

# THE LOGICS – THEIR RELATION TO ABERRATION AND SPACE

A lecture given on 3 November 1953

1ACC – 49

09 50 25B 49 3 Nov 53 The Logics – Their Relation to Aberration and Space

Transcript of lecture by L. Ron Hubbard AICL-50, renumbered 25B and again renumbered 49 for the "Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space" cassette series.

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

And this is November the 3rd, morning lecture of November the 3rd, and this morning we're going to take up the Logics in relationship to aberration and space. Much less complicated than it sounds.

We have the first of the Prelogics having to do with theta's ability to locate things in time and space. And the ability to do that is of the essence, and so we'd better go into this a little bit further and find out what connotation this has and in addition to that, find out what time is, just by doing this.

Well, it comes into a lot of definitions. I'll type this up or do something with it so that you'll have this piece of paper here. But the definitions with which we're dealing can all be stated geographically – in relationship to position.

So we find that determinism is the responsibility for location in space and time. That's what one determines. He determines location. That's all one determines. And when one can't determine something it's because he can't determine a location and that's all there are to it.

And when you have you putting people in spaces and – relative to other spaces, why, you're determining them; and when other people are putting you in spaces and time, why, that's them determining you. That's all there is to self-determinism. It's all right to say self-determinism, but let's find out what we're determining from a standpoint we can use in processing.

All right, then, we have determinism. We have another word here which is just terrible in – when these two come into conflict, and this second one is determination. When one's lookingness has shortened to a point where he has mostly effort, he doesn't use determinism, he uses determination. See, I mean, that's of the essence, determination.

It means "a will to effect something," is determination – the connotation of that word, as we're using it here, is "the use of effort in." And where we have determination cropping up,

it takes the place of what we know as determinism. Determination is the will that one is going to effect a change of location in space. And determinism is the fact that one merely makes a location in space. He actually effects a location in space. And determination is trying to effect a location in space.

Well, let's get the difference. A fellow says, "This block of stone will be at 9th and Chester"; it is. And the other one, he takes the block of stone and he puts his shoulder to it and pushes; that's determination.

Well, after he has done just so much determination by pushing on the stone, he can't tell you whether he's got to go and send the stone to 9th and Chester or 8th and Walnut or whether he was ever trying to – had any purpose at all for the stone. As far as the purpose is concerned. "What are we going to do?" that comes under the head of "How many things are going to be in this location in what space pattern?" "The reason for" is then: "We've got to have reason for effort," and so forth, is that so other people will attract their attention to that place. That is why they should pay attention to this location at 9th and Chester. See, that's "the reason for"; that's about all it is. "The reason for" comes down to grabbing a lot of other people and giving them a push toward 9th and Chester.

Well, now there's – people easily entangle; and most of the cases which are bad off have entangled badly determination and self-determinism. They know they got to have will and willpower, which comes under the head of biceps, and this doesn't work.

If you've ever seen anybody really getting down and sweating over something and grinding his teeth and having a rough time in general, he was using determination. Determination is an act or a play. It's something else. Determination is a something else thing; it isn't the thing. You see, it's a – a fellow says – says, "Well, I will do it! I will do it! I will ..." Well, he hasn't done it, has he? That's the first thing you can ask yourself about that.

Now, a low Step case is saying, "I will be exteriorized! I've got to be! I'm apathetic that I can't be!" and so forth; he's ramming all around the place; he just isn't. He can't get the concept of simply being. See? He's got to try to be before he is; and you know that you have to try to be. Well, that's merely a symptom of necessity to use effort. He's indoctrinated into the fact that the only allowable portion of the lookingness band which he is able to examine is that one which has effort in it, and he knows he can't do that. In other words, he has to collapse his looking in order to look. And if you find any one of these boys looking, you will find he's doing just that; he's collapsing his looking in order to look, and of course then he can't see. That's the only squirrel cage he's in and he's going round and round in that one; he's collapsing his looking in order to look.

Did you ever see these people looking? Well, he's collapsing his looking. And when they look at something suddenly – you can actually get them to do this – you can say, "Look at that building." He's got the idea of the building being right here, see, and then way out there someplace. Very interesting.

Long time ago somebody decided that self-determinism was the stuff all right, and then immediately tried to sell everybody determination. "All you have to do is make up your mind to be cleared and you'll be cleared! Yah, yah, that's all, ah-hoo!" A fellow told me that

one time; immediately afterwards says, "Well, now, if I wanted that ball in the middle of the floor, and you (he said to the little girl) wanted the ball in the middle of the floor," and so forth, "why, my self-determinism would cause me to pick up the ball on the floor." And she said, "Well, what if I picked up the ball?" "Well, I just – you'd just get killed that's all." Well, this was – this was the way he solved things. This case couldn't have been exteriorized with a rocket pistol.

