Cycles of Action

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 5. December 1952

December 5th – December 5th, first hour afternoon.

We're going to – now that you know all about gradient scales – take up that very interesting subject known as a Cycle of Action.

You had to know something about space and anchor points and points of origin and so forth before we could take up cycles of action. Now that is a uh… precaution on my part which has not been observed in the past in the field of physics. They just assumed there was an in before they decided what was it.

And uh… the cycle of action, therefore, did not come up into the prominence that it should and is, as a matter of fact, one of the first uses of it and it has not been used enough to bother with, except by statisticians that wish to prove something that they were trying to hide, uh… since the Vedic peoples' statement concerning this very interesting datum – that things started with creation, continued through growth, went through a period of decay and then died away. And they assigned this to the universe.

Now that was a very wise sort of a statement and very possibly a piece of information about which they might have known a great deal more once. As it is now, it is a piece of information which is submerged into the Vedic Hymns.

Now, let's take a look then at the microcosm called „Man", and uh… let's take a look at him as uh… a cycle of action.

He starts in with conception – starts in here with conception, goes through into birth, goes through into childhood, goes through into man and then here's an old man, and then dead. That is what he believes his cycle of action is.

And uh… sure enough, for one body, that is for one term of havingness, if you measure havingness in terms of the body – let's not worry about time, let's just say a term of havingness – he continues through this cycle and was for a long, long time content to believe that he ceased to exist when the end of the cycle was reached. That's peculiar to this cycle of action – is the relative content with which it has been accepted. Anything which is quietly accepted, such as a bullet in the brain, being disemboweled, dying of pneumonia, being buried in mud, being trapped – you know, there must be some… quite some pressure in there to insist that this has… has uh… agreement. There must be very heavy agreement on this. Otherwise, otherwise nobody would ever stand for it.

All right, now let's take… let's take what is known as a spiral. And this is one why… now this is a spiral. And we'll start in this spiral here at Creation. This is a spiral for Man. We start in here at Creation, Conserve, End.

Now there are several other points on that gradient scale, but a spiral is simply this: A spiral is a term of lives, or a term of existences or a single existence which bear an intimate relation, one to the other. You, for instance, will go back in a preclear's past and you will find out that you have an overall spiral of him being in a body. He picked up a body some time or another, he was in and out of bodies for a while. And then all of a sudden we get a long spiral that uh… it's just life after life after life after life after life after life. And he goes downhill in the end and he is no longer… he is no longer on the spiral of bodies. Now that's… that's a bigger spiral.

The universe could be said to be, although this term YEAR is very deceptive, it could be said to be about 74 to 76 trillion years. That is to say, homo sapiens is found here on the planet Earth in the solar system at this end of this galaxy, uh… found to be about 74, 76 trillion years. Now exactly what they're computing as a year, I do not know. But you simply say „year" and you get an immediate response on the E-Meter.

Now it could mean that they are talking about a galactic year uh… as plotted arbitrarily, they're talking about some planetary swing, uh… something of the sort. But it's so many swings and this all boils down to so many units of havingness. A year, you see, is a unit of havingness. That's why it gets to be a unit of time.

Now that spiral at first was 100 million years old, at least. A fellow entered the MEST universe and he went 100 million years until he finally conceived he was dead. And then he conceived that he was resurrected again by some necromancy and he thought himself a new being, an entirely new being, and he went on this time for maybe 50 or 60 million years – his next spiral. That's a spiral. And then he felt himself „dead" and he was resurrected again and he went on for maybe 25 million years – getting shorter each time. And the current spiral for most people here is 34 thousand years. You'll find some preclears who are about three thousand years on their current spiral, and you will very rarely find one who is any longer than that. When you do, you find somebody who isn't tracking with the… with the culture.

There we have, then, spirals. And those spirals come down on the order of 100… well, 100 million, and then maybe 50 million, and then maybe… and so on, until they're down here right now to this microscopic spiral point which is uh… this current spiral. And Man is part of that microscopic point in one lifetime.

Now let's just measure in terms of havingness. A year is a term of havingness. A year here on Earth: we have Spring – creation, growth, Summer – continuance of growth, Fall – decay and conservation, Winter is death. And then from Winter, again emerges the year once more.

This is the spiral of havingness and a cycle. And unless you have the factor of havingness, designed as a spiral, you cannot get, really, anybody to agree to the unit of time. Take a month: a month is having a full moon. The moon is not there, then the moon is suddenly created, and then the moon swings around and gets larger and larger and then it declines and gets smaller and smaller, and then it isn't there any more and uh… that has passed by.

