Spacation: Anchor Points, Origin

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 4. December 1952

Third hour this afternoon, December the 4th, continuing this third talk on spacation. Going to go over this again very rapidly, very, very briefly and very rapidly. We are talking about, in this universe, a series of agreements as follows:

One, there is an origin point, unknown but understood. You've not located that origin point, you just say all this space somehow or other comes from an origin point. Now that is the first point of confusion about the MEST universe, is that there's space all around and it must be coming from someplace and so on, which is not the case. Then there's origin point one and that could also be origin point „I". And that is the viewpoint of dimension, and that is the definition of space: Viewpoint of dimension, of the individual. And he looks around and he can assign viewpoints. The handiest way to do this is, of course, to simply mock up anchor points, mock up dimensions.

And then the third thing we're dealing with is anchor points. Now an anchor point is that point which origin „I" assigns so that he can have dimension and motion. Now he has either assigned it or just agreed upon it, or agreed that he will assign to these understood things. It says: That is a room. A room has eight corners, therefore there are eight anchor points to a room. Every time you go in a room now you know this, there will be eight anchor points and you will accept immediately the anchor points which everybody around accepts as this room's anchor points. Is that understood? That's good. Now we've made you dependent.

So, there's origin I and that is a viewpoint from which one can perceive anchor points, and these anchor points actually assign dimension or boundary to space. And these anchor points are called anchor points because they're actually used as electrodes or terminals as on an electric motor. Whenever there is motion, one holds the anchor point and perceives the motion. It's very simple. He also perceives the anchor point, holds and perceives the anchor point and then sees something changing without those anchor points moving. You get a… at sea and you give some ensign a maneuvering board problem; you've got a picnic on your hands, because you're telling him to use as origin points the center of a board which… it's an abstract center which has no real reality, which is probably moving.

And then you say, „Now look, here are three or four anchor points. Those will be the ships in the problem and these anchor points are all in motion. Now this is a maneuvering board problem. When will the anchor points coincide and crash? Or when will they rendezvous? How far do they have to go in order to get any…?" That's a maneuvering board problem. That's very rough stuff.

Now, if he doesn't have an instructor who merely wishes… if he… most instructors, you see, merely wish to obfuscate, and if he doesn't have an instructor who wishes to obfuscate, the instructor will point out to him, „Look, it doesn't matter how fast that origin point is moving. It is static. It's right there in relationship to the outermost limits of the graph."

One of those graphs, simple looking affair, but uh… you've got anchor points which don't move and they're not moving at such and such a postulated rate, well, who cares? Who cares how much they're not moving? They're anchor points. And if you'll just take the center of the board and the limits of the board, and then figure out everything else on the board as points in motion in relationship to these anchor points, he's all set.

But if he goes at it in reverse and tries to… to figure it out that the anchor points are in motion, and the origin points are in motion too, of course he has nothing to tie any motion to, so no motion can occur and he can't see how any motion could possibly occur and he'll just sit there with his mouth open.

That would be the same thing if I told you the two forward… forward corners of this room – if you believed it – the two forward corners of this room uh… were moving four miles an hour to the right except the right-hand forward corner which occasionally went in a circle. And those were the only two points that you could perceive anywhere around.

Now you were supposed to tell the velocity of something that was between those two points. I just… just wouldn't… just be horrible. But you could do it because you've got one point and you could possibly plot the other point. You could stretch your minds to do this sort of thing, but it'd be an awful job.

Now, anchor points, then, are assigned or agreed upon points of boundary which are conceived to be motionless by the individual. He's on a train. He looks up and down. Somebody walks down the aisle of the train; he knows somebody's walking down the aisle of the train because he holds the forward end of the car as one anchor point and the after end of the car as another anchor point and the individual, who is in motion, has a shifting dimension, from one to the other of these two things so somebody can walk.

But let's look out the window. And there we see the countryside flying by like mad. Sure, it's the countryside flying by like mad. You have to explain to a little kid how the countryside is not flying by. The countryside is motionless; the train is what's in motion. He knows this from past lives and so forth, but a little kid can get awful kinda fooled on this. And every once in a while he'll sort of grit his teeth and say, „All right, it's actually doing that – but it doesn't look that way." So actually the countryside is flying by with relationship to the two anchor points, the forward end of the car and the back end of the car. Those are what's motionless and the countryside is flying by, of course.

Now if you say every telegraph pole there is an anchor point and those anchor points are shifting, then you can conceive that the train is in motion. You can even sit in the train then and feel the train rushing forward and the countryside sitting still. But it's quite a trick. But you can do that with great ease.

A race driver does this with facility. He goes so fast that even he knows he's in motion, because the track is shifting so fast with relationship to the bonnet and the shoes of the car

that he… he could feel that. Why? He's got an up-and-down vibration and sideways and so forth.

If you want to really drive a fast car, get one with small wheels built close to a track; that's a very fast car. If you want to drive a slow car, get one with great big wheels and a big powerful motor, and with… it rides awfully easy. And that's really a slow car.

