At least I have action there."

Another point: "I have action there."

Another point: "There will always be action there and I can't stop it."

Another point: "I must stop that point." (I hope the point was completely motionless.)

Another point: "I have to stop that point."

"This point is arrival."

Another point: "That's the source of all my trouble."

Another point: "That's coming in on me.

Another point: "That can't come in on me.

Another point: "That has to come in on me."

All right, we've still got these points in assorted places. Now be sure and you – put one below and one above you. Okay.

"I'm supposed to be here."

"They think I'm there."

"I hope I am here."

"I'll never get there."

"They hope I'm here."

Now, very rapidly with all these assorted points around outside the body, well outside the body, now:

"I'm supposed to be here."

"No, I'm supposed to be here."

"No, I think I'm here."

"No, I'm sure that's me."

"I'm certain that's doing it."

"That's causing it all."

"I'm supposed to be here."

"They don't know I'm here."

"They'll never find out I'm here."

"All is lost."

Now, another point – very precisely located point: "All is lost."

Another precisely located point: "All is lost."

And another one: 'All is lost."

Another very precisely located point: "All is lost."

And another point located with signboards: "All is lost."

Another point: "On the way."

And another point: "On the way."

Another point, completely motionless: "On the way."

Another point: "On the way."

Another point: "What a serious journey."

Another point: "I'm just a particle."

Another point: "All other particles are rivals."

Another point: "No letters better show up."

Another point: "If I resist enough." Just that – "If I resist enough."

Another point: "I don't think I'm here."

Another point: "I may be here."

Another point: "I'd better be judicious about where I am."

Another point: "It's important."

Another point: "It's important where I am."

Another point: "If this moved, they'd miss me."

Another point: "If this moved, they'd miss me."

Another point: "If this moved, they'd miss me."

Another point: "There is no motion."

Another point: "I need a stamp."

Another point: "I'm lost in the suit pocket."

Another point: "I have a mission."

Another point that's sitting completely still: "I have a mission."

Another point: "I can't arrive here."

Now another point that's securely there: "I can't be here."

Another point: "I'm just a particle."

Another point: "I'm just a particle."

Another point: "It takes consideration..."

Another point: "I mustn't arrive here." "I mustn't arrive here."

Another point: "I mustn't arrive here."

Another point: "This will never be there."

Another point: "Here will never be there."

Another point: "I'm just a particle."

Another point: "I'm valuable because I'm a particle."

"I'm valuable because I'm a particle."

"I'm valuable because I'm scarce."

Now get a whole mass of points in one place where you haven't been putting them before – whole mass of points: "We're valuable because there's only one of us."

Another one: Put a whole mass of points in another place where you haven't been putting points: "We're not valuable because there's just one of us."

Another point: "I wonder where I'll get a Seeing Eye dog."

Okay, now let's recall something real.

A time when you were in good communication.

A time when you felt some affinity for somebody.

A time when you knew you'd never have any further affinity for anything.

A time when you refused communication completely.

A time when somebody else refused communication.

A time that was completely unreal to you. (See, one or two there just got time track.)

A time when you were in good communication.

A time when you wanted to be happy.

A time when you decided you needed processing.

Another time when you decided you needed processing.

Another time when you decided you didn't need any further processing.

You can make it just at the moment if...

Now something real.

And a time when you made somebody happy.

A time when you had some suspicion that you weren't quite human.

The time when you decided to play it in close so that you could get more sensation out of it.

Something real.

Good affinity.

Good communication.

Okay, for those who haven't been tracking easily on this, now let's remember present time.

Okay, now let's get not being able to have present time.

Now let's have present time.

Okay.

This morning we have to take up the matter of the communication particle. I gave you the little drill so that what I had to say is more understandable perhaps to some of you and less restimulative perchance, mayhap. Communication particle.

The subject of Scientology in its highest echelon divides sharply, so far as this universe is concerned, into two immediate things.

One is space, with its viewpoints and anchor points – definition of; use and exercises in; and the other (very closely allied to it but of the same rank with it, because it goes into different forms elsewhere than this universe) is communication.

Therefore, you should have a very good grasp of the theory of communication because we have already seen that continuous agreement with this universe brought about a condition which was not always entirely desirable, at least from some viewpoints.

I wish to make a cautious statement there because, of course, we're dealing with this universe; one has to be very cautious and impartial with regard to this universe. One mustn't go too fast, and the future is always the past in this universe, and the future is the particle that exploded and came your way but hasn't arrived yet, you see? So, present time may be halfway on the line.

You see, there's been an explosion at this moment – let us suppose there has been an explosion in south Jersey, the concussion waves of which will require thirty-two seconds to arrive. But it's a big explosion and will flatten the entire building. The explosion has happened; the buildings are not yet flat.

Now, fifteen seconds after the explosion-we have the explosion, the future of the building which is about to be flattened. Very simple. Explosion is the future of the building which is about to be flattened. But the explosion has already happened – it happened fifteen seconds ago. But fifteen seconds ago is the future of seventeen seconds hence, because that's obvious, because seventeen seconds hence, that is – that's the future. That's seventeen seconds from now, so that's seventeen seconds into the future. So, you see, the building will be flattened by an explosion which is thirty-two seconds into the future of the explosion, but the

flattened building is at this point (fifteen seconds after the explosion) seventeen seconds in the future of the building. I hope you understand this. This is what's known as a communication lag.

Now, where is present time? Where is present time? Fifteen seconds ago there was an explosion which, seventeen seconds into the future, will flatten the place you're standing. Where's present time?

Problems in velocities and relative motion have always been trying to the school child. As a matter of fact they try the schoolchild with them, and try him and try him and try him. And then flunk him before the high court if he doesn't succeed in being confused enough to answer this question (quote) intelligently (unquote).