A day starts with dawn as its creation, and swings on through to the pre-dawn death. If you don't think that just before dawn it's death, the whole world feels like death at that time. Very few of you, probably, have ever had too much to do with wide spaces just before dawn, but the confoundedly most darkest hours are in that period.

As an odd coincidence, in a day, most people die at 2 o'clock in the morning. There's an enormous majority of deaths at 2 o'clock in the morning. It goes right around that. They feel that if they can just live through the next… if they can get through the next two or three hours they'll go right through another day.

So here we have these spirals of havingness. They seem to want to go into divisions of four, for some reason or other – although I've written three here each time.

Now we have four periods for the moon, we have four periods for the year, and uh… there are possibly four periods for an outer spiral. But it would be quantity of havingness would measure the span. And that quantity of havingness is determined on this spiral, and we find this spiral excessively native to the MEST universe. You can use this spiral in any universe, and it is used to a large degree, but I want you to view it as a specialized thing, not as an inevitable thing. This spiral of action, then uh… pardon me, this spiral of growth and decay is also many other kinds of spiral.

All right, when we reach out for the whole universe, we find out that the MEST universe itself is doing a spiral which began with its creation and is going through to its death. And that's the big spiral for this universe. But it is certainly going on through to its death.

Now there's the spiral of action of a game – any game has this spiral of action uh… if it's plotted out on rules even vaguely similar to the MEST universe. That doesn't mean that every game has to have this as a spiral – I scan, this as a cycle.

Uh… here we have, then, the whole universe going from creation to death, and we have the macrocosm. And up here we have Man under the microscope. So that's the big and the large in terms of this spiral.

Now if this thing can be found as such an interesting common denominator, then it must have some intimacy with the whole field of experience. In this universe, then, there must be an intimacy between this and the whole field of experience. And let's make it our business now – we're in the business right now of building, and uh… conserving and destroying universes and it's… it's a fairly big contracting business, and we should know a little bit about what we're contracting to do.

Uh… people who take contracts to the US Government in wartime don't have that laborious requisite laid upon them that they have to know what they're doing before they can do it. But we… we should.

So, let's take a look here and find that uh… what space is. Now, oddly enough, a piece of space… a nice piece of space is a postulated particle. Now you have to have a particle before you can have space. And before you can have an actual particle, you have to… before you can have space you have to have a particle, and before you have a particle you have to have space. So it's a coincident manufacture. They are very intimate. They're not two different things.

Two particles, that far apart, become two anchor points. You say, „Well, there's a point over there and a point over there." Now you could be mathematical about it and you could simply say, „Well, that point has neither length, breadth nor depth." That's your right to say so. And you'll find it's difficult to hold it in one place. But uh… that's your right to say that, and so… so it is.

And then your next step could be a particle. Or you could simply just be more confronting about it and you could say, „Now here's a particle, now it has mass," and you've got your creation of space. Your particle has mass. Now your particle could be something without mass. The… the particle… it's not necessary for a particle to have mass. It's… it could be just a piece of space, a microscopic piece of space which you then… then give mass to.

It… it's merely postulates you're dealing with here. I… I can see on some of your faces you have this creepy notion that this thing is going to slide in sideways on you somehow or other and turn into a very difficult feat in physics. But honest, HONEST, it… it… it's just… it's just too simple, actually, to be… to be readily grasped. You have a particle and you put that particle there, and you have a particle and you put that particle there.

Well, where do you get these „theres" from? Well, that's very simple. You just say, „They're there." You have to take a viewpoint of dimension and you have a viewpoint. Now you have to say you have a viewpoint before you have a viewpoint, and in order to have a viewpoint you have to have something to view. So that's coincident, too, isn't it?

So you get the… the viewpoint, the coincidence of view, uh… the anchor points and the particle actually simultaneously. That should tell you something very interesting. This is all going on here at once. I mean, they can't divide these things so that you have… „Well, now we have space." Oh yeah? Yeah?? The heck you do. If you're going to say „space" you're going to have to say „anchor point to anchor point", not just arbitrarily. The second you sweep your hand this way or something of that sort, or motion out that way, you've got an indicator, and you're indicating a point or a line in which you are now going to view an emptiness, and which emptiness you may or may not adventure to fill. But we've got the… all of these things.

Now what about the intention? You actually can't state this intention without it happening. Of course, you could state it in such a way that it wouldn't happen. But uh… if you stated the intention, uh… you say, „Well, now I'm going to put a piece of space out to here," you've already lined the thing up, and you can't have instantaneousness.