What's this got to do with miles per hour? It has nothing to do with miles per hour except in relationship to anchor points which the driver isn't perceiving. You see? Uh… that's very interesting.

In some countries they tell you they have very fast railways. That's because their trains go over rough tracks, terrible tracks; they're built rather close down and the countryside isn't ever observed. But what is observed is the way you bounce around in that car – boy, is it taking off. Furthermore, everytime the engineer starts one of them up he goes it from zero throttle, full throttle – BOOM. And you go crash across one car and crash the other way and you know that thing is driving. You know that thing is really going.

But let's take something with 120 lb. rails, built well up off the ground and let's take it at 120 miles an hour down the track. Thing isn't moving, obvious. You sit there, have a whisky soda, something of the sort, in the parlor car. Finally railroads became so despairing about people believing trains didn't move fast that in most of those very fast trains, back in the parlor car they have a speedometer.

All right, then what… what is… what is this whole business motion? Well, let's get right into the second stage here.

What's matter? Matter is not simply condensed space, it's relatively unoccupiable space, and the solider matter is, the more you have postulated that it is unoccupiable. And when you get out as a thetan you're travelling on a high wave length, the first thing your preclear may do is slam into the ceiling. And then he realizes suddenly that he does not have mass, and the second he realizes he doesn't have mass he goes on through the ceiling.

Sometimes he has to fish around for a little while to find the wall of the ceiling in order to… to come back through it and use it as an anchor point. He has to practically repostulate it in order to get back into the body, and when he gets out and first realizes this, of course all time and space scrambles to him, scrambles all over the place. The reason why is he has lost what most people are holding on to madly as the last anchor point.

I call this, the point of origin is in the body – well, let me extend that a little bit for your clarification. The only anchor point he has is the body, that he can be sure of. His level of certainty has diminished and diminished and diminished throughout life. He's become so dispersed, any other anchor point has been found to be so reliable, that they disappear if you sneeze at them. And this unreliability of anchor points has finally brought him down to the fact that when he pinches himself, he knows it's real. He knows he's not dreaming because he can pinch himself and get a sensation. This is the same thing as saying, he knows he can perceive his body because he has not been chased off that as an agreement.

See, he agreed to all these anchor points, and then other people broke the agreement. They kept taking anchor points away from him. So the one thing they haven't taken away

from him is his body and he has this body then as an anchor point from which he cannot be robbed.

So his reality consists of anchor points to the body and other anchor points around are kind of vague. He doesn't perceive them very well because he knows other people haven't agreed to them. Why? They've taken them away from him, haven't they? So when we start perceiving, or as this person starts perceiving, he'll perceive the body more and more and more and the environment less and less and less until we get the dwindling spiral which finally leads not only past the normal homo sapiens, but on down to a six and a seven case level of Standard Operating Procedure.

And this person doesn't even know it's real by an anchor point of the body. A seven has lost the body as an anchor point. No longer has the body as this anchor point, so he cannot be sure where he is because he knows the body isn't real either.

But as a person goes down the tone scale, down the tone scale, down the tone scale, his environment contracts on him. The lower emotions are contracted environments, less motion capable, more solidity, harder to move through. A person can actually feel this. You get… run him through a moment of shock, he will feel the environment close right in on him and become practically no-dimensional.

He's abandoning every anchor point in the environment because he's saying, „It can't be actual. It can't be actual." That's the same thing as saying, „It can't be happening. I don't want this motion. I've tried to stop the motion itself, in order to stop the motion, all I can do is abandon the anchor points and that will make the motion stop."

Only that doesn't make it stop either because he's still got the body. And he's got the body and the motion continues in relationship to his body as an anchor point and so he feels the whole environment contracting down and he'll finally abandon the body as well in order to stop some motion which he conceives to exist beyond his control and beyond his ability to withstand the perception.

All right, this gets right into motion, anchor points, dwindling anchor points. You'll find that individuals who move the least have the fewest clear anchor points. You will find that the ability of an individual to tolerate speed depends completely upon his ability to hold anchor points. And his ability to hold anchor points depends only upon his belief in his ability to hold anchor points. And anchor points come down to being postulates.

How do you remedy this situation then? How do you rebuild this ability? You just have a person start postulating anchor points, dimensions to space, that's all, and contract them and expand them and contract them and change them around and then put in new dimensions and change the old dimensions and then age the dimensions you have and then decrease the dimensions. And then decrease the space and expand the space again and scramble then the anchor points.

Have the anchor point that is over to the right move and be the left side anchor point and so forth. Turn the space upside down backwise to. Interchange these points and then throw in a whole bunch of random points. Then throw all these random points together in a

pile, thereby collapsing the space. Make some matter out of it and then bring those anchor points back out again and move them around as anchor points.