Now, determination has all of these things; besides "I will be," it's "I must be here," "I must be there"; "It must be here or there"; "You must be here, there"; "They must be here or there," or "He must be here or there," or "She must be here or there." In other words, we've introduced "will" into the problem, and the second "will" is introduced into the problem we, of course, immediately introduce conflict because the reason one uses will is because he feels it's going to be opposed. And if something is going to be opposed, then it has to have will exerted against it, and so on. It never occurs to these people to simply relax. All they have to do, actually, is just relax and say, "All right, I'm there," or "I'm looking at it" – they are. And if they can relax sufficiently on the subject, why, they stop trying. They don't have to know before they go, they simply go. But all this determination is knowing before you go.

"I will. do it! Now, what are the factors involved in this problem? The factors involved in this problem are such and such and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so. And if I walk across to the other side of the room, then the significance of being on the other side of the room will be .." and so forth. That's just determination. He knows he's going to be opposed.

In other words, there's going to be something else saying "Be elsewhere." He knows this will occur.

Now, what's loss? This is a very important thing, loss, because people go black when they lose and so forth. What's loss? All right, loss is it or you, they, he, I, she is not here or there and won't be here or there – of course wasn't here or there. This is loss. It's just the place isn't – the thing is not necessarily completely disappeared, but the location in which it is, is the – now the wrong location or can't be determined.

A person can consider he has lost a dollar in a poker game if the dollar is right in plain sight sitting in front of him but closer to another player who has just taken it in the pot, you see? See, the dollar is lost. In other words, his possession of it has ceased. His possession of it simply means his liberty to move it.

Now that the dollar is sitting in front of somebody else, did you ever reach over while you were playing poker and start to make change out of the pile of somebody who was – who was very, very alert, shall we say, to the insidiousness of man? The moment you do that, of course, you're in a little bit of a squabble. Why? You're just changing its location in space; it's the only thing you're doing. He objects to that. He has large significance to this.

"Why you can't and why I must, and why I can't and why you must change locations in space" are the whole total of significance; that's significance. It's just a consideration has been added, completely specious and spurious of the point involved – that's the speciousness of the thing; the point involved is simply that something is going to change location in space. All right?

Ownership is a matter of "It's here" or "It's there," and "I'm here" or "I'm there." The plainest example of it is "It's here and I'm here!" We've introduced determination into self-determinism. It's almost a dare. Any ownership is a dare: "Take it away. Go on. Go ahead. Go ahead, take it away. Go on. I'm right here. No, I won't do anything. Oh, go on, touch it."

This is deeds of title, car licenses, everything else involved in this. If you touch somebody's automobile it's just – just faintly and you're in a line of traffic or something of the sort and you drift forward slightly, and there's a little tick, about enough maybe to have bent a cigarette slightly, hardly any noise involved – you very often have found somebody getting furious, just furiously angry and being all upset about this, and so on.

Well, you see, you have almost moved something which he owns, so he has almost had to pay off because of the dare, and he gets all geared up to do this. His large significance on the matter is he mustn't have that thing moved.

Now, the worst possible thing you could do to anybody in a fight is simply move them off the space they're occupying, or move something they own off the space they're occupying. If you want to get even with somebody when you're fighting with him it tells you the way to drive a man utterly berserk – he's thrown his hat down – is simply pick his hat up, you see, and just put it in another location. You don't have to have any emotion with this or anything of the sort, nothing goes into it at all. Just put his hat in another location. And he says, "Don't do that." Why, just dust his hat off, and very carefully – don't throw it down, you see, or anything like that, because that springs him. I mean, he immediately then – it's destruction of property or destruction of a space shape has occurred and this is the trigger, and this is – this is horrible. So all you would do would be to pick up his hat and move it to a slightly different location, very carefully, and the guy would go mad. I mean, he hasn't received enough overt act, ordinarily in this society, to strike, and yet something is being done which he must not permit, and the result is he will talk. That's in essence this.

Now, artists and writers and things, their pictures, their books, and things like that – they never, when they're early in their careers, they never think of the thing as being theirs – somebody else's; it's just something created; they don't care. They can always create something else; it doesn't matter to them. Can always put something else in a new space.

Later on it becomes very upsetting to see their name in bookstores and books in bookstores, and to have people buying their books, because possessions of theirs are being moved around. They've lost the idea of selling something. And this is aided and abetted by publishers who pay on royalty instead of buying something outright.

This society would be agreed with if the thing were bought outright and he had no further title to it. But they've got it rigged so that one goes on having titles to things just forever.

For instance, I have a motion picture about – I wrote a script and scenario for a producer a few years ago. And the conditions of sale were so many thousand dollars on the delivery of the scenario, and then a percentage of the box office gross from there on. This is very, very grim. One keeps on owning the damn picture, you see? And then he goes past marquees every once in a while and he finds out that it's still playing someplace or another,

and then he has to worry about it being up in the projection room and how much the manager of the theater is – and whether the manager of the theater is saying how many pieces came into that particular space, of money you see, and whether or not this goes through to the producer and so forth. Some little scrap of it is his property, you see And other people are pushing it around.

Well, an artist or a writer who has gotten to this stage of where people have harassed and worried him about payment and about books and so forth, he'll only be upset if he doesn't feel that he would immediately be happy about creating another picture. See, the big difference is – so if people can make him unhappy about creating things, then he'll stop creating; that's the theory people go on. He'll stop filling up space and they can maybe have a chance to fill up space, only they don't. But it's an amusing thing – vested interest.