Where… we can't get off zero of the stopwatch with this. Uh… every time we add one of these things to another one of these things, we find they're being done at the same moment. That gives people the creepy idea of the simultaneousness of time. And time, sure enough, is terribly simultaneous because it doesn't exist. Time is something they invented. The great god Moloch, you know. Uh… he really didn't exist. But uh… somebody had to invent him in order to keep the… keep the slaves in line.

And Time… they have to invent him. He has an altar and uh… a beingness and is sacrificed to in every factory in the land. That is a time clock which is a nice little altar, and they come in and they feed him pieces of… little bits of paper, and he goes „chomp-whirr!" and

that's… that's the Oracle. And every time he says „Chomp-whirr!" he is saying, „Bless you, my child. You will be paid."

They'd actually get much further if they would simply put a pot-bellied god up there on the wall and give it a good-looking face instead of a silly circular face with Arabic numerals on it, because a god with Arabic numerals all over his face is kind of dull.

Uh… now they tell everybody that this is an… is an object known as Time and it is a great mystery. And it is a mystery which you mustn't crack because if you crack this mystery too solidly, you're going to crack everything else too, and there's a lot of people got a lot of vested interests around here. They can't manufacture energy themselves, they couldn't build a universe themselves, three or four people couldn't get together and slap one up that uh… looked pretty good, so they say, „We've got to keep this one – we've got to keep this one."

Those people are on the center of this action cycle.

All right. Now what do we have here as an interrelationship of cycles? Let's just take a look at this very broadly and let's say we – just… just for fun – that we have to have space before we have action. Now that's actually not a… not a good way to look at it at all. But uh… we say we have to have space: Space is a requisite to action. Actually, as you have action, you have space; as you have space you have action. As you have space and action, you have havingness. And then… and it's just all right there in what… simultaneous time, and it's very easy to have simultaneous time because, as I said, that is a myth and a mystery.

But this other is not a myth and a mystery. You can experience this. So God bless anything you can experience and to hell with everything you have to take on somebody's word.

So here we go on a first action cycle. We have here uh… space postulated, you know what space is. This is the same space we were talking about yesterday. And that comes through here to particles. And this comes through here to action, and this comes through action to solidity, and here you have matter.

Matter is a condensation of space. How much will space condense? It'll condense, of course, back to zero, because you're not condensing space. It's just… you're just narrowing dimensional viewpoints on something and postulating more particles in it, that's all. It's a… you say, „Well, it's a…" and so on.

Now you actually have as much time as you postulate space and particles. And if you postulate lots of space and few particles you have action; you have a field of action there can take place. And if you postulate very little space and an awful lot of particles you have solid matter.

Now there isn't any reason why you couldn't do that one instantaneously. You could say, uh… „Now it's from here." Don't think these things have to grow. They don't. That's… that's the whole trick of the universe. You could have this… you could say „From here to here, and there to there, and there to there, and there to there and there to there. That's… that's a piece of space. And now it is a solid mass of particles – there you are: a piece of iron." I mean, there isn't any reason you couldn't do that. Just simultaneous time.

It does not depend upon any gradient scale of occurrence. Let me make that very plain to you: It doesn't depend upon a gradient scale of occurrence.

Now there are many people around who know this instinctively and they can't possibly figure out why they have to go through all this work, .particle collection idea, in order to have a whole flock of particles which then go together and form an object. Or why they have to go on a gradient scale of this sort of thing. And you can take a little kid and uh… when he wants something, he wants it right now. He doesn't want it „till Daddy works another month so that you collect enough paycheck to this and that." And „Yes, dear. Now you want to be very… you realize, dear, that uh… these things take a little time, and so forth. And you have to work for what you get. And if you go to school and you gradually go across the line uh… and so on, why, you eventually work for 80 or 90 years and they will finally let you be a psychiatrist."

And uh… uh… they… the fellow is in instinctive protest, is saying, „Noooo! This doesn't have to be!" And every once in a while somebody will jump sideways on this and say, „I want it right now! Zing! No gradient scale, anything of this sort. It's got to be right now." And he'll get into trouble with the rest of the society. They all come around and tell him how this takes time, They don't tell him what time is. They merely say it takes time.

What they're telling him is, „You put a lot of particles in gradually." They're telling him the difference between, „Now we'll make this box up here – this big cube – and now you want to just say, „That's all full of particles and all those spaces are occupied and they're in juxtaposition to each other in such a way that they'll cohese, and those kind of tetrahedrons in space are going to do this and that, and therefore you've got iron." You… you just want to say, „Zong!" and that takes place."