Now take these anchor points and set them way out somewhere and then fill that space full and then defy the laws of space in the MEST universe (which laws of space have to do with our agreement on how much space can hold in relationship to oneself) and start dumping into that space things it obviously cannot hold and have it remain the same size and just keep on doing this, then empty that space again and then dump things into this space. Now empty this space and throw them to places where there is no space, and bring them back into places where the space is much too small for them and have them fit very adequately.

Shift the anchor points around again, throw the anchor points away. This starts in on a gradient scale. Take one point and move it around, and then take two points and move the two points around and then move them close together and then further apart. The first thing your preclear will find – if he's down around five and so forth – don't pick this up if you don't do it – is, the first time he tries to hold two anchor points in relationship to each other, they'll snap together and go zero on him. He'll try to put two points out there and they'll keep going snap.

The distance between them will collapse. Not only will they snap together, but they'll snap back onto his body. Of course they will, because his point uh… anchor point is his body. So in order to be sure of any anchor point he naturally has to bring it back and feel it on his body, If he doesn't feel it on his body, it isn't an anchor point.

Eventually get him to perceive an anchor point at some distance from his body. And then perceive two of them and be able to hold them apart and shift them around at will. Be able to move them farther away and closer up. Shift them around all locations possible, these anchor points. Change the character of the anchor points. Make them different.

The next thing you know you've clicked out the belief he must have that the anchor point must be furnished him, and he will find out suddenly, „Gee, what do you know, heh, I'm… I'm the viewpoint of dimension."

Now the second step of this merges straight on into force and it goes into the first level of force, which is sensation. Sensation has a lot to do with ARC – ARC, it gets pretty crude when you can define it as ARC. At first it is merely sensation. It is rather undifferentiative. It is still a flow; the ridges on it are quite minor, and then the ridges start to get heavier as the person comes down the tone scale.

So the first thing you do on a mock-up drill is to put something out there and put an emotion into it and then feel the emotion. Because that's what a person does all the time, 24 hours a day. There's no sensation coming off of anything except what sensation he puts into it and pulls back off of it again. Just as he neglects continually to postulate his anchor points in space for the sake of automaticity and interest to himself, so does he neglect continually to perceive this little step. In order to see something and feel about it, one has to project onto it the generally agreed upon feeling about such things. And one projects onto it this generally agreed upon feeling about such things and then perceives back off of it this perception, and the first step he wishes to enter his awareness is „I perceive a sensation emanating from."

Now he's got to have space in which to do that because it's emanating FROM and you can't have anything emanating from anything unless you've got some space there first. You can't have anything emanating to anything unless you have some space there first, too,

Now what's the drill? What's the drill? You just put things out there and you just take the emotional scale and the emotional scale from 40 to 0.0 as will be covered, is the zeros of MEST and the 40.0 is space. Now matter is really a 0.0 and 40.0 is space. So what does this coincide with? It coincides with the action cycle. At 40.0 you have start, intermediate you have change, at 0.0 you have stop. At the top of the emotional scale you have space, at the middle of it you have action, at the bottom of it you have matter. And this coincides with an experience: emotional experience, with the top of it being serenity and then, about 20.0, on a very high exhilaration, then exhilaration dwindles off and we get… we just skipped enormous array of emotions, by the way, and we skip right on down into what the homo sapiens and low level beings in general experience as emotion, which is enthusiasm, caution, boredom, antagonism, anger, fear, grief and apathy.

And as we go down that, we're going down the action cycle. We're also going down the creation, change and destruction cycle. And all those cycles are coincident cycles. So your preclear will be able to perceive only at the lowest levels at first, usually, and he will only really be able to perceive at a certain height. This is the only way I know of swiftly changing the emotional tone and therefore the position of the preclear on the tone scale is to shift his position on the sensation scale.

That sensation scale and the emotion scale can be considered to be coincident scales: that is, to have him put anger onto an object and feel its anger, to put fear onto an object and feel its fear, to put grief onto an object and feel its grief, to put apathy onto an object and feel its apathy. Now what would that be doing? That would be moving your preclear in order right on down the tone scale, wouldn't it? And if you went through that order and you said, „Now put some antagonism on this object. Put some anger on it. Now put some fear on it and perceive the fear, now put some grief on it and perceive the grief. Now put some apathy on it and perceive the apathy. And you just went through that cycle in that order from 2.0 down each time as the drill, you're agreeing completely with the MEST universe. You're agreeing and therefore he will on go down the tone scale.

But now if you just vary that and then make it slightly random and then vary it upwards and then make it random and then vary it upwards again, why, you'll eventually be able to boost him up because really what you're doing is changing postulates. You'll be able to boot him up to exhilaration.

The fellow who goes initially and immediately into serenity, very fast into serenity, without realizing what he does for emotion has simply backed off from experiencing sensation. He has mistaken serenity for sensation. I mean this… he's mistaken this sensation of backing off from sensation for serenity.