Well now, everybody has a vested interest in the MEST universe; he's done a certain amount of creation in it. And if he were very factual about it, he would be wanting to know as a personality, individualized to the extent which he is individualized today, exactly what percentage of the MEST universe he created and exactly where these units were. This would be of concern to him. And people are shoving these around all the time.

You can get a preclear pretty shocky, by the way, by pointing this out to him and then showing him that people are driving automobiles and some of the particles he created might be in that automobile. See, there's never been a transfer of title and nothing has been routinized. So he has to figure either that he owns it all or to hell with it, he doesn't own any of it. And you'll find these people in this frame of mind mostly about just the MEST universe in general. Its space – what part of its space did he create, and what part of it doesn't he own, and so on. And he's real messed up about the whole thing.

And loss, of course, then takes place anytime anybody loses anything. See, he's a co-loser. The building burns down; well, that might have been some of his particles too, so he's a co-loser. So you get to a large degree the terrific absorption of interest in the destruction of things which people demonstrate.

All right. Ownership being "It's here and I'm here."

Now, protection is "I'm there." It's not so much "I'm here" as it is "I'm there." Protection, "I'm here," is perfectly good but then that's ownership and that's utterly defensible; one can see that there's a possibility of defending.

But protection – on the connotation which we'll use it here, since the word has too wide a latitude to mean anything very specific – protection would mean "Now that object over there is mine," or "That object over there is under my guard." You see, "I'm not there, but it's there. And as soon as it's there, why then, if you start to move that, then I will have to do something to you," and we get retribution. We get retribution after the fact because one is not there on the ground.

Did you ever try to protect a preclear while he was on the couch? Noise, sudden noise occurs which is liable to be very upsetting to the preclear, and you're there immediately – pam! – to keep the noise from hitting the preclear, see. You put out some kind of a beam to

arrest this or something of the sort. Real weird to do that, because you can't protect the preclear from being hit by the noise.

And I've run auditors and just have run that fact out of the case all by itself as an isolated fact, and we got into protection.

The effort to protect when one is not present is the effort of protection which is aberrative. Spaceship is about to hit a planet, and you decide it better not hit the planet; you might have some of your anchor points in it or something. So you put out a beam or something to keep from hitting the planet. Of course, it hit the planet an hour ago, and your beam is intercepting into the facsimile; that is to say, the space-particle pattern which arrived at you is not the space-particle pattern. So we're into the problem of present time.

So protection is nearly always after the fact and people are engaged almost always entirely in locking the door after the horse is gone. It's almost a hundred percent operation.

You won't find a government will take a single preventive measure on Earth today unless it can be demonstrated that thousands or millions of casualties or losses of some sort have occurred through their not doing it. Protection is after the fact.

When you realize that protection is after the fact, you see that the act of protecting, as it's past, then confirms one into the past instead of the present.

The effort to protect puts the preclear in the past because of this MEST universe lag in communication. And you'll find out that the people have gone down most solidly into the past in failures to protect. We'll go into that more on space.

Now, a protection failure could be qualified as "I was not there." Whenever a person is thinking "I wasn't there, and I should have been there" you've got a protection failure.

And you'll have some little kid, Papa is dead, and he should have been there because Papa died, and therefore, it's his responsibility. His responsibility for Papa's death is his blame. He should have been there and wasn't there so therefore, he is to blame for. See, he's to blame for Papa's death. Simple.

Now, hiding: "It's not there, but it is there", and so you get hiding as a maybe. See, a fellow says, "It's not there," but he has put it somewhere. So you're onto a maybe. So things that are hidden go riding forward on the time track. It's most likely that you'll find hidden things in present time rather than – the preclear has – rather than things which you can see. And so we find this to be the case. Seeing somebody else's ridges is quite a trick; he's hidden them.

You see, a hidden thing is more likely to be riding a maybe than otherwise, because it's basically a lie; he says – he says, "I haven't got anything here," and he's got something. "I didn't put anything under the bed"; he's put something under the bed. And that's what hiding is, is: It's there, but it's not there, or it's here but it's not here. Overtly, "It's not here." Actually, "It's here."

This gives everybody a sneaky feeling sooner or later in processing, and that is exactly what that sneaky feeling is: he's sure he's hiding something. The auditor is always sure the preclear is hiding something. And it's both true; he is hiding something and so forth. But the

consequence or significance of his hiding something is utterly nonsense. There is no significance to what he's hiding. Nobody is going to steal his facsimiles if he brings them into view. A person will get this sudden lurch feeling in his stomach "My God! The auditor's liable to locate me!" See, he's even hidden himself. It's just "Whoa! That's bad." Technique which I'll give this morning which does self-location and so forth is – generally gives people that feeling.

Then, something being discovered which you have hidden resulting in the loss of the thing – well, this combination of stuff is guilt. You said it wasn't there, but it is there, and then they found out it was there, but it wasn't there, then you've been caught in a lie. In other words, you've been caught nowhere.

Male voice: Shame in there?