„Whereas we assure you solemnly that we know utterly that that cannot be done, because WE can't do it." So they say, „Here's the way you do this. First you make this big empty box. Now you've got that? Now you can't have anything. You've just got to have an empty box and it has the flimsiest possible anchor points. So we can say they're practically zero. Now we've got that box, and we take great care that it has the perfect geometric shape, and so forth. Now we take a particle – another little piece of space here – and we take this particle and we say it's all full. We say that is in the shape of a tetrahedron and that is all full.

„Now we're going to take that particle and we're going to put that in the box, understand? All right, now we're going to take another small piece of space here, because you see, we can't do these big things. We've got to do small things. And uh… just take this second little tiny piece of space here and we say that's all full of particles, that's fine. That's another tetrahedron, and we'll put that in this big box. And this way… this way, eventually we will have a box full. And it's much more satisfactory to do it that way."

And if you said, „We will make a large tetrahedron of space and fill it full of particles. And then two more, and then four more and then put those in this big box," that would not be fair. And you say, „What's fair?"

„Well, fair."

Evidently what's fair is not well done. And that, by the way, is… is terribly true all across the line when people start to talk about what's fair.

Now you'll get the idea here, gradient scale. They want a gradient scale. They can't do a lot of it at once, so they want to do a little bit at a time.

Now this universe is built on that postulate that I just gave you. It's built on the postulate that you take this space and you make little particles and fill the big space that way, and it's built on the postulate additionally that when you get it just so full it starts to get smaller. That's shrinkage and decay. In this way we've got a method of getting rid of these masses of things, or maybe a way of collecting them, or something. Nobody's ever quite sure what they're… what they're doing on this. But it's… it's a game. And it should… should be just awfully bare-faced to you, you're supposed to go down and…

People are building an airplane down here, and they go down and they… they make the sheets, and they put the sheets on the airplane and so on. And that's all very interesting.

And they build this airplane and they put a motor on the front end of the airplane and they put gasoline into the thing. And they take a young boy and they train him how to fly, and they take the airplane out to the landing field and they take the young boy who knows how to fly and they put him in the cockpit. And they go up here to the… to the tower and they have a man in the tower who knows how to dispatch airplanes. And they have radio men and weather men to make sure that the airplane won't get into trouble in weather. And they have radio stations and other fields and other places where you can get gasoline. And they've got this all figured out.

So what? So he can fly. You sit him down in a chair and you say, „Be two feet behind your head. Now go to Chicago."

And you immediately say, „But you can't take a body to Chicago." Why should he take a body to Chicago? If he gets hot enough, when he gets to Chicago, he'll make one.

That, that by the way, is the essence of teleportation. Well, what do you want to lug… lug a body around for? If you… you'd have to lug something around and it would encumber you.

A person has to encumber himself to the direct degree that he cannot create and destroy. And so if you want to lug this body around all the time… you could teleport it, sure enough one way or the other, but uh… why? You just uh… you've got this nice body and everybody looks at it and it feels solid to them and it's all set and uh… you come in and there they are. And they say, „Well, I think I'll go to Chicago." Poof! Poof!! There they are – walking through the Loop.

And that's very simple, but they'd have to be able to re-create themselves a body when they got to Chicago which compared to this body, so there would be identification involved in the thing, if they're that MESTy that they have to have identification.

What… what you really get identification on is matter. You don't get identification over here on particles. A person who can BE a universe is not worried about whether his name is Jones or William's or Spooner. He… he is not worried about what his name is. And

possibly the beings which were in his universe, and so forth… he probably wouldn't go around with his ear very harshly and solidly to the ground to make sure that they kept on calling him Jones – anything of that level.

Now you say, „Well, Jones owns so-and-so and so-and-so, and you have private property. Therefore you have to have a label so that you can tell what he owns." Oh, what the… what the… hey! Wait a minute! What he owns? You mean to say that the guy's got to own? Oh, this fellow has to own, huh? Why, I thought we were talking about gods! Gods don't have to own, they create! And they don't sell, they destroy!

There is no traffic in the marts of the Valhalla we're talking about.

Now when you get, however, into this whole subject of… of cycles of action, you find out that the imposition of a gradient scale on the manufacture of an item gives the illusion called time. And you want to unsolve this with the preclear – you'll find your roughest preclear is the one who has the roughest time with possession. The roughest preclear has the roughest time with possession. He wants – he can't have. The mere fact that he wants to be out of his head is enough to confirm the fact that he's going to be IN his head. The fact that he doesn't want something is the surest guarantee that he's going to get it. He is just in a complete reversal, lower than that, he's practically MEST. He cannot handle force, which means he cannot make objects. So if he cannot make objects, he is at the bottom scale of having to want.