A boat is going down the river at ten miles an hour. Another boat is coming up the river at five miles an hour. There is a current in the river of five miles an hour. At 3:00 the upper boat started downriver, and at 3:02 the lower boat started upriver, and the two points are 36.872 miles apart. Exactly how far from the starting point of the first boat will the two boats pass?

It's a very easy problem. The answer of it is, of course, a very simple answer. The answer, of course, is "MEST universe." And if you were simply to write this down in an examination paper, believe me, you'd be far more right than what they gave in the answer books. Because a foot – a mile is – a mile is a distance which was composed of so many feet and "feet" was the length between the heel and toe of a British king. You see? And the miles near London are bigger than the miles out in the sticks. It's very interesting. It's – MEST universe is the right answer.

You want to know who measured the river. You could be very embarrassing as a schoolchild. Who determined the velocity? How do we know that that's accurate?

Now, this is a theoretical problem, I trust, because the method of progress of a river steamer is not measured in this type of velocity, so we must assume that you knew the answer before you figured out the problem so that you could get the average velocities. Therefore, it's a hypothetical problem and can't happen, because it could only be determined by test and then figured backwards arithmetically. So it becomes a false problem which doesn't have any actual factors. Therefore the problem's unsolvable – simple. River steamer has to dart from the right bank to the left bank and go up with the current and so forth.

A proper answer to it is that the velocity of the stream probably has no bearing upon it. The upbound – the upbound riverboat is probably being assisted by the eddies along the bank. Oh, we must go deeper into the problem and fire its pilot for being incompetent! In other words, people putting out this problem can get in very hot water.

The only thing which really determines the answer to the problem, as any thetan discovers, is experience. The only real answer to any problem is if the problem happened. Has it happened already? Well, then, we know the answer to it. And thetans who are in apathy about this whole cockeyed universe will get into that frame of mind eventually. They'll say, "Well, did it happen?"

"Yes, it happened."

"Well, all right, if it happened, we know the answer to it. Just because it happened though is – it's probably going to happen again, but we'd better not let it happen again, because if it happened in this universe it's bad " Period. That's all adjudicated.

We take up this explosion – this fascinating problem. Where is the fifteen seconds? Is it in present time or the past or the future? Or just where is present time? The explosion happened and then thirty-two seconds later the building flattened, and the person is at the building – well, where is present time at the moment of the explosion?

Male voice: At the wave front.

Well, the present time could be the wave front all the way on down toward the building, but then you have a present time thirty-two seconds long.

I tell you, when you ask people – when you asked people, in Dianetics, to come to present time, you were asking them more than they rightly knew.

So if it is so – if it is so completely desirable to be in present time, it is logical to ask the simple, rather rhetorical question, "Where the hell is it?"

Time is determined by the relative motion of particles. That's all time is. In this universe they move at a certain relative speed with regard to each other and they will therefore traverse a certain proximity with regard to each other, according to your consideration.

% [The old reel ends here. The remainder of this transcript % is based on the clearsound version only.]

An old person very often finds the days going by like box cars past a telephone pole. And a summer afternoon, when one is three, lasts forever. Consideration.

We find two particles in proximity to each other determining time. Who for?

[Please note: At this point there was a break in the original master recording. This tape now resumes as did the original master recording.]

Second part of the October 30th morning lecture, continuing on this "Particle with Regard to Time."

Two particles then – this is very elementary – two particles, two units of MEST universe, are relatively spaced here and here and then these two particles come together at this speed, pass each other at this speed. Well, this simply means that there must have been some consideration concerning it. The second you say "speed" there must be a consideration.

Now, people go so daffy on this problem they finally say, "Well, did any two particles cross at all? And if they did, why, let's just skip it. All is illusion, all is illusion, I can't see anything, I'm blind, let's not look. Because it's all illusion anyway, let's not look."

Well, that's one way of looking at it, but here we have these two particles, they're passing each other and somebody says they're traveling at the rate of eighteen miles per hour. Well, that's fine because you can set it up on MEST universe – look at the trap involved here – you could set it up on MEST universe meters and sure enough, it is traveling at eighteen miles per hour. What do you know! Now we've proven it.

What's eighteen miles an hour? Well, eighteen miles an hour can very easily be considered by a scientist as a datum which has some bearing on the subject. He thinks that if he reads it on a meter, he's made it come true. If you prove the MEST universe by the MEST universe, then the MEST universe is true. Follows!

Now, there's a particle there and if there's a particle there, then there's a particle there. And he just moves right on past this very small and insignificant point: There's a particle there if there's a viewpoint. That's what proves that there's a particle there, not that there's a particle there.

You see, eighteen miles per hour is an automobile moving down the road according to its speedometer. It's being measured in its movement down the road by its speedometer. There was nobody to look – we're back into the old philosophic saw to some degree: Would there be a sound in the woods if there wasn't anybody in the woods? Well, let's solve it for a change. Put it into a category where we can use this thing instead of just squirreling on it.

Now, the sound in the woods is a sound in the woods, if we've determined there's a woods. That's about all there is to it; if we've determined there's a woods. We have to move it up another step.

See, they – as long as they can keep it down to the basis of "Is this car moving eighteen miles an hour?" "Yes, it says eighteen miles an hour on the speedometer, therefore, it's moving eighteen miles an hour." It's all simple and elementary.

But the second you move it – move the same problem up into the fact: "Is there a sound in the woods if there is nobody in the woods to hear the sound in the woods?" All right. There's two particles in the woods and they're moving together and one is a tree and the other is an air particle and when these two come together it signals the fact that the movement from the sound source has finally reached the tree. And it isn't a problem, actually, of "is there a woods?" The most basic problem in it is the velocity because we've immediately entered the field of consideration.

We would consider it a great velocity from our viewpoint if it knocked down the tree. In other words, we've added volume or mass translation into speed and that is the way we consider whether or not something is moving fast – the amount of creation or destruction performed thereby.