Shame is a little bit different – shame and degradation. They're going in here a little bit later. Now, let's get into something really important in this, something that you've been batting around with for a long time. Something we talked about yesterday in terms of certainty, now we'll talk about it in other terms.

What is reality? Well, let's find out what reality is by finding out what unreality is. We find out reality is "I'm here and it's here." That's reality. Or "It's there and I'm here" – reality. Now, unreality – what is this unreality that things kind of fade out and you get the sensation of having lost something and so forth? Unreality is "I'm not here, and it's not here or there." That's unreality. It's the effort to withdraw. It's the "I'm not here" with that effort to withdraw.

Now, what's happened is, is the fellow just about was ready to hit a brick wall, and just an instant before he hit the brick wall he said "Ha! Ha! I'm not here." That damned brick wall hit him anyhow. See, his postulate didn't work. And the MEST universe or somebody else got him.

So, his postulate was invalidated, and that is unreality. So that any time in the future something invalidates a postulate – in other words won't let it remain in that space (the thought) – he is up against it; he's pam just on this.

Somebody says, "Oh, that – that's really – that's really not so, is it?" And he gets a feeling of unreality. Well, it's basic; the basic engram on that is he was about to hit something, he says, "I'm not here" and boom! A heck of an invalidation. "Those anchor points are going to stay at that distance" was the first thing he said; and then that failed – And then he says, "I'm not here at all," and then he got hit; and there were anchor points. Well, that was anchor points with an emphasis he didn't want. And this is certainty on the MEST level.

Certainty is that which is added to convince a fellow he's there by hitting him with anchor points. See. That's external certainty; that's certainty by impact. You want to know why an impact does deliver a feeling of certainty to an individual, it's simply that it confirms his presence in terms of sensation. And it immediately afterwards restimulates "I'm not here." See?

The best way to be present is just simply to have some anchor points, not be hit or pounded around. But it's the MEST – it's other-determinism. This certainty by impact is other-determinism determining one's position. Certainty by impact is other-determinism; that's

what's wrong with it, and it, of course, always winds up in somebody else locating space for you. Somebody else locates space for you, why, that's other-determinism and that does not enhance one's self-determinism.

A psychiatrist trying to give a person an electric shock is simply delivering him an impact rather – that says to him "You're here."

Of course, they spoil the whole thing. If they just simply would take the guy and hit him with a zap gun and the fellow could suddenly look at that beam and look at the room, boy, he would get an illumination the like of which he never heard of, see. I mean, he'd be sane right away. They ought to try this sometime just as a change. But, unfortunately, they are too decadent to do this and they are liable to get sick at their stomach doing this because they'd see all the pain. So, they anesthetic somebody and make him unconscious before they give him the electric shock and that, of course, puts him nowhere. This is a confirmed nowhere then and is the most – easily the most aberrative thing you could do to an individual. This is an engram.

We haven't forgotten Book One – but this is why an engram is particularly rough; it just goes on that basis. And it goes on the basis of "I'm not" – the fellow is already "I'm not here;" see? And then you fix him up so he doesn't know where he is; he's in a complete fog; his consciousness goes because you've ripped off all of his anchor points and put them all out of control. And then, while he's in that condition, you suddenly wake him up into a one-sixteenth consciousness, or daze, by the administration of a terrific impact or a pain, and of course, this tells him he's somewhere. This impact or pain says, "Well, he must be somewhere," but it doesn't give him any present time anchor points.

The way not to give an electric shock – and let's be very psychiatric about it – the way to – not to give an electric shock is to anesthetic somebody first. But the psychiatrist, being a sniveling coward (to be polite about it), wouldn't dare give anybody an electric shock without giving them some anesthesia first. But they've got to give an other-determinism present, if they just cut down the volume of the shock and omitted the anesthesia – but then that heads under the heading of cruelty. That would tell the fellow where he was, and that's cruelty, see, to such a person, because that person doesn't want to be there, and yet you insist he's there and you give him enough impact to show him that he is there; bring anchor points in on him quick enough. All right, you see how this is?

You see how psychiatry is invalidating itself and its own treatment; this is why an electric shock never does a patient any good.

If they would give instead of 110 volt AC straight out of the outlet plug, which is what an electric shock is today – built up logarithmically – that's all it is. Oh, they have great big machines and so forth, but if you looked into them, their electronic components are simply a light cord. You'd give anybody an electric shock just by taking apart one of these plugs; you know, take an extension cord, set it into the wall outlet, and just fray the two ends off of the – unplug it out from the wall before you do this – and take the plug off as it goes into the lamp, you see, or take the end plug off the extension cord; now you've got two bare wires. Now plug the plug you unplugged back into the outlet, you've got two live wires, and you just simply touch the two live wires to either side of his temple.



Well, because the – because the area is too small for the amount of shock involved, it'll burn him; he'll get a little burn on it probably, so the thing to do is to give him some jelly or something over the area to spread the area of impact, you see, a little bit; and it's more, then, like a blow. And then you would simply take these two probe – these two ends of the electric wires straight out of the outlet, you see, and just touch the fellow to either side of the temple and he would have had an electric shock administered to him.