So let's take that as a cycle there. And uh… that would be… that would be the cycle of an object here, this space, particles, actions, solid and matter, and objects. And we put this on here very carefully: „MEST Universe." Now we'll put also very carefully „December 1952" and we'll… we'll make a translation of that uh… so that we know what 1952 we're talking about. Because that is based on a very, very tremulous sort of thing.

It's… it's a… it's right on the razor's edge because that says, „A.D." And I don't know that we know whose „A.D." it's for. So we'll put it what it is, which is Cycle 56, Marcation Two – which is Hub Time.

Now there is the cycle of an object. Now get it very specifically: the cycle of an object here and now at this time, the place and what… what agreements you find yourself in.

Now, what cycle of action, then, for an object that's built like that? Well, a cycle of action for an object that's built like that goes this way: it goes Start, it goes Change, and it goes Stop. Those are the three characteristics of motion, that's all. That… those… those… motion does those three things. It doesn't do four things or six things or twelve things. It just does those three things: starts, changes and stops.

Now, you can fancy this up here, then, as motion actions. You can fancy all this up, and make it very, very interesting by putting in here just a little bit more particulars, see? You have Start, and then you have Change additive, and you have Null Change, and then you have Change negative, and then you have Stop. Now that's just highly particular. That's null there in the middle.

Now this compares to this: uh… Start, Increase, Decrease, Stop. Start, Increase, Decrease, Stop. That's the way this works out. This is the formula of agreement on how we're to

make matter and maintain it and increase it and decrease it and so forth. Here we have again – Conception, Growth, Conservation here in the middle, then Decreasing – you notice old people start shrinking – and then Stop. When they turn to dust they really shrink.

Now there is all these related cycles of action. They're just all the same thing; we just kept drawing the same thing only we're getting more and more into experience on this. So let's just be… let's say to hell with this and go right on out and find out how many of these things can we interrelate.

Well, we have to go into comparative experience. You saw yesterday space was beingness. We could compare space to beingness. Now that's very handy, because as a person increases in space, he increases in beingness. This is observable in a preclear and it's extrapolable from other things. So, all right, we'll say space is beingness, and this is doingness, and this is havingness. Beingness, Doingness, Havingness.

And up here we have this, of course, as space, energy, object – object doesn't matter. When you say „object", we're talking about energy, too.

All right, and this is Start-Beingness-Space, and this is Start, Change, Stop. And this is Creation, and this is Conservation, more or less, and that's Destruction.

And all through all of these things we have a related experience. And that's very strange that all we have to do when we're looking at uh… all of this material is uh… just interrelate these items. When we're processing or trying to understand something, we can't understand it in one category, shift it over to another category of the same bracket and we can understand it.

We've got three things working here, then.

Now we've got the various items here of energy, and when we get down to the final analysis, how does this relate? A preclear must be able to create the condition, energy or object, he must be able to conserve it, protect it, control it, hide it, change it, age it, make it go backwards on a cycle of action, perceive it with all perception, shift it at will in time, rearrange it, duplicate it, turn it upside-down or on its side at will, make it disobey MEST laws, be it, not be it and destroy it. If he can do all of those things, he's answered every condition that is possible in the MEST universe.

Now that just comes out of this stuff. This is with ease… considerable ease with which you do this stuff. Space and beingness are coincident. A man is as much beingness as he can handle space. He easily starts things because he can always create space for himself, a little more difficult to change things, and it's sometimes quite difficult to stop things, once changed, in this universe.

So the… as far as energy is concerned, it requires energy to do. It also requires space and matter, because energy or little tiny particles of matter, which sum up to big particles of matter with no space in which to move, very rapidly and that is matter. A particle with no space to go anyplace is matter.

Now we have, then, uh… energy compares to doingness and, of course, the essence of energy is change. We get uh… things shifting this way and that way and around and around, and we get change – consistent and continual.

And energy, of course, when we… I put conservation in there just to mark the center point. Then it ought to be also „Grow, Conserve and uh… Decay.“ And the operation of energy can be found to be in Growth, Conservation and Decadence. It's uh… uh… that's Change, but those are your characteristics of Change.

Now Change is marked out in terms of increase-decrease. And doingness, up here, is initiate-inhibit. You can… you can… you can initiate and carry forward something, or you can inhibit something in doingness. And just pure doingness wouldn't do either. If you really wanted to be very technical, it would neither initiate nor inhibit, but you can't have a theoretical uh… null in the middle of action. So right in the middle of action there's always an umpire. You can always have an umpire on a game, because that has to be one of the characteristics.

So, over here we have an object, or matter. And that's havingness, and that's stop, and that's destruction. And those are related things.