Down a little lower on the tone scale, of course, a person is fixed in what they feel. Just like a piece of MEST is fixed with what you felt. You put this MEST out on the table and it's on the table. You know a table is there because everybody feels that table. And you agreed that you are everybody, so there you are out there and you feel it.

Now, you can put something on it and take an emotion off of it. But that is a little hidden step and most people very successfully hide that from themselves and they'll be quite startled when they suddenly find out that their emotional a… volatility is considerably increasing and also that their complete and utter slavish dependence upon the MEST universe as such is itself decreasing.

Why, they never saw the like of this, it's very strange. They… they… they… they feel better. That's the only way they'll say it. Probably won't even explain it to you at all exactly why this is. But up to this time they've said „MEST universe will deliver sensation to me."

The reason a guy gets down to apathy is he's no more willing. He thinks he has to receive the sensation without putting the sensation out. And the more he believes this, the less force he employs; and the less force he is willing to employ, the more he will do this; and the more he does this, the less real sensation there is for him; and he gets into the null of no sensation lower band, which apparently is just flicking around sort of grief and apathy and maybe a little fear. Once in a while he becomes annoyed and he said, „I was in a rage the other day."

You know a real good rage is an interesting thing to behold. If a fellow started postulating rages on something he could probably bust agreements which other people had hanging on it. Let's say he levered a rage at the window and everybody has still got hold of that window, and it's a window, and they've all postulated and so forth, there'd be such a kickback from the window that they'll say rumph, and the window will go kablam – there'd be no window. This is how you produce sudden shocks in MEST.

All right, what then is the first… first requisite on this motion? Space. And what is the first requisite of motion? Is that you can shift postulates about anchor points. That's the first requisite, that you can shift postulates about anchor points. That gives you real anchor points and that then you can observe something shifting in relationship to anchor points.

Now the essential step there is of course to perceive that something is changing in relationship to the anchor points. You postulate it's here, and then you postulate it's there and then you postulate it's over here. What are you doing when you're doing that? You're saying, „It's here, it's there, it's here, it's there, it's here, it's there, it's here, it's there." Look at that thing vibrate.

Now, this apparently and obviously requires time, doesn't it? Because what did you say? Time? What's time? Well – time – well, you've got a watch, haven't you? Says in the old axioms, a single arbitrary is time. Uh-huh, this MEST universe for homo sapiens has as its arbitrary time. Because he'd made time an unknown thing which can be given… experienced only secondarily, and he's sort of agreed that this is what it is.

Now in order to have motion you've got to put into existence two anchor points, and you've got to have a shift of dimension. Well, when you have two anchor points, you can say those things exist without dimension, but that isn't very handy.

So let's put something with its own dimension there and certain solidity so if somebody runs into it they'll know it's there. Let's make sure that's there. Now when we get something shifting there let's say it has a certain unenterability and let's get it shifting real

good, right to the left, left to the right, right to the left, left to the right. Now let's get that going real good. Now we got that.

All the time, by the way, we're sitting there watching it and being very surprised, very, very surprised that uh… and affected and amused by all that action that's taking place that we don't have anything to do with it. We're not doing that, no, no. We're doing that with complete agreement, so we put an object there.

Now what's this object? This object is a particle. It has an unenterability of a certain dimension of the space which we're dimensionalizing and that is a particle. That's very simple. This particle could be a sheet, a cube, a lightning bolt, anything you want to put it there. Hut let's say a particle. And let's get this particle being first, second, third, fourth, so that there's an order of position.

Now we could go first, second, third, fourth, just agreeing that there's an interval of sh… shift. Unless we've got a solid agreement on an interval of shift, unless we've got that one, nobody will ever see anything travelling at the same speed, and we couldn't have that.

So let's get that thing and then you can shift it to one, two, three, four, as positions. And then you could shift it to positions as I'm going to write as follows up here on the board, and your shift of positions would be first one… positions one, two, three, four – notice this is in relationship that you're seeing it, by the way, to those two anchor points up there.

And uh… so then we could… we could do this change, we could do this change, this uh… in two ways. We could say one, two, three, four, or we could say one, two, three, four, or we could say one, two, three, four, or one, two, three, four, or one, two, three, four. And that last one, two, three, four all piled up on each other there would make it look like it was standing still, or that it wasn't there, which it isn't in the first place.

All right. So you ever see anything do this? You ever see anything vibrate broadly and then narrow and speed its vibration and then narrow and speed its vibration until it's practically standing upright and vibrating like the dickens?

Well, now it's… it's going to shock you sometime to find out how fast you really think because you don't think measured against time. And when you think your time against MEST time as such, running a clock or something in the MEST universe, you're going to be flabbergasted to find out that you're thinking brrrp. And you've just thought out this whole book. Or you say brumm and there it all is. Oh heck, you… you can do that and you've got a condition… you've got a condition… you can go brrrp and you've got a condition. Well, you've got a condition – that's very interesting, isn't it? You've got a condition. There it is. Very interesting.