That's all; it's a much more therapeutic electric shock, by the way, because there's been no hocus-pocus involved in it and there's no unconsciousness in it. This would really say, "Bud, you certainly are on either – there's two anchor points for you you're not going to escape easily." This is what it amounts to.

Why anybody needs a machine to do this is a little bit puzzling, except, I suppose, it just adds more necromancy. It's something like witches have to have pots to boil things in so they can make potions and incantations before they simply hit the fellow over the head with chloral hydrate and give him the implant quick.

Now, the sound of the voice, the impact, the cuff in the cheek, the cut, the slash, while the person is unconscious, tells him he is somewhere without any co-related anchor points.

So, he's got sitting all by itself out there in the middle of the ocean, you might say – the ocean of nothingness – he's got five or six anchor points. Well, they must be valuable because they had impact with them, and somebody else wanted him to have them. This is certain. This is one thing a fellow is always certain about a bad engram: somebody wanted him to have it; he didn't want them. But somewhere in this mass of unconsciousness, uncorrelated with any other anchor points, he's got some anchor points. And so these things will drift on the time track. See, they are – don't tie down in any particular time.

Why does "Remember something real" and so forth, why does this start snapping a patient up line? Well, it's very simple, he's just not adrift, then, because he's tied down location.

Now, you can actually straightwire out an engram one way or the other just by making the fellow locate it. If you were to simply take the fellow and cuff him around and ask him the question several times, "Well, all right, now you keep saying that operation is in restimulation. Now, goddamn it, were you out of the operating room at any time? Now, come on! Were you out of the operating room at any time?"

Fellow would finally break down on your new impacts and say, "No no I had the sensation once, I remember kind of like a dream of standing on the other side of the room looking at them butcher up my body."

"Well, you didn't leave the room though?"

Or he'd finally say, "Yes! I did. I went into an 'in pawns' area. Yeah, I – I'll admit that now. But there was all of that – drifty anchor points there, and there was somebody else someplace else and out of this confusion I couldn't orient myself for that period of time."

"Well, where was your body at the time?"

"It was in the operating room."

"Did anybody remove your body from the operating room?"

"Well, they must have taken it down the hall and put it in bed."

"Well, did they take it anyplace else?"

"No, I'm sure that they didn't take it anyplace else."

"All right. Well then, what about this operation?"

Well, you could actually jammer and yap at a person around like that, and beat him around until you actually got him more stirred up about putting some anchor points into the area, and you would have, in effect, settled either your determinism of where the engram belonged or his.

I've seen auditors do this in desperation by the way; practically get the feeling after a while that they'd just like to throttle this preclear. That's because the preclear won't put the engram anyplace, because it, of course, doesn't belong anyplace.

Now, get this as unreality: "I'm not here." Now of course, unreality is no perception, which is "I'm and it's not here." "I'm not here; it's not here. Nah, there's nothing here! Ha-ha!" And that's the basic on unconsciousness: "I'm not here; it's not here." That's a complete scattering confusion and disorientation.

People hope for unconsciousness sometimes just because they get so worn out trying to place anchor points. They know they can't place them anyplace, so let's just be in nowhere and that's the end of it.

Now, anxiety is, is "I'm supposed to be there." He's not, of course; it's just "I'm supposed to be there." Some fellow who was accustomed to being audience gets on a stage. Some fellow who was accustomed to being stage is audience. In either case, they will feel anxiety. One will feel anxiety for the audience, "What are they thinking? What are they saying?" and so forth. Fellow who is on the stage is not accustomed to being on the stage, he gets very anxious about the audience because he's not there, see; he's on the stage. And people in the audience will just very often – some poor actor or something who keeps dropping the teapot in the play, or whose hand is shaking s-s-so badly when he tr-tries to utter his lines, and people in the audience will just agonize! They just watch this fellow and they just go batty, you see. And that's all there is, just "I'm supposed to be there." See, it has to be based on the idea they're supposed to be on the stage and they're not on the stage, and then they see something going wrong on the stage, and they feel, "Gee, you know, that'd be me." They get an association of location, so you get an anxiety and that's why anxiety and stage fright go together so easily.

Now, this business of shame and degradation is where a fellow has said, with great confidence, "I'm not here," and then the brick wall hit him. And you get the emotion of shame. Shame is "postulate didn't work." And real degradation is "It didn't work and it's not worked and they haven't worked for the longest time." See, it's just a continuation of shame, shame, shame, shame, shame and then you get degradation.

And there's sudden impact of – the fellow is carrying – carrying the – well, this fellow's carrying the jewels of the Czar of Russia and also has in his keeping the Czar's

mistress. And he's a very faithful and loyal courier and he is delivering same to the Czar in – all in good order. And he's been entrusted and brought up all his life, you see, to have this take place, that he should be entrusted with such things. And as he's driving down the road or something like that, why, the revolutionists hit him, slay mistress, jewels and everything else with a terrific bombardment of bullets, or he goes over the cliff and hits something with a crush and he doesn't have these jewels or the mistress anymore. He's hit an impact and he was not supposed to be there at the moment of impact, you see? He just wasn't supposed to be there, that's all.