Now let's… let's… apply this practically in the business of running the game called „MEST universe.“ Let's not worry about processing for a moment, and let's take a look at these things and see if they're useful. We want to kill something. All you've got to do is stop it often enough and it'll die, just as simple as that. You don't have kill a puppy dog by shooting him in the head. Every time he runs in the room, stop him – stop him – stop him. He tries to bark – stop him. He tries to jump up in a chair – stop him. He wants to do this – stop him. He wants to do that – stop him. Don't let him do anything. Any time he starts to initiate any action or carry forward any action, you insist that his position on the cycle is stop – and he will die.

Now let's say you want to stop something. You want to stop something – give it things. Give it lots of matter – lots of matter. And the more matter you give it, the slower it will operate. And you want to stop it dead in its tracks, just empty the dump trucks on it. It'll stop. Just give it things. Give it things that it considers quite desirable – gold watches and… and Cadillacs and mink coats and… The more you give on this, why, the uh… more upsetting it is to this person. And they… they KNOW they want to have these things, they know that, because that's right, it says right there on Agreement One: „I want to have the MEST universe.“ And it… they say they want things – but the more they get of them, the unhappier they get.

And if you want to just get rid of somebody, just completely, start giving them a lot of presents. You'll just… you'll just – bye-bye. You have to exaggerate it quite a bit, but if you were handy at making things so that every… every 15 or 20 minutes, why, they could receive another present, they… they would either run away utterly or die in their tracks.

That's one of the biggest mistakes that… that women make – or men make – in interpersonal relationships. There's a good and adequate reason for that, by the way.

Now, let's take… if you want to stop something, the neatest way to do it is destroy it… really the neatest way is just destroy it, it'll stop.

And uh… if you want matter… if you want matter… keep stopping things, don't start starting things. If you want to accumulate matter, start stopping things. And if you stop enough things, you'll get lots of matter. It is an operating principle of such magnitude that it would shock you. You think the capitalista has to be very, very sharp, you think he has to be a real sharp boy and get around there, at the right place at the right time, and call up Bill… He's actually just cutting his throat. Every time he makes a motion, he's cutting his throat, if his goal is to be a great capitalista. He should never, under any circumstances, do that sort of thing. All he should do is keep on stopping things.

If' he finds out that there's going to be a bank loan which is going to be transferred to such a place, all he should do is make it his business to stop it from happening. If he finds out that they're going to build a certain item in a certain place, all he's got to do is stop that from being built.

If there's a new law going to be passed, he should stop it from being passed. It doesn't matter what it is – of course, they'll kill him, but then what the hell. I mean, he's just a capitalist. Uh… and, by the way, it works out the same way for the commissars. That's a big joke, you know. There's no… there is no mental difference and no ridge structure difference between a commissar and a capitalist, which I think is the most amusing thing of all. And, of course, this would have to be true or the two bums would never be clawing each other's throats out. They're both trying to have so madly that they have to stop each other.

You wonder what's going to happen to communism; well, it will stop capitalism. You want to know what's going to happen to stop capitalism; well, it'll be stopped by communism. It's very simple because they're both heading for the same goal. Now we get a nice interlinked relationship of stop going in both directions there.

Now the destruction should be… should be the main business of the capitalist – that's what he should specialize in. And sure enough, there's always a little suspicious thread of – you know that last little war we just got through fighting? You know, I could swear somebody promoted that for their own benefit. I could just swear that was the case. It just looks that way.

Now you take Pearl Harbor. Let's see: they ordered in all the ships into the harbor for a three-day's admiral inspection immediately before it was bombed. Yet, at the same time they had service from the Russian Intelligence Corps that said that Pearl Harbor was going to be bombed at eight o'clock on Sunday morning. Now they had other confirming lines, and 24 hours before Pearl Harbor was bombed a submarine had been sunk immediately outside the harbor at Pearl Harbor. Now it's a very funny thing that an admiral's inspection was what was ordered, because an admiral's inspection means that you take all your ammunition out of the ready boxes on deck and put it below in the magazines. That's very peculiar, and it's very funny that in the first lines of strategy and tactics – it says, in the US Naval Academy it says, „When two nations are engaging in diplomatic relations and adjustments" – or words to that effect, meaning when there's a little strain in the air – the position of the fleet should be at sea with whereabouts unknown." That's line one of elementary tactics, US Naval Academy.