You want to sit there with nothing else to pick up your interest? Time is for the purposes of interest. Time is made to interest one. So we get time to be a particle, a motion, an object. Now look it, don't… don't… don't get too slippy on this. Time is not, definitely not, at any moment, anything as silly as a change of motion in space. That is not time.

To say that there's time and then to describe an action of space and particle and your postulates and then say, „Well, there's time" is to put out a weird sort of a thing that some kind of an unknown thing that goes on that we don't want to know anything about. So that

compares immediately to something on the automaticity scale. Not wanting to know in order to produce randomity. Time is… is the object, call this particle an object. Sounds awfully strange, doesn't it? Time is an object. Call this particle an object, call anything which becomes solid as a result of that as an object, call any energy flow which is a whole particle or made up of particles, whichever way you want to look at it – call that whole energy flow an object, or call any section of it an object. But let's kind of use the word OBJECT. There's a good reason for this. It's an object; because you can change a person's time sense and time beingness and alter his time just with objects.

So let's divide this thing up for clarity of thinking in order to compare it to experience as an object… objects. Let… let's… let's class… let's forget about the clocks and their hands going around in circles for a moment and see this as an object, and the chair as an object and the place as an object and so forth. And there is a lot of change of space matched up in each one of these things on which you're agreeing like mad. It's really… you've got no idea how bright you are. Why, you're so bright that you can keep all these postulates running simultaneously. That's brilliant!

Well, let's… let's… let's take a look at this now and let's take a whole lot of objects. Let's take a great big pile of objects. Let's not do anything with the coordinate points, the anchor points for those objects. Let's just take that great big pile of objects. Now unless you come along and do something about them or unless they're motivated to have something done to them, or unless internally something will happen to these objects, there's no change.

And if you were to walk in there according to the MEST universe time of 1200 and take a look at that pile of objects and you were to walk in there in the year 2000 and take a look at those pile of objects and there was no change. You were there in 1200, and when you went in there at 2000, you were there at 1200. Well, when you went in there at 1200, you were there at the year 2000. See, it doesn't matter a doggone. It doesn't matter when you came in that area, that space, and examined the objects; if there's no corrosion, no loss of the object, you've always got the same time. You never have anything else, but the same time for those objects.

You have a change of object out in the environment beyond this space by which you can judge whether or not… you've got an alteration of anchor points, postulates shifting for your own interest, out here in the anchor points of the environment, and you've got this big pile of stuff there. Now you say it went from the year 1200 to the year 2000 not because they changed – no change. You… they had just duration. There's no change; that's duration, that's also matter. All right.

But you could go out here in the environment and you could go around and… and you get… you… you… you postulate you've got a Ford and you postulate you've got a building, you postulate you've got a moustache, and you postulate you now have a family. And you got this and you got that and you got this and you got that and you got this and you will have this and you won't have this and something else this and that, and so forth, and this whole cycle goes along for an awful long time, and then you come back and take a look at this room. There's no change, but you know it's been a long time. Not because anything happened in the room, but because something happened on a broader set of anchor points. Only when you

make a broader set of anchor points for observation and include that room in them, is there any change in that room.

Timelessness is an apathy and time itself is an apathy. Timelessness merely means something that endures across long spans of time. That's silly – something that endures across long… one is a long span of time.

The Egyptian pyramids obviously have changed. They are not timeless. You could measure the amount of change of the Egyptian pyramids. People came along and took that nice marble facing off of them and built doorsteps and privies and things out of them, and did different beautiful things with them. That's a fact, they did, and the desert sands came up and hit them and corroded them and blew them away. There are big nicks in them and the space of the… space of the Sphinx has all corroded; there's been a change there. We know they are changed. But if those things existed as the day they were built with the same condition as the day they were built, we'd walk back there and it might as well be the 3500 years ago as now.

The more solid apathy is… you see, apathy can be this no motion apparency. It's an all motion which has no space to operate in, all postulated, all collapsed on itself. We have, then, an object.

We've got duration. We have duration. Mostly because another guy, some poor little weak guy can't come along and take a look at them and say, move this way, move that way, move this way, move that way, and they get all changed. No, sir, these exist on changeless postulates. They've been agreed upon so hard and so thoroughly and so carefully that nobody can come up and in a few little weak postulates alter them. There's no time there. Things would stop.

Now if that existed, only on its own anchor points, there'd be no time. The place might as well be empty on its own anchor points. It's empty on its own anchor points; it's full of matter on its own anchor points, you still have no sensation of time, until you put a particle in there.

So let's just forget about this slippy, stupid word TIME, let's forget about that and let's get change of position. Now that's theoretically the definition of it. And the only reason we're interested in this is not interested in it from a physics standpoint even remotely. They've been too long running around in that squirrel cage. Going round and round and round, space is time is MEST is a particle is space is time is MEST is a… I mean we're… space, time, energy, these three things are related. Related, hell! There's no difference except in terms of experience. And the second we put these things in terms of experience we can handle the problem in processing. And that's all we're interested in. You just say, anytime time factor comes up, you just say have and have not, and you've got it. Sounds awful simple, but, boy, the case is just ripped to pieces on this one.