Now, once or twice in Scientology, we have hazarded, "What are these particles which compose this universe?" We've talked about it quite a bit in this class. If you dehydrate MEST in a certain way and a such and such a way and on a certain system, otherwise, it finally becomes very solid and view-able and all is well. And we do that. And if we throw some affinity at it, and too much affinity, why, it'll sort of swell up and do other things. In other words, particles have – obviously can be combined and do things with particles if the same system of communication is applied to the particles which originated the particles. If the same system is applied, then of course you get the same behavior.

Why? Well, you've agreed on the whole track, all the way on down the track, that that was the way it was going to happen. And if it was going to happen that way, then of course

you've agreed that it's happening that way, and so they're there! There isn't any question about it not being there. They're there; there are particles.

You have a viewpoint, don't you? Well, that's all it takes to make a particle. And the whole MEST universe is proven by the fact that you have a viewpoint. It's proven by the fact that there's life, not by the fact that it measures itself

Now, the fixation upon the meter is wonderful. Because all a meter is doing is moving at the same ratio of the particles it's moving with, the particles it's measuring. It's of the same breed of cat and has been originated by the same agreement system, and it's running on exactly the same agreements as the particles it's measuring – particles or lack of. You see? You've taken a cat, now, and asked him whether or not there are cats. And of course, he's a cat, so he says there are cats. And here we have Q and A, because this universe is essentially foolishly silly in its origin. It is so simple in its origin that it would completely escape anything.

And a matter of fact, a fellow can walk around a long time pondering this... What is the significance of it? Well, the reason he can work so long pondering it, is because there isn't any significance to it! It's just the fact that – a particle moving.

Now a person who is sixty or seventy sees a car go down the road at twenty-five miles an hour through traffic and he says, "Speed demon!" And the kid of eighteen says, "Slowpoke! Why doesn't he get off the road? Why doesn't he get it – get it out of reverse, huh? Wake up and die right." Viewpoint.

Fact of the matter is that the only actual monitoring factor involved, the only metering factor on any of this, is consideration. And we could get very biblical, "religiousical" and logical and say, "Be ye as ye consider ye ist," and you would have it. "Be as you consider you are." And you would just about shape your personality. That is very fascinating because it merely says – it permits somebody to say that all you had to do is decide to be self-determined, you'd be self-determined from there on and that's all there is to it. See, even that – somebody comes along and says that. Fact of the matter is, that can't happen.

I spent – November 14th lecture of 1951 goes on for an hour saying how this – how this is terribly possible, and then the second hour was devoted entirely to why it couldn't happen. An awful lot of people heard that first hour; nobody ever listened to the second one. I should have reversed them.

The point is that all art and so forth, is agreement. It's basically agreement. So you get an art form out of an agreed-upon aesthetic. But anybody can consider anything beautiful if he steps outside the field of agreement. And there we have a clue to all of this: If you step outside the field of agreement far enough, you're outside of it, believe me. And there's where exteriorization and its results produces your sudden effects. And why you can then go on and exercise somebody into what? The creation and destruction of particles, creation and destruction of space, creation and destruction of communications and channels – while exteriorized, because he doesn't have to agree with speed.

Now, while a person is being audited, he has to, to some degree, agree with the speed of the auditor. But that's all right, we can get up to a higher speed than is normally tolerable in

communication lines and you're outside the agreement level, or we could actually go down to a slower speed than is normally tolerable and we're outside the communication agreement speed. Because we have to step outside of the speed agreement, and this is only stepping outside of the agreement that there must be motion. That's one of the first agreements. The thing that pins people in this universe is just that: There must be or there must not be motion.

The one thing that is peculiar in this universe is this fact: motion. Why should there be motion? That's very silly. Motion says that you have to go from one place to another place in a gradient line of travel.

You have to go from – when you go from A to B – this universe tries to tell you – when you go from A to B, you have to go to A plus micromillimeter, A plus micromillimeter, A plus micromillimeter, see, down to the halfway point when they would start calling it B minus maximum micromillimeters, less one, less one, less one, less one, less one, until you're at B.

The way to go from A to B is to go dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-dit-B, see? The way to go from the center of town to the edge of town is block by block. Well, every time you do that, you have – you are, in effect, creating new spaces. Now, we not quite sure what we have to do with these old spaces that have been created, but we're no longer there, so it's all right. We've kept creating space, so we just say that's in – all in the past. That's vanished space.

All a thetan has to do is lose his ability to vanish space and he's stuck with the past in present time. It's just as simple as that. The second he loses his ability to vanish space, he's stuck with the past in present time, which hangs him up with what? That hangs him up exclusively where? The past – because he can't get any more space, because where he is now doesn't matter – it doesn't make more space. See? The fact that he's at 9th and Chester doesn't make new space because the space he made that morning was at 5th and Wesson, when Joe hit him in the rear end with another car. That's space.

So, he has to be convinced over and over and over and more and more and more and more and more to make a new point of space. And at first a fellow goes along simply by creating and destroying particles and he's got lots of new space, new space, new space, new space, new space. And then after a while he loses his ability to do that on that scale, so he starts borrowing particles to – that somebody else is sort of moving along for him. And the next thing you know, why, he's down into the level where he's got – where he's what – going what? He's going engram to engram to engram to engram; that's his space particles. He's making new space on the basis of "Let's see, I was hit in the jaw in Milwaukee. That gave me an anchor point." Masses of anchor points is what he has to have. It – he's got to be convinced he made one.

But just the fact of driving by 5th and Elm doesn't, at that instant, give him the space at 5th and Elm. If it did, he'd be in present time. What determines the ability to be in present time? Simply that.