And it's very strange thing that when you have a message that says, „Pearl Harbor is going to be bombed at eight o'clock in the morning," and you get this, somehow or another the admiral in charge of all this in Washington is at a party and somebody else is at another party and they finally get in touch with these fellows and they… find out, they get in touch with somebody over there – whoever was there at the time, I've forgotten. And uh… they… they uh… get these people, and then these people all say, all say, „Well now, the thing to do…" – see? There they sit. They've got batteries of telephones, secret circuits and everything else. „And th… th… the thing to do is to put that in top secret naval code. Well, that only takes about three hours to encode; they probably don't even have it in Pearl Harbor, but uh… we will send them word of warning in plenty of time, and we'll put this in top secret code, and it'll take three hours to put it in the code and about an hour to transmit it, and then when it gets there it'll take them four or five hours to break it down." And what do you know? That code was broken down and finally the message was read at ten o'clock Sunday morning, Pearl Harbor time – two hours after everything was in ruins.

Now I don't mean to infer by that that there was anything strange or peculiar about Pearl Harbor. I don't tell you the thing was sold out at all. The thing was not sold out, very, very definitely wasn't sold out. It was just „stupidity'd" out. And uh… there is fortunately no monopoly on stupidity, and stupidity is no test they use in politics or naval or military circles. They never test for stupidity. They say „intelligence tests", and so forth. They never have stupidity tests.

Yeah. When you get these three things working together, you really have a mess on your hands, because they don't work together, they work simultaneously: Havingness will stop, Stoppingness will destroy, Destroyingness, oddly enough, results in Havingness.

Now you want to know how that possibly short-circuits. Well, let's look at war; if you destroy the army you get the country. You get the idea? Havingness. If a fellow has to have something which somebody else has, it's a lead pipe cinch that he's going to have to destroy to get it. And what do you know? He'll destroy what he is getting, too. He'll lessen its workability. There's be an element of destruction entered into anything which is procured in that fashion. And this is a working, a little working rule in the MEST universe.

Somebody wants to go down here and take over… take over the combined Dupont factories. And they go into a… a destruction of a lot of reputations and a lot of fortunes and a lot of this'es and that'es, and finally they get the Dupont factories over. And the Dupont factories, at that time, would not produce what they had produced. You'd think they'd go right on producing, but they won't do it.

Let's take General Foods: General Foods accounts for one or two percent of all the food that's distributed in the United States. Well, it's just wonderful that at the time that General Foods was making a rush to get this terrific monopoly on food preparation and so on in the United States, they kept grabbing little companies, and they would go out and they'd grab products which were good products. And they would cut a few throats and lay them in the streets and run a few tanks over them and uh… wipe them out on the stock exchange, and uh… buy up their due bills and close down on them so they couldn't get machinery that they were using from the places they were. In other words, cut off, cut off, cut off – stop, stop,

stop, stop, stop. And all of a sudden the little company would say, „All right, I have no choice. We will sell out to you."

And, by the way, it never occurs to a person in that bracket to walk in the front door and say, „Here's three million dollars. Now how about your company? That's fine. Let's sign on the dotted line." He… he just can't… he just wouldn't know how to operate. That would be beyond him. He… he's got to do it the other way and invariably will. You just look at the… the trading that goes on in the back of the bank. It's fascinating.

All right, so we get… we get Postum – let's take Postum. Uh… General Foods uh… cut its throat and uh… threw it over the shoulder and… and… and packed it off into slavery, and the product called Postum went down in quality – zoooom! The type of can in which it was packed was markedly changed, and that went down in quality – zoooom! And the sales of Postum went down in quality – zoooom! And then General Foods sits back there and say, „You've got to have, you've got to have, you've got to have. Advertise, advertise, advertise, advertise. Postum, Postum, Postum – everybody drinks Postum, Postum, Postum – everybody, everybody, everybody… horrible stuff – drink it."

„All right, we surrender. We've got to have."

The degree to which a person has to have is the degree to which he will survive. If he's got to have everything all packaged up solid, he's stopped and he's dead, because although possession is an end goal, when attained, it ends the cycle of action.

There is never a great adventurer who did not end his career upon having discovered the sacred treasure of Peru. Bolitho, good old Bolitho, with his TWELVE AGAINST THE GODS – it's a wonderful thing to read – gorgeous! And the introduction of TWELVE AGAINST THE GODS is one of the best pieces of work I know of, even related to a lot of things, and particularly to this subject.

You know, we can add this little line to it: we… if a fellow,. if a fellow would act and act. and act and then finally with his terrific ambition attain the treasure of Peru, and then he would turn around and look at all the people who had impeded him in getting it and he would simply take the bars of gold and the gems and make those people have them, he's all set. And if he would walk away from his greatest triumph – and if a man ever could do this – walk away from his greatest triumph with his hands empty and his pocket empty and with maybe just the shirt on his back, he would live to triumph again and again and again and again. If he could do that.