In other words, the resulting – you just keep mounting it up. These things which he has are supposed to be someplace else, they are with him, he has this under protection – in other words, he's supposed to be here with these things – and all of a sudden, why, bam! he gets this terrific reason why he's not supposed to be there. If he were walking down the road all by himself, he had nothing in trust but a body, and he felt he could get other bodies and so forth, and he were hit in the face with a cannonball, why he wouldn't feel degraded particularly by it.

But it would be other people's determination of location, and other people's determining that he ought to be there, and then he ought to have these things there, and then he can't have these things there, and he is made to desert all these things, then you get, by this complexity of spaces deserted, degradation,

And if you get – just in spaces deserted, valuable spaces deserted, you got degradation. And you just do a series of mock-ups of the fellow running away from various spaces, various valuable – first, just various spaces, then from various valuable spaces and just keep running away from these various spaces, and on and on and on, and all of a sudden, boy, the feelings of degradation would turn up to a point where, as a preclear, you'd almost throw up. And that would probably run out and get him loosened up on the track. All right?

Interpersonal relations, on this positional matter, would be "want and don't want others to be here," in most cases. Want to be here, and don't want others to be here – just this interlocation, interrelationship of places, see? And where interpersonal relationships are bad you get into "want and don't want others to be here." That's about all the guy can hold on to finally, and most people down on the street are in that situation – don't want others to be here; they don't want them too close up, and they – so on.

And they get to a point finally where others aren't here. Guys can talk at them and yap at them and so forth, and no respondo. Interpersonal relationships are perfectly easy to manage upscale where everybody has a certain degree of determinism and no great anxiety about space. The second they get anxious about space they just tip on over into this: Spaces are too valuable and they can't desert them or come back to them.

Now orders and commands are "Must – must not be here or there" for people and objects. And control: "Other things must be in consecutive places." Control is consecutive places, assignment of consecutive places. And let's go back and look at this all in terms of space now.

Determinism is the establishment of space, whether creation or simply taking over something else's anchor points; that's determinism.

And determination is an assignment of space; "That's your space, and that's my space and that's somebody else's space;" and so forth, which immediately bars out uses of space. Denial in uses of space is the lower scale of determination, and it'll follow all through on "I will be and won't be;" and so on.

Loss is just the failure to assign space.

Ownership is the fixation of space.

Protection is the shielding of space – fixed shielding of fixed space.

You can also protect something in motion, but then each time you have to have a new fixation of shielding; that's force screens. You want to know what you're dealing with with force screens: you're dealing with the shielding of a space so nothing else can get into it. You've immediately gotten randomness mixed up into this.

And we have, there, protection and randomness right together. You have to select out something to protect, which means that you have to have selected out something evil or destructive, or otherness. You have to have found an otherness about existence before you can have randomness.

Now, the best way to get some randomness going is to start selecting othernesses, because it's very apparent that in order to have some action you've got to have a villain. See? There's got to be an other beingness who is not doing the assignment of space correctly and you're going to assign the space correctly. Just any kind of interaction like this, and you get randomness. And that's what randomness is. And that makes motion.

Motion is something determining the courses of things. Something has to start reversing courses of things and changing courses of things before you get motion. Everything would be a static if that didn't happen. See how that is? Everything would be a static unless something had come along and had determined a – first thing it does is determine a change of fixation; and that's what life is best at.

Life comes along and finds all these anchor points in the shape of a star, and life at first says, "Isn't that interesting, everything is in the shape of a star," and looks at it for a little while, and says, "Well, I've looked this long. Now I think it ought to be in the shape of a diamond," and simply reaches over and fixes this thing, which it had not – has not had any contact with formerly, into a diamond, and you get motion. Otherwise, the star would simply stay there without a determinism being exerted against making it into something else besides a star. Well, that's what life is best at – is shifting it around.

That is not an aberrated impulse. Life just does this; it gets no interest, no motion, no livingness or anything else unless it starts shifting things around.

You get somebody doing something who has a very high velocity or something of the sort, and he won't be able to stand it unless he shifts something around.

You get some truck driver, you look in a plant – here's a big plant and they've got a big lot of trucks there, you know. And they're high-speed drivers, they're boys who are really doing a good job, they are not the boys who break the speed laws. They break the speed laws, but nobody could probably catch and wouldn't anyway. The guys who are really traveling fast – you know, I mean they're in high motion like we were talking about in the last lecture yesterday; speed – their velocity is way up, so forth.

They look around the place and they'll see the trucks are parked in there, and all of a sudden it will irk them that a couple of trucks are parked a little bit out of line; they go and jump in the trucks and square them around and park them in the proper alignment order. Or the trucks are just too desperately well aligned. They see them like that every night, so they'll park their truck a little bit haywire, just a little bit kitty-cornered. Anything to change their – change position, and that way you get motion.

And if you don't get shift of anchor points, you don't get any randomness.

An automaticity is where no one has – wants to shift anchor points anymore, and so they set them up so the anchor points will shift themselves. And after you've got it so anchor points shift themselves, you're all set; nobody is keeping track of them. That's no responsibility; nobody is keeping track of them, nobody is looking at them, nobody is shifting them. It's just sort of going on that anybody – any time anybody glances over that way, you get a change of pattern.