Then what determines a communication? A communication, in essence, would be flowing along a certain line, making gradients of new space by this universe definition. And

that is the imposition of an arbitrary. So your thetan recovers quite rapidly if he does his communication on a change-of-space basis: A to B, A to B, A to B, A to B, A to B. See?

But if it's A plus one micromillimeter, so on, he sort of loses out. He has to be perfectly willing to let such a thing as a body go on doing all the gradient steps of a communication line, while he himself is content to guide it, or to guide other particles, or to re-form or mass or take apart other particles. If he's just willing to do that, he's all right; he can go through all the gradient steps he wants to.

But then one day he says, "I am a particle." He begins to believe that the particles which compose this stuff up here, are alive. The day he gets interested in little things which are alive "just like he is" (reference: biology class), he's gotten the idea that particles are alive and that particles recombining with particles is life itself. And this is the doctrine which is taught today.

"There's this universe, see, and after a while there gets to be a crystalline formation. And this crystalline formation..." See, and here we go, I mean, we're off to the – we're off toward madness immediately. Because we have taken out of the problem the one factor which solves the problem: consideration. We have fixed him with the arbitrary of having to consider himself as a particle, and consider life as produced by particles, and giving to particles as in that wall – those molecules – the role of source! He doesn't want to do that, so he assigns to those particles in the wall the role of receipt-point. And when he assigns that role to them, he's doing what they were supposed to do in the first place. But if he's identified himself with a particle, he thinks he's going to wind up eventually as a molecule.

And all they had to do earlier on the track was to implant somebody with an implant known as 'The Electron," and we were all set with a universe and everybody could be slaves. And that's all it took! And you'll find a lot of preclears going around – they're afraid they're going to become MEST. There are implants all over the place that tell them they should become MEST and so forth, Hey! You'll never be one of those particles – you can't be! You could have them. You could have all you want of them. You can make all you want of them. But you don't dare destroy that stuff eventually, because it's alive. You don't dare destroy it – it's alive. It is – it's terrible.

If you don't believe that, watch some mama sometime upbraiding the little kid for having wrecked one of his toys; she gives him the definite idea the toy must be alive and hurt. And people will talk in terms of hurting MEST objects.

They talk of themselves as being ruined, and the rain as ruining their hat. You see? They talk of a motor having been abused, but they hope it didn't hurt it. They hope running it without oil for the last twenty miles didn't hurt it any. Complete confusion, you see?

They're MEST and as long as they believe this, they think they're going to go on a dwindling spiral straight down to the point where they become one of them things.

And I let this coast for a long time to see how it wound up and what it did with cases and so forth, one time – I just let it slide. And I mentioned in a lecture that there was some feeling that this might not be – this might be so, and we got an immediate opinion on the part

of a lot of auditors, yes sir: what molecules were – were dead thetans. "Yeah, molecules are dead thetans." And so people suppose this to be true.

They see a body lie down and die, and then they see it become dust. Obviously the person was dust, then! Elementary, simple, neat. Of course, they don't want anybody to know that the second the thing started to – thing started to kick the bucket, they shoved off. Anything that was alive there and could consider was gone.

So we have life as the thing which can consider One of its higher activities is consideration. If it can broadly and certainly consider something aesthetic, can do so.

Actually, a little kid running the glorious irresponsibility of being a baby, can consider that a lot of the darnedest things are beautiful – oooh! They come around and just any MEST is perfectly all right, any form they put it into, any way they smash it up, it's still beautiful; they just consider it so.

And then one day, some artist in the rough goes to art school. The next thing you know, why, "Well, van Gogh, uhhhm, uhm, ..." He's considering, all right, but he's considering with a MEST communication lag. And that is the death of an artist.

This stuff is not supposed to be destructible. The postulate with which it's made is "It does not destroy itself." That's the postulate in it. And if a fellow thinks he's MEST and just another breed of particle, and some kind of a communication system of particles which somehow mysteriously and mystically have become alive in some fashion or another, he thinks that he will get conservation of energy on this same level. He knows he can't do it because he's made out of these particles and these particles say they mustn't destroy each other.

The last ditch in this, as far as politics is concerned, is communism: "We mustn't destroy each other. We can't – we must conserve everything. We must produce. And we sort of live parasitically off anything that'll move." That sort of a weird, weird idea. Justice is composed of "We mustn't destroy each other."

And a thetan should be able – should be able to pull stuff apart and put it back together again rather easily because if he doesn't, the stuff will pile up on him in the present. The energy he's using is energy, if he's fool enough to use energy.

Now, you just run on somebody with these considerations, the idea of "I am a particle" and you get dynamite. You get – mock up a communication line going through his head or something of the sort and have him be on one end of it and then be on the other end of it: "I'm source." "I'm receipt-point." Weird things will happen to his case – weird. He gets somatics and – all over the place. Not particularly a bad process, but doesn't lead too far; but quite often will unburden the case markedly – the case that thinks it has to think.

The thing you should do with such a case is merely rehabilitate his ability to create and uncreate space. And you notice we haven't gone too much, yet, into the uncreation-of-space exercises.

Fellow after a while gets scared to create something, you see, because if he – he creates the damned thing it'll still stay around and he can't get rid of it!

You have most artists, if you – who are deteriorating, if you asked them suddenly why they're not painting as many pictures as they used to, they would tell you bluntly – well, I mean this – their first response, if you could only get it on a flash answer, it would be, "Well, I'd have them around." It's completely unconsidered. They have other methods of getting rid of them. They sell them, they translate them into other kinds of anchor points – money, which vanishes very quickly.

A writer almost never can be persuaded to write five or six stories in advance of the one he has a sale for; he'd have them around! You see? In other words, his method of destroying a thing he created is to sell it – get rid of it.

Now, you have amongst the communist art schools the theory that one should never sell anything or part with it, naturally. At least commercial art permits one to get it gone. You know – swoosh. He gets the idea after a while though that it's precious and ought to endure someplace or another. That is a lower echelon, lower – level idea.