You know, we live in the midst of a tremendous amount of propaganda – continuous MEST universe propaganda on which the vector is 180 degrees twisted, so that we are led to believe that so-and-so is the case. And then we take that on faith, and we don't go out and look. We don't see what is the end product, for instance, of finding the treasures of Peru.

Let's just take the sweepstake winners of a few years ago; let's look them over and find out what happened to them. I know a little girl in Hollywood who is a very famous star today. Very good friends, and she is a… well, they got lots of MEST… they've got lots of MEST today, she and her husband. And uh… gosh. The only thing she was interested in was her family. Her family in the East. And they all came out to Hollywood and she had this tre-

mendous income. And she could give them anything they wanted. She proceeded to do so. She has no more family – the one thing that she cared about, her sisters and so forth. And then the whole group has just gone to pieces completely. And yet what is she interested in? She's interested in her work. She isn't interested in what she has. She would buy a Cadillac and leave it on the driveway and never look at it again. She would be in a position where she could do that.

Do you know that this kid isn't happy? You see… you see this kid's name in lights all over the place. And you'd say, „Gee, this kid certainly must be happy." Oh, no! If this kid could just make up her mind that what she was trying to do was what she was trying to do – she was trying to act and she loved to act and she loved the atmosphere and the creation of acting. And if she would go into her dressing room in her gingham dress, or her 3.98 dress and put on the costume of the play and take it off again and put on that dress, and every time they gave her a pay envelope, take 50, 60 dollars, enough to eat out of the thing and pay her hotel rent and throw the rest of it in the nearest garbage can, she'd be a happy girl.

But nobody can expect her to do that, and the studio gives her all this money and they… they wonder why she isn't happier and why this old spark isn't always there and so on. They're killing her, little by little, inch by inch.

And that's completely contrary to the way the MEST universe is supposed to run. You're told very carefully, „Now look: if you're a success, you get an awful lot of stuff. And you can have all these things. And you can have these big beautiful homes and you can have all this way, and you can have all that way, and you can be very happy then." And actually you can persist in that… you can persist in that delusion, because it's a completely backwards modus operandi and it doesn't fit and it won't work out that way at all. You could persist in that to kid yourself in order to keep yourself in action. But the second you cease to know it's a pretense, you get caught in the trap of it.

You actually have to be in a position like this sometime to have a superfluity of MEST to find out what it does to you. It's just fabulous what a lot of MEST can do to you. It makes an awful „MEST" out of you.

Now, these things are then related. And where you see these things cropping up as manias, where you see havingness mounting up and the MEST stacking up all over the place and getting higher and higher and higher, and that is more or less your object and modus operandi, you're going to get a stop, and where you get stops, you're going to get destruction. And where you get destruction and stop and so forth, there's going to be more matter there.

Boy, there is nothing as full of matter as a battlefield after the battle has been quote „won". You've really got an awful lot of bodies there if your goal is bodies. They're in sort of a secondhand state, because they always are on such a thing. But that's the way it goes.

Well now, these are interrelated experience. If you want to know why this man's space is in bad shape, it's because he conceives his beingness to be in had shape. If his beingness is in bad shape, then it's the matter of ability to start is in bad shape. And if his ability to start is in bad shape, that simply has to do with what he can create. If he can create, his beingness will be in pretty good shape. If his… if his creation is in good shape, his space will be in pretty good shape. They just all go together.

Now if you want to knock out this – we have all these various lines here – uh… interrelation, if you want to correct any one of them, address the other three. Remember old ARC? Well, we've got it right here.

ARC, by the way, is – I'll comment on it much more broadly – just to put it in here and show you that we're not out of the frame of reference we've been studying for an awfully long time. There's an ARC here and an ARC here and an ARC here. There's a gradient scale of ARCs, only ARC is the plane but uh… it's a triangular plane, and it adjusts up and down, back and forth on this scale. And you can say ARC, ARC uh.

We have over here ARC, and so on.

Now let's… let's look at this and let's get into the most vital center of what we know to be the backbone of thinking ability. And that's Differentiation, Association and Identification. We're right back there. Differentiation, Association, Identification. Out of Association, you get logic, you get action thinking. You reach things, and so forth, with action thinking.

And out of Identification you get insanity. You go down to the spinbin and you'll find identification is identification. And so „he rowed a horse" R-O-W-E-D is the same as „he rode a horse" R-O-D-E. And there he sits with the oars on the back of a horse.

Identification, Time, everything else, ceases to be, it becomes a solid mass.

So let's just put this in here where it belongs: Differentiation, Association and identification. And there they are.

So we have related the gradient scale of insanity to the gradient scale of action… of the Cycle of Action and Space, Energy and Matter.

Let's take a break.

(TAPE ENDS)