Essentially, by test, if you will treat an engram which is held in present time as something which a person still will have or is trying desperately to have not, you have the essential ingredient of time and it's present time for him. And that's what brings your engram into present time.

Your engram is in present time because the person still wants it and hasn't got the actual object, so he takes the picture of the object. Guys are always packing around little pictures. They can't have the object itself, so they've got a picture of the object. That's a facsimile and all that a facsimile is, actually… they know they can't have the object, they haven't got sense enough to make it again right there; besides this would overrule the law of scarcity and so… so they… they… they… they carry this little picture of the object around and that's permitted in the MEST universe.

But all of a sudden you'll… you'll open up the preclear's track a little bit and you'll take a look and for heaven's sakes here is… here is 8000 B.C. and 5 trillion years ago and so forth all there together. Well, he's had enough change that he more or less estimates – because of what?

Planets alter. The havingness of a sun, determined by some prior set of postulates, the havingness of a sun is scheduled. And the havingness of a sun is scheduled. The sun is as long as it has, as far as a… as a… has what? Has change. And if it doesn't have any change it might as well not be there, because it isn't going to emanate any light or isn't going to do any other thing as far as you're concerned. You can readily tell the kind of matter that isn't supposed to emanate so you… you say it won't emanate and it doesn't.

Now, let's… let's be very specific about this, then, in terms of energy. Now I don't care which one of these energies is which. There's two energies.

I mean, just might as well go round the other way and call the minus the other one and so on. There's the have and have not energy. And there's stuff which you approach and that says, „Have me." It really does sort of say, „Have me." You can… you've got an idea that that's the kind of motion that should be in this environment and those space coordinates and so you, „Have me." It has… sets right there. That's very good.

Now there's the kind that says, „Don't have me" and these two things get together and they go flick flick flick flick flick flick flick across and you get randomity.

Let's take the animal kingdom. The animal kingdom rushes around with two thoughts in mind: „I've gotta have" and „I don't want to be had." That's all; that's what appetite is.

Your engrams break down immediately into those two classifications: the engrams „I've gotta have" and the engrams „I don't want to have". So there's two haves. There's a „have" engram and a „have not" engram. The trouble is, with a have not engram the fellow has lost his ability to have not. He no longer is able to say „I won't have it." And so of course anything he says, „I won't have it" to, why, that's gotta say „l have… have not." And it will back off and then stay in suspension.

It's right there; he can't run it either because it's… it's ready to punch him all the time. He says, „I don't want this," therefore he says, „I'm not responsible for this, so therefore it keeps hitting me and I keep creating it, but it keeps hitting me and here it is right here and it's knocking hell out of me and therefore I don't want it." And the harder it hits him the more he says „I don't want it," and the more he says „I don't want it," of course, the more it's a have not. And the more it's a have not the more it kicks him because he… he owns it less, so we have a standpoint that's horrible.

So you have big fish flying around in the ocean and they say, „Gotta have, gotta have, gotta have, gotta have.“ And all the little fish fly around in the ocean and they say, „Have me not, have me not, have me not, have me not.“ And the more they say „Have me not,“ the more the big fish say, „Gotta have, gotta have, gotta have,“ till the fisherman comes along and he says, „I gotta have“ and there goes the big fish. At that moment the big fish has changed his postulate and suddenly says, „Have me not, have me not, have me not, have me not.“

So we… we get a system of interdependencies along the dynamics. You ought to trace that out just for your own edification. It’s the cycle or series of „have me’s“ and „have me not’s“, plotted against the cycle of creation, destruction, plotted against the cycle of action, plotted against the cycle of sensation which finally wi… and plotted against the cycle of experience. All these things plot together and you find out time is an object. Now there’s two kinds of objects, there is have objects and have not objects.

Now what to you find in the preclear? The preclear is always saying, „I had, if I had only had, if only I had not had,“ he’s putting it in past tense. Oh, it’s not in past tense though, isn’t that horrible? He’s still got a facsimile sitting right there in present time all the time he’s saying that it’s in the past, and the more he says it’s in the past and he doesn’t want it and… and so forth, and the more he regrets it, the more he’s upset about it, why, the more he’s got it because he hasn’t got it.

So he can move his whole engram bank right up into present time by simply saying all the time, „Well, if I’d only had, the trouble was I had.“ He’s saying „had, had“ and pretending that such a thing as „had“ exists, and then all the time going on in complete agreement that he’s in present time, and then saying, well, „had“ really exists.

You’ll find this person’s incapable of handling time. There’s a way to handle time. The way you handle time is to handle objects. If you handle objects, you’ve handled time. That’s all, too simple. That’s because time is a word which talks about the interrelationship – you see, we aren’t quite on time when we say object; but time is an interrelationship of beingness, action, and object, and the interrelationship of beingness, action, and object become themselves time.