Well, all right, we needn't beat this thing to death. It becomes very simple that an individual who supposes himself to be an anchor point is not going to be able to make space. And an individual who supposes himself to be a communication particle which is merely a kind of anchor point, cannot, of course, make communications or receive them.

Now, what's – what's a – what's a motivator? What's an overt act? How does that tie into this? Ties in very simply. The motivator-overt act sequence is a great deal of trouble to cases, which as a matter of fact is the hang-up of the maybe. And if you want to know why is it the hang-up of the maybe, it's because a person has tangled his consideration with the consideration of being a particle to a point where he has to have facsimiles with which to operate. He is a particle, he can only operate with particles, so therefore, only being able to operate with particles, it is then obvious that he has to have a particle before he can put the particle into action.

A person has already abandoned his ability to create and destroy particles for this lifetime – you know, he's saying, "I've been punished enough. I've been punished enough. I can't create and destroy particles. I didn't do it. I can't make it." He's gotten the idea that he has to receive a facsimile before he can use it in an action. And if he's done something, you see, without the facsimile, then he's gone against the law of something or other. He's gone against the law of the MEST universe, is "There has to be a particle" – it says, too, "There has to be a particle there before there can be any motion of a particle." It's a silly law, but I mean, it's the fundamental law. There has – it's just – it sounds silly, it sounds too simplified but yet it's – it's there: There has to be a particle there before there is a particle.

See, in other words, nobody made these particles. These particles are not being manufactured at this moment – and they are, you see. People believe this who are low on the Tone Scale. They believe nothing is being manufactured at this moment in terms of a new particle. They think they are already manufactured by God or something at Some unimaginable distance in the past, when the stuff is just floating around changing its positions changing its positions, changing its positions, that's all, and vanishing with relationship to other particles.

All right, the effort to arrive is the effort to have motivators. One gets the idea, when he goes along the line, that if he can just have enough things happen to him, then he'll have enough particles and enough impacts so that he will then have enough fuel or energy with which to arrive at a point toward which he's going. And these impacts and so forth might even work in such a fashion as to drive him along this line to make him arrive at B. He sort of thinks he has to be beaten into it, in other words, because he knows he hasn't got energy enough to go the rest of the gradient scale to B.

Now, the efforts to have motivators is also the effort to be the source. See? I mean, a fellow, before he can be source of any output of energy, why, he has to have some energy to use as – to output. Same law as we just went over with regard to the MEST universe: There has to be a particle there before there is a particle. So, as a motivator, he has to have motivators before he can be source.

Therefore, you get all wise men and messiahs and things of this character having to be beaten into complete apathy, and crowns of thorns and sacrifice and all of this sort of thing has to go along before they (quote) have the authority to be a messiah (unquote). See, it takes a lot of motivators. See.

Well, this comes about through the – through actually the belief that one needs facsimiles in order to use facsimiles. Of course, if one uses facsimiles, one needs facsimiles; one needs facsimiles, one uses facsimiles, it's obvious.

Now, the dependence upon facsimiles is, therefore, merely a dependence upon already created particles which is already an abandonment of the ability to create particles, and that ability to create particles is abandoned when the person first begins to believe that he can't destroy particles. He can't out-postulate somebody: "You're dead." "No, I'm not dead." "Yes, you are dead." He can't out-postulate somebody.

Now, the thirst for motivators equals the necessity to have and use facsimiles. Anybody who has motivator hunger is using facsimiles for operation, fuel, energy. They will also eat other people's facsimiles, they will steal facsimiles, they go out of valence. To have it explained well why they're in Joe's valence, they're in Joe's valence because Joe is a very put-upon man and he's very sad, so that means he has lots of facsimiles, so you just pick up those facsimiles and use them for fuel. And he's got lots of motivation for doing something, so therefore he theoretically could be source. "If I just had Joe's woe, I could be source: That's the way that works out.

Now, this is – you notice, then, anybody who is having motivator hunger, you can run, run, run just so long on this case and all of a sudden you'll have to give the case a whole flock of motivators. Well, although we've been letting this go by this far because we didn't want to stretch this material, the wrong way to run it is feed them motivators – wrong way to run it. It's nonsense. They mock up motivators and mock up motivators and mock up motivators. They might as well be mocking up energy. I mean, it's just silly. It's adding too much reason to processing. You don't have to have him mock up motivators, particularly.

Rehabilitate – this is remedied by the rehabilitation of the ability to create. Create what? Energy. Which is remedied by, to some degree, the sudden realization the fellow can destroy something or make it invisible or do anything with it; he can make it vanish.

If you worked with a pc until he got something vanished, why, he'd be much happier and after that he'd be able to create better. So you'd work with him some more until he'd made something vanish. Either by making it invisible or doing anything you want to it, you see – you don't care what you do with it – why, you'd get around to, after a while, the point where he – his creative urge would come way on up.

He has to be able to destroy before he could first create. And there are some slugs that have kind of crawled into the universe through back doors, in the theta world, who are going around so dazed on this one that they try to destroy everybody and everything they run into in an effort that – in an effort, you see, to then be able to rehabilitate their ability to destroy. And if they can destroy enough, then they'll have the right to create again. This is highly, highly simple.

It isn't an ethical question. Motivators and overt acts are not a question which belongs in morality or ethics. And any time you tangle it with morality or ethics, you're simply letting your preclear agree some more with a system which won't put him up into the line of being an artist again or being able to make space again or anything else.

Morality is itself an interesting thing because it's a nice game; it's a game of restraint and restriction. When it gets played down to the level of making somebody a slave, that's playing the game a little bit too far and a fellow looks up and he can't quite see that it's a game anymore.