And any time you get one of these sudden changes of pattern, you've got a picnic on your hands because nobody can tell which way it's going to go now because nobody was determining it before somebody looked at it.

So, it was all set up to line up all the trucks. The trucks were simply left on the ramp and then this automatic machine was supposed to grab all the trucks quickly and suddenly and take them all in and line them all up in their proper stalls or parking places underneath the plant. There was a machine there that did that. They set it all up and the little hook would come up through the floor, you see, and hook on to the front axle and every truck would get its proper hook and they'd all go into place.

And then one day, a bar breaks or something of the sort, see, and nobody has noticed this either. Nobody is looking at the thing. And the lever goes down, the sun goes down, and as the sun goes down it establishes a certain degree of light on a photometer and this turns on the machine and it parks all the trucks.

Well, it has to assume that every driver is in by this time. Well, there's a little bar broken and quite in addition to that, somebody else didn't deliver his truck in that night, so there's a space empty. And they come back the next morning and all the trucks are wrecked.

And somebody says, "Who's responsible for this?" And of course, they can't fix any responsibility for it because the maintenance man, well, they forgot about it, but he was fired a long time ago; there's been no maintenance man for the rig. Well, the sun is responsible; it went down too late or too early or something of the sort. Or the fellow that didn't deliver his truck in – well, he's responsible. Well, he couldn't be responsible because his truck broke down. Well, why did his truck break down? He's responsible for that, then. No, what's

responsible for that is management; management is responsible for that because after the maintenance man quit on the trucks, and so forth, and on the machinery, why, they didn't hire another one. And yes, they did hire another one; they sent orders to the foreman and the personnel department to hire another one, and as a matter of fact this is true, but when the fellow reported the machine which stamps all of the cards that hire and fire and so on, it stamped it in the wrong slot which said this person was merely supposed to clean up the place; he wasn't supposed to maintain it. So there was a machine failure there; well, that goes back to the maintenance man, but there was no maintenance man hired.

Who's responsible? And then we just start playing this game, you see, this fantastic game "Who's responsible?" And that all comes out from somebody having set up some automaticity. This thing will now assign spaces without any livingness supervising it. This will now assign spaces.

That always happens on any piece of automaticity. And there's one thing you can be absolutely sure of about automaticity: It's going to go haywire. It's going to break down. This is certain.

Some fellow – in a science fiction story one time – wrote a story about a civilization which was composed of machines but then there were repair machines which repaired the machines which broke down and got them back into order. And then there were machines which kept in order the machines which kept in order. And then the original machines that were being repaired and being kept in order, of course, their primary task was to keep the third echelon of repair machines going. So you had a circular society.

Looked awfully well on paper until I pointed out to him that this was all very well, but what would happen if a meteorite had struck the planet? Then you wouldn't get perpetuation forever of these machines. He had omitted this in the story; so in the rewrite of the story he put in that there was maintaining a force screen around the planet so no meteorite could hit it. Real silly.

To double-terminal the concept "setting up something so it will keep on going by itself" will very often produce a fantastic amount of action for the preclear; I mean, he'll get a lot of energy charges going in all directions, because that's all he's doing with automaticity; he's setting up something so it'll require no further action. That, in essence, is what happened to the MEST universe; it all got set up automatically. Now there's nobody hiring a maintenance man and we've got that sort of a problem in the thing.

Well, hiding is a denial of space, and when you have a person who is hiding something, he has some space but he's denying that he has space. Now, after he's hidden his first object, from there on he is denying space; first moment he hid something he's denying space. And you ought to add this to your list of things to be run in the MEST universe – the first place he hid something. He denied perception, he denied space the second he did that.

All right. Hiding self: When you've hidden yourself completely – when a fellow is completely hidden as a – as a thetan, boy, he doesn't have any space to the amount of space he could have at all, so he doesn't have any anchor points.

And now unreality (covering this in terms of space still): different space in the same space. Unreality is a different space in the same space. The fellow said, "I'm on the moon," and then the brick wall hit him. He said, "I'm not here;" you see. "I'm on the moon;" he said, and the brick wall hit him. He was right there on Earth; he was about to hit a brick wall and he said, "I'm on the moon." Bam! – brick wall hit him. Well, he got to the moon, but his lines energized and brought him back to before the brick wall.

You'll find a split instant of "I'm not here" and of the fellow being someplace else, and he'll get hung up being someplace else. So he's carrying – been carrying ever since, moon space; every time he saw a brick wall, he knew he was standing in moon space.

And by the way, it's not not hidden; that's not hard to locate on a case. When he said, "I'm not here;" where was he? And he generally said he was someplace, early on the track.

Now, let's recover the first space – on the MEST track, again on this same list – let's recover the first space where he coincided two spaces; that's what he did, you see. Unreality is a lot of spaces coincided one with another. Tremendous number of spaces eventually get stacked up with a fellow. And now it's real? Well, boy, he's not – he's not here in each one of these spaces. It would be perfectly all right to coincide space, but where you have the fact that it's not the space you get in bad shape.