Uh… you’re going to flounder with this for a while; there’s hardly a homo sapiens alive that can grab on to time. You can make time happen brrrr, or you can make time happen pocketa, pocketa, pocketa, practically at will.

Do you know in the last instant before you hit bottom, that a lot of time can occur? It’s the degree you’re trying to have that makes a lot of time. Just get that – the degree you’re trying to have is what creates time. So you’ve got this urge to have.

Now you go around you find these fellows who in… oh boy, are they in bad shape, are they way down tone scale and in horrible condition. It sums up under one… one heading which has two parts, and that’s… they have this idea: „I will have and I won’t ever get.“ He’s going to be punished and he’s not going to get any good out of it. It’s in terms of havingness.

His future is in terms of havingness. If you cut off a man’s havingness he has no future. I mean, if you cut off all of his havingness his future’s done and that is the one condition about death – as far as the current lifetime and combination of homo sapiens, thetan and so

forth, it's the end of havingness. About the only thing he ever has that he's really sure of – he's got a body. And he knows he will have the body and so he sort of sticks on a time track. And he sticks on it like mad. He does everything he could do to stick on this time track, and it's a very slippy job. Actually trying to stay on a MEST time track for a person who's fairly aberrated is like walking a very, very high tightwire with greased shoes.

You get your psychos and so forth. A psycho will come around and he will hand you a moment, and you try to take a phrase away from him and he will finally give it to you. And I've had them reach in their pockets for it and hand it over. Phrase is an object.

People who are pretty well down tone scale, words and symbols are objects, they're not thoughts anymore, they're objects. And these people are so literal with words. You… you tell them rrrrr and so on and so on and so on, and you give them this idea and he says, „Now wait a minute. Now what word did you use?".

And it's just as though they were sorting over a pile of rubble, you have suddenly changed a word. It offends them somehow. The… you… you use maybe a colloquialism or something like that, and, boy, they're upset about this. It's really hit them.

You wouldn't be so upset with them if you realized that you had probably driven a bullet into them or something of the sort. The thought is the object because the person is in such bad shape that they can only think as an object. They are an object and their thoughts are objects, and they are objects, and they're getting more objects every minute, and they'll get pretty upset about it after a while because they realize that they're on their way out.

Now what's havingness. Havingness. Have and have not. Positive- negative terminals, so you get this positive- negative randomity as explained by the interaction between haves and have nots. So you get this in the political scene. Let's just apply it in one time; that would be the most familiar thing to you.

There are the haves and there are the have nots, aren't there? And they fight all the time. And the big joke is that the have nots are really the haves and the haves are really the have nots. The haves have no liberty, they condensed all their space and the have nots have got freedom because they haven't got any space. They're not troubled by objects.

The haves are trying to keep having, that is, hold on to, and the have nots are trying to procure. So your progressives are usually found down along the level of the revolutionaries, or is that up along the level of the revolutionaries?

That rich man tries to buy duration, tries to buy duration, and he gets duration all right; he turns into MEST. That's why the rich man can't go through the eye of the needle: his ridges. These ridges are haves, and a person has ridges to the direct degree that they are upset about have and have not, in direct ratio; and they are stuck on the time track to the degree and the exact degree, and their time is unable to be handled to the degree, that they are upset about have and have not.

They can have or if they could get the idea that they will have in the future, all of a sudden their track will free up and they'll run like gazelles on it. But they're sitting there with the idea they can't have but they have had but they're trying to hold on to, and you can get ahold of them and put your foot against their chest and pull on the ridges and have them snap

back and go booong. And you try to pull out the tractor beams, and get alongside of that and so on and they go bing-bong and go right back into place again.

You can't take anything away from this person. You're trying to run an engram. You're trying to get him to… get rid of a little energy. He isn't going to be able to do it. He can't get… do it because he can't have, can he? Well, therefore, he's got to hold on to it, hasn't he? And those… those things are all have nots, aren't they? So he can't touch anything that doesn't want to be had because he can't use any force, can he? Because he hasn't any space to orient against, and you say, „Run out that engram." And he'll say, „What engram?" Well he… and you think, „Christsakes!"

The fellow keeps walking around all the time saying, „I've got to get rid of it, I've got to get rid of it. Well, I've just got to get rid of it. I wonder why I worry all the time about knitting needles, knitting needles, knitting needles? I've got to get rid of it." And he's just walking around. He looks like he's in a prenatal and there he is.

You start to ask him to give up this prenatal, he'd probably start reaching and looking through his pockets when you start talking to him about an engram. He uh… he… he'd be unable to conceive that he was dramatizing, that's why; it's cause and he's effect.

So way up at the top of the tone scale, the individual is cause and as he dwindles down from beingness through action to having, he becomes more and more an effect of what he has.