Well, then how do you rehabilitate somebody who's motivator hungry? Well, how do you rehabilitate somebody who just goes around trying to destroy everything? He just wants to destroy, destroy, destroy, destroy, destroy.

The test, by the way, is very overt, this destruction. We're not looking for a back of the – back of the – of the hill significance to this. They'll – may talk about constructing something, but the truth of the matter is they're not putting anything out; they're just overtly destroying things. You can go out and look at their MEST, very good test – boy, oh boy, oh boy, oh boy – enMEST. We go and look at this and we look at that and – with regard to their actions.

Auditors – people in Scientology, actually, in Dianetics, by and large are darned nice people. For instance, I noticed yesterday when I said, "Worth – while people haven't time," a couple of guys in the class winced. Well, the point is, we do have a leisure class – people who have some slight margin on their ability. There you're picking out the top crust of the society. The working, upper-working-class intellectual of the society is more pinned down. You can determine a person's worthwhileness, to a large degree, by the pinneddownness; until we go into the mockery level of the scale and then we find somebody is entirely mobile just so he'll destroy, destroy, destroy. See, how we – how you work that out?

You get the most mobile strata of the society, the most mobile (and when we say "mobile" we just mean comfortably able to move about) in the society – ordinarily it's the

most worthwhile strata of the society. These people can create things, they can destroy things, they're taking it fairly comfortable, fairly easy on life.

Below that level we have professional levels and these people are. less mobile, but they're not immobile.

And we go down below that, we find the working stiff – the fellow who works hard (that's the phrase with which he calls himself, not the phrase I call him). And he works less hard than the laborer, but he's pretty well pinned down. His margins of survival are not very great.

Then we get into the laborer and the worst margin in the society you ever saw in your life is the fellow who has to sweat the hardest in order to eat. And we get down to that level.

Now we start to drop into the loony bin. Because down below the level of a person's ability to work, we start to run into neurosis and psychosis. And we find people that are flying all over the place – they're never still a moment, they never go home, they never do this, they don't got one. If they do have one, why, it's a mess and a hurrah, and they'll only stay with that long enough to completely bust it sky-wide and handsome. And you get this tremendous commotion going on.

These people, by the way, rarely have any substance. They rarely have any MEST to amount to anything. They rarely have any – in this society, rarely have any money and they rarely have anything. It's fascinating how that package goes together I've only had about three years of looking at man and it is quite interesting how his categories fall together so easily.

The town drunk, for instance, if – he's only – he's into an inversion of an inversion stage. You see, he's not only broke, indigent and neurotic, he also now is in the next stage down where he makes himself unconsciously so. Well, he – the reason he doesn't move around is he's not there and he's not anywhere.

See how your society strata falls apart. Actually, there are only ten or fifteen thousand intellectuals in America – people who are free, people who have some mobility.

You would be utterly amazed – people of this class you are – the people you associate with and so forth – you would be utterly confused to know – I mean, it'd be amazing to you if you just took a look and found out how few you were, numerically, in this nation. Ten or fifteen thousand, about the works.

You go around and you get confounded because everybody's supposed to be equal in America. You go around and you get utterly confounded because the fellow next door just can't seem to understand what you're talking about. He knows you're a very clever fellow and very witty, kind of nutty sometimes about some things and so forth, but he doesn't understand you.

Well, the reason he doesn't understand you is his breadth of understanding isn't any – hasn't got any width to it. He's in a pattern. You've never inspected this fellow for a pattern. He puts on his hat at a certain moment; he goes through certain moments; the job he's doing, very often, looks like it's a very intelligent job and that sort of thing, but if you worked hard

you could dream up a robot that would do the same job. This isn't decrying such an individual, this is probably below the level of the professional.

A professional – the professional class of a country used to include its doctors. These fellows are just working stiffs now. They're penicillin needle pushers. They're technicians. Always you read in costume historicals or in diaries or something like that, the doctor was always hanging around the drawing room and they were this and that and so forth. Philosophic discussion of this or that was going on, why, his opinion was always on it.

Well, don't ask a modern doctor his philosophic discussion opinion. The last discussion I entered into with a US doctor on the subject was, he came in to give me a shot – I had a – oh, I'd had everything in God's green earth falling on my head for a few days and it had been very wet and I'd gotten a cold a couple of times. So, I decided that I'd just better stop what little bacterial fluster was going on in my lungs with a shot of penicillin, so I had somebody send for a doctor and he came over and gave me a shot.

He noticed my name on a grip. He didn't say a thing, he merely got very brutal. "What do you want to go into philosophies for and that stuff!" Here we go – MEST universe. He was very interesting, very interesting.

And I noticed he had a rash, a bit of a rash below his ear, and when he left (I hadn't said a word to him) I said, "By the way, Doc, if you..." Oh, they hate to have you call them "Doc" because a dock is something that belongs to a horse or it's something you tie a boat to. And – the – as he left, I said, "By the way, Doc, if you want to get rid of that rash, come around and see me sometime."

The – there are some of the old boys still around who haven't been super-indoctrinated, but they're real old, by the way. And they're real nice guys. Okay.

That's not off the point, particularly, it's just a consideration. But it's also the ability to create. The ability to create unfortunately depends, as you would neglect – and if you need processing, if you really need processing, it's merely because you have neglected the ability to destroy. And this doesn't ask for people to go out in mass armies and blow down all the towns. That is a method of trying to waste the ability to destroy on the MEST universe itself.

Where the ability to destroy must be in – put into place is a fellow's ability to blow up his own facsimiles. Stop using facsimiles for anchor points.

Now, a process immediately presents itself if you can just get a pc to start using, just that, facsimiles – indestructible facsimiles – as anchor points and keep him putting them up: brackets of six and then run five on the MEST universe, then a bracket of six – of indestructible anchor points.