Well, no perception is no space, and anxiety is other space – always other space; it's just that – other space; he's supposed to be elsewhere other space. So he gets into the idea after a while that he has to be in other space, so then he, to settle his problem, he says, "All right;" he says, "I am in other space"; and he's done; he's not in other space because he has gotten an "I'm right here" keyed in the moment he did that. Nice little problems that mount up on people and which cause this thing called aberration.

Now, what's time? What's time? Time is "I'm not here." Anybody who is having trouble with time is also running "I'm not here." Anybody who's running "I'm not here," or coincided spaces, is having trouble with time. Time is the single aberrative factor Why? It's "I'm not here."

And do you realize this stuff, to keep on going, has to be saying – this MEST stuff has to be saying all the time "I'm not here. I'm not here. I'm not here. I'm not here. I'm not here?" Huh? Has to be saying at the same time, interlarded with that, "I'm here. I'm not here. I'm here. I'm not here. I'm here. I'm not here. I'm here. I'm not here. I'm here. I'm not here."

A fellow, to keep track of it, then has to at least locate the I-am-heres; he at least has to locate that. "I'm not here. I am here. I'm not here. I am here. I'm not here." Follow that? Time is consecutively on the track, the fellow is saying – is all the time he's saying, "I'm not here. I'm not here. I'm not here."

All right, remember when we talked about the motorcycle? Was the motorcycle taking the guy down the road, or was the guy taking the motorcycle down the road? Well, there's two postulates in time as far as this MEST is concerned: It's here and then it immediately has to be not here; it's here, not here.

All right, the person – this is just a matter of consideration. Believe me, it's just a matter of consideration, no matter how much proof goes with it. It's fantastic that it is, but

there isn't any energy has to change hands, there's – none of the effort has to take place to change this consideration.

And you think and possibly you are looking at a point on a case where you could simply go bip! and the fellow would be Clear. It's whether or not he considers himself in tune with the I'm-not-here of time, or whether he's in tune with the I-am-here of time.

That's why holding the two back corners of the room produces such a fantastic result on a case. It does; it's fantastic. Because you're making him run – see, you're making him stop running "I'm not here. I'm not here. I'm not here." And making him start running "I am here. I am here. I am here." You've just changed his consideration.

And where you forcefully changed his consideration to "I am here. I am here. I am here. I am here," why, you're starting to key out the I'm-not-heres, I'm-not-heres, I'm-not-heres, I'm-not-heres, so the guy gets located after a while. And if you just keep that up for the preclear he'll be fully located before you get through.

That's idiotically simple, isn't it? It's whether or not one takes the motorcycle down the road, and the motorcycle takes one down the road. It's whether one thinks the molecules of a space-there are those anchor points – are saying "I'm not here" or whether one thinks they're saying "I am here." These molecules are saying two things: they're saying, "I am here; I'm not here. I am here; I'm not here. I am here; I'm not here. I am here; I'm not here. I am here; I'm not here." If they weren't saying it you wouldn't get any progress on the time track.

A fellow has to say, to go forward in time, there has to be this thing, and this is the base of the automatic machine which makes time. He's saying, "All right, I am in this instant; I'm not in this instant. I am in this instant. I am not in this instant. I'm in this instant; I am not in this instant. I'm in this instant; I am not in this instant. I'm in this instant." Has to be saying that all the time and it depends on how fast he can say this how much time he has. This is fantastic! I mean, it's one of those idiotic things.

Now, you have somebody who's having a rough time of it, simply hold the concept all through the MEST objects which he can locate all around him, "I'm not here." I don't advise you to do this; this is making him resist the universe. It's just a test; just have him locate this concept all through these objects: "I'm not here."

All right, now do that, do that, all of you. You get this stuff all saying "I'm not here."

Now get yourself saying now, "I'm not here."

It's a lie on some of these cases – it's a lie! But of course, you've hit your first one on hiding because there isn't a thetan present who isn't hiding.

All right, let's hit the other one now; let's get in all the surrounding space around you, this stuff saying just repetitively pam! pam! pam! pam! pam! "I am here. I am here. I am here. I am here. I am here." Now get yourself saying, right where you are "I am here. I am here. I am here. I am here." All right, now get yourself saying, suddenly, "I'm not here; I am here."

Now get something saying – get you saying suddenly, "I'm not here," and then something in front of you saying, "You're here!" You're saying, "I'm not here," something in front of you is saying "You're here!"



Now that little operation, the last one I gave you where you're saying "I'm not here" and something else is saying right immediately "You're here" is the exact moment where your V level's case is stuck. And his consideration is that the MEST universe around him is saying "I'm not here." And all you have to do is change it to where the MEST universe is saying "I am here" and then change it to where the MEST universe is saying "I'm not here. I am here. I am not here. I am here." He can get it very smoothly because he's doing it automatically in the final analysis. And this permits him to recover this automaticity.

Now, if you get a machine which tells you "You are here; you're not here. You are here; you're not here. You are here; you're not here," the machine will eventually turn into the MEST universe and that is the primary automaticity in which you're sharing.

[End of lecture.]