That person's span of life is freest where they have the least and expected the most, and became most stultified and ruined the time when they finally procured. And their instant of procurance is their instant of no time from there on. Your one-five who was holding on, holding on, holding on like mad, he's holding on to the arthritis, holding on to Little Bessie, holding on to this, holding on to that, isn't going to get loose of anything and so forth, and he's going to destroy it, but isn't going to… no motion, no motion, no mo… what do… what do you find in this person? Boy, anything that comes near him, just hits up against the body like a magnet. It goes spoing – thug. You run down, you get rid of this engram, you run this one-five through this engram, you run him through this engram from one side to the other all the way through the thing. You say, uh… „Well, let's go through it again." They go all the way through the thing again, and you say, „How's it feel?"

„No change."

„Let's go all the way through it again…" You're not going to get anyplace with this, that's all.

You've got to get into this to a point where they can change. You've got to find someplace they can change, because they haven't got any time and they haven't got any time because they own all possession. And it's all have not possession. And if they got all this have not possession and some have possession, they have to hold on to the have possession and that makes them hold on to the have not possession. And the first doggone thing you know, what's the first thing a one-five tells you? He says, „I've got no time. I have no time for that." And you'll see him sitting there at his office desk, hour after hour after hour. I mean, „I haven't got any time for it. I'm awfully rushed, I'm so busy." He'll look at you rather sadly and sigh wheezily, „I have no time for anything." There he is – he's got no time for anything.

That's perfectly true. He's got no time; he's just so upset on the idea of time, his haves and have nots are so intermingled and balanced he can't do anything about it.

From there on down he tries to get rid of possessions. A one-one tries to kick possessions away and get the hell out of there because he knows he's in death. Now a one-one will destroy possessions covertly and try to get rid of them, push them aside, they won't leave him. He hasn't enough command value to do that. Your one-one, he starts to kick this engram through and he will sort of reach down to the side and move it over to the side and say, „Yeah, I'm all rid of that. Yep, yep, I ran that. I ran that" – the end of the session he takes his foot off of it and it goes spoing and he's got it again.

You say, „What's the matter with you today, I thought we ran that out yesterday."

„Oh, we did."

Huh? There it is.

Their time. What happens to a one-one's time? Boy, time is the master. Everything is an effect. He's an effect to everything.

Well, now maybe you'll understand this a little better on this scale. On this scale, 40.0 is beingness. This is in terms of experience. 40.0 is beingness. Now there can be beingness and individuality above 40.0 but space is one trick of beingness. And beingness in this universe is space anchor points coordinates. And that is beingness. And the most beingness a person could be would be determined upon the most space the person could embrace. Free space postulated. Now you find your big rancheroos out in the West. They owned one hundred eighty-five thousand square miles and so forth, they were big men them days. Yeah, they sure had an idea of beingness. Space! Nothing on it at all.

You go out there, you also find that the biggest liars that ever lived probably come from spaces, big spaces like that. Out in space in your space crews and things like that, the guys who are really free and have lots of space. They wouldn't know what the heck you were talking about, if you said, „What is the truth of this?" „Truth, there is no such thing."

Now, we get 20.0 is action. And action is energy. Energy. But the funny part of it is that 0.0 gives an interdependency of objects and beingness which amounts to action. It is very hard to get into… very hard to get into action without an object. Just get… try to get into action.

By the way… way, one of the ways a fellow dramatizes this when he's a little kid, he says all the time, he's saying, „If I only had the gun and mask and so forth of Red Rider, then I could be…" And he gets much older and he has the wherewithal to buy all the guns and hats of Red Rider you could possibly imagine, but what does he do? He's… all of his childhood was spent trying to get dressed so he could play a part in the play. And all of his adulthood is spent trying to get dressed. He's forgot that there's any part left in the play. He isn't prepared for anything anymore.

So time is an object really. It's an interaction between beingness and object that gives you action. And so it takes a full forty-to-twenty interrelationship in order to give us activity

and energy. And out of this we get force and the production of force, and all of the other things in which we're interested.

Now this lower scale here is S.E.T. related to experience. E.X.P., and that experience is the human experience and in human experience space is beingness. Action is energy, and object is time. And if you want to process a person who has no time, process if… in that s… way. If you want a person to increase his energy, you have to address his beingness and his object, in other words, his space and his object.

So instead of processing too much space, energy and time as such, you could process beingness, action and object. Or instead of processing, as you have in the past, thoughts, beingness, object, abject, so on, so on, trying to get at it like that; you can process directly space, energy and object. Space, energy and time, because this time is just have-have not, that's all.

You can process that directly and in that wise you can straighten a preclear out and make him run like a gazelle, but you have to rehabilitate force in order to do any of it. And force of course is the middle ground, and the way you get force is space and particles, which are objects. And that is the way it is done.

I'll give you the mock-up drills in tomorrow afternoon's lecture. Tonight we'll be covering the axioms.

Let's get a bite of supper.

(TAPE ENDS)