He'll run out the postulate and the anger that he went into one day when some other thetan kept potshooting him all the time. He'd put up an anchor point and some other thetan would come along and blow them in. He'd put up some more and he'd blow them in. Put up some more and blow them in. This was a good game only up to a point of where he says, "Here I go now," and he puts up these undes... indestructible anchor points.

And you know, he's still got them. You'll find them in the case as you process him – indestructible. "I'm going to hold this line if it's the last thing I ever do," he says. Of course, he recognizes at that point that he has been chosen for somebody else's randomity, so other-determinism ensues. And the second he does that, he begins to associate himself with particles to some slight degree and after that goes into the line of being a particle and the second he becomes a particle, he starts believing he's a communication.

Now, get this – the thetan three feet, twelve feet, eight miles, Six light-years back of the head and using the body for a communications unit – a relay point for what he's thinking – is doing something entirely different than a thetan who is in the body being a communications relay point.

You want to know what's the chief difference between an exteriorized thetan and an interiorized thetan? The one who is exteriorized is running a communication relay point and he knows it's a communication relay point, and the one who is inside thinks he is being run. See? Because he is inhabiting a communications relay point, so lie thinks he's the communication.

And as you go downhill, people get more and more convinced about communications, communications become more and more valuable, to a point where almost any psychotic you run into, if you asked them for a word, they would hand you some solid object. They're handling solid objects when they're handling words. You ask these people to put up a couple of anchor points and they're liable to put up something like the pyramids. Real solid see? They're on this line of "We've got to make it terribly indestructible or it'll be destroyed."

Mocking a child – child says, "Glub, glub," and somebody says, "Glub, glub." Little boy comes in and he says, "School..." and somebody says to him "School! Rarrh – that's a – I bet you didn't either..." and so forth, when he offers these words, see? What's he doing? He's putting up an anchor point. He's started to use words as his anchor points instead of create real anchor points, see. Mama takes this anchor point and destroys it – she blows it up. Puts up another word, blows it up. He puts up another word, Papa blows it up. Puts up another word....

He thinks he can handle his schoolmates. You never notice anybody getting terribly aberrated from other children – they're the same size and they can beat their heads off if they have to and we don't get too much of that.

We get these giants going around who keep eating up these damned anchor points, these words. What makes a neurotic and psychotic, see? The entering wedge is "a word is an anchor point." Which is, of course, otherwise stated, "A symbol is an anchor point – a symbol made out of particles I don't own is an anchor point." That's the entering wedge, which is also a facsimile. "Particles which I don't own are an anchor point for me." It doesn't matter who made the particles – that has nothing to do with whether he owns it or not. The question of ownership should never enter. It's just that "somebody else owns this facsimile and I'm using it for an anchor point."

So, he's taught the English language and he uses it for his anchor points, exclusively. And he puts out these words and they're his anchor points. And people start mocking, pounding in words as far as he's concerned, ridiculing his speech, he'll get so he won't even

put up words for anchor points. And he has hit the breakpoint of neurosis right there. He's right into it, hot and heavy.

You can give him a polite conversation – anybody could say anything they wanted to – and he won't say a thing. School teaches people to be neurotic, by the way, by teaching them that "silence is golden." Anchor points are golden – that means noise is golden. See what a direct, bald lie it is that "silence is golden"? It's not golden. It's no color at all. It's nothing. And of course, they always revere a child who is willing to be nothing. Only, of course, they sit around and tell him he has to be something. That's, of course, confusing to a child. They convince him he has to be something, and yet they educate him to he nothing.

Anyway, there is the entire problem, actually, if you want to look at it, as far as this universe is concerned: What is present time fifteen seconds after the explosion?

Well, I'll tell you what's present time fifteen seconds after the explosion: it's just what is the simultaneous instant throughout the universe. Just because MEST waves are flowing from A to B is no reason why present time is even vaguely disturbed; it's not even vaguely disturbed. Present time is simply a simultaneous instant. And people who are unable to reach present time are concerned – overly concerned about the motion of particles and the destructive quality of those particles, with regard to themselves as a particle.

What's present time? It's the simultaneous position. You see, at the moment of the explosion you could say, "Thirty-two seconds later a building is going to be flattened." But at the moment of the explosion, the building is there and the explosion is there. Halfway through, the explosion is pretty near exploded and its waves are out and the building is still there. And present time, as the particles change, the simultaneous position – what you'd call this, this is important enough to really assign a word to; you'd call it the "simultaneous position."

You've got the building flat and the explosion expended. Now, what's present time at that instant? Just the building flat? Thirty-two seconds? Who cares about thirty-two seconds? That is a consideration. Somebody has said, "Thirty-two seconds ago." When? You mean – you mean a meter that you have here which is made out of MEST particles has gone tock-tock-tock thirty-two times – that's all you're saying.

In a battle, it is often of great concern to find out for soldiers they've fought for hours, when they know that the action just started a couple of – oh, just a few minutes ago. And they look up and the sun's going down. Where the hell has all that time gone? Well, there was just too much motion around there and their time sense got disturbed.

And the other fellow thinks he's fighting forever and he's very astonished to find out that only one day has gone by when he knows he's been in that trench for seven months. The day itself will start to take on the characteristics of the seasons of the year: 2:00 to 3:00, now it's fall. Consideration.

Now, what's this got to do with somebody running facsimiles? How does he get into this in the first place? Well, if he's a communication particle he must be traveling through time. If he's not source and yet he experiences motion, then the source of the motion must be back of him as far as time is concerned. So, source is in the past and source is agitating

particles and the particles being agitated in this fashion, of course, means that he is in the past; because he is a particle and all the particles are in the past.

Now, a very funny thing is an individual actually has, all through his body, particles which will tell him a date. This morning I asked a fellow for his flash answer machine. We were working with old flash answers – very fascinating. It just depends on what flash answer is the loudest to know which particles have the most command value. And I asked him what date it was and he says 1724 according to this flash answer, but that was the date machine under his feet.

I said, "What is the date of the creation of that machine?"

"1724, of course."

I didn't ask him the rest of it which is, "Where is it?" That might have been Rome or it might have been almost anyplace, you see. It's a particle which has been geared up and hung together with enough new energy on an old platform, so every time you look at it you reactivate it.

Every time you take the vacuum cleaner over and plug it into the wall, you connect it up so the vacuum cleaner runs. That's the way circuits go. Circuits are never operative unless live consideration is played upon them Tells you an awful lot about processing, doesn't it? A circuit is never active unless live consideration is played upon it. It is a – a circuit is a vacuum cleaner which is not plugged into the wall. You could very well be the source of the juice in the wall, but that doesn't mean you're an electron.

So, just because some type of energy translation moves energy into translation is no reason why motion is even vaguely necessary, much less – much less, there doesn't have to be a life source moving the energy all the time. A piece of coal isn't alive; hasn't got any life in it at all. All life is, is consideration of that piece of coal; but life could theoretically look at that piece of coal and burn it up. You could also take it up on a pair of tongs and drop it on an existing blaze and it'll burn it up. The consideration in that case is, "I think we put another lump of coal on the fire." If you were to drop it into a volcano, or if it were to fall after an explosion into a volcano – boom – it would also burn up. Which means, of course, "the MEST universe is alive," just because life does the same thing it does.

Motion is the foe of life, not its friend, so far as the cases with whom you will deal are concerned And they are fighting the one thing which is aberrative: is change in space by gradient scale. And they'll fight this so hard that they will fight all change in space, regardless by what scale. See, they fight the gradient scale change which is driving down the block with each new space, new space, new space, because they know they can't destroy space they've created, therefore they don't dare be a place that will create new space. You see, they – they're resisting that and they finally get about resisting being first in A and then in B without going from A to B.

Life can do the silly thing of existing simultaneously over a large area. The second it realizes that it can be simultaneously over a large area, it finds present time. Otherwise, present time gets tipped out of shape badly.

The reason why psychiatry insists on processing the past is it knows it's a particle, and it knows the patient's a particle, and a particle is on a communication line and a communication line has already been departed from, so they're just trying to find source of the line.

Well, in order to find source of the line, it says, in the MEST universe, you have to go and find the beginning of the line. The beginning of the line would be the source of the line, so therefore, you have to get to the beginning of the line, before you can do anything of the sort.

And sure enough, you just put your preclear at the beginning of the line, there's nothing easier than that. Just say, "Be at the beginning of the line. Well, right now, be at the beginning of the line. Now be here. Now be at the beginning of the line. Now be here. Be at the beginning of the line. Now be here." See? So you keep up that process all by itself "Be at the beginning of the line. Be here. Beginning of the line... Be here..." So he'll finally say, "What line?" You just – I mean, you just start in on somebody off the street, he'll finally say, "What line?"

"Oh, any line you happen to think of"

"Okay, I'll be at the beginning of a clothesline." He's sane.

But the people that aren't doing too well at the moment and who haven't been even vaguely indoctrinated in Scientology of course, you immediately go and find the beginning of a communication line – but people who don't know anything about that, they'll go right to the beginning of a communication line and they're a particle on it. They find this very hard to do and they'll find angels at the beginning of it, and they'll find all sorts of religious symbols at the beginning of it, and they'll find all sorts of bric-a-brac, at what? At the beginning of the line. Where is it? It's in the past, of course. Where is the past?

You just tell them to be at the beginning of the line, and if you just kept it up and kept it up and kept it up and kept it up and kept it up, here and there and here and there and here and there and here and there, the first thing you know, they will have been in the geographical area of their entrance into the universe and have cleaned it up and you will have shot basic-basic on the case.

Of course, there are lots of other liabilities on such a case. The fellow thinks he's a particle, he is a message. After a while he begins to think he's an answer.

You know, you could – you – some fellows will fly into a towering rage – into a towering rage if they have an answer presented to them out of a page of a book. They just look at the page of the book and so forth, and boy they get mad. At what? Well, it's just an answer – not even an answer to something they've been thinking about. Well, we get the gradient scale, then we go back up and find the answer.

What is the answer? "Them," of course. You go around, every once in a while somebody will say, "Well, just as you're speaking there, I almost had the answer." See? They know that there's an answer there. Sure there is – sitting right there is an answer. They are the answer. Yeah, that's too elementary simple, because they can only be an answer as long as

they're a particle. And as long as they use facsimiles they continue to believe themselves to be, to some degree or another, a particle.

Is there any reason why anybody has to use facsimiles in order to remember everything in the bank and so forth? There sure isn't. Because, you see, I'm not at all sure that the MEST universe ever goes into the past – ever. And I'm not at all sure that these facsimiles ever disappear or that a thetan ever does destroy any energy. He might just make it invisible and he would have to do that by changing his wavelength, wouldn't he? And if he changed his wavelength often enough to make enough things invisible, after all he would have run out of waves-lengths. Because of course there'd be a finite number of wavelengths; because of course he has to use motion, because he has to use energy. So it's elementary.

There is no answer to it and all is lost. Inevitable, you see. He's had to change his wavelength. Actually the system is, on most preclears that are having a rough time with their cases, running somewhat on that level; they keep shifting wavelength to avoid looking at something they just made and then they happily say, "Pffft – it's destroyed." Well, they're going to – if they keep on using this type of energy at that type of target, they will eventually run out of wavelengths. They can't avoid looking forever. They're going to run out of directions and geographical locations, and they're going to run out of everything else and they're just going to be pinned but good. Well, what's their first error? The original sin, of course, is "energy is indestructible."

"You will blow in my anchor points, will you! Well, now these new anchor points can't be destroyed!"

[End of tape.]