

ABOUT THE "PRESS" TONE LEVEL: PSYCHOMETRY

A lecture given on
18 December 1952

December the 18th, 1952, first afternoon lecture.

And this afternoon, I want to take up some of these processes and demonstrate them quite directly. I noticed that uh.. your professional practice has been.. or your application of this material has been materially assisted by TIME magazine. Uh.. TIME magazine is run by a Catholic, I think he is, or something, and I think it's on the.. on the uh.. the magazine is published, and.. by license of a papal bull. And uh.. a fellow by the name of Luce runs this magazine; and I merely want this to be on a tape for the record for posterity. If this fellow ever turns up for processing he's to be thrown in the clam. And put there very heavily and very strongly and left to go about his way.

The last person that was thrown violently into the clam lost all of his wisdom and molars. That's right, that's what happened.

Uh.. the general state of affairs in the world and Scientology are much better than' you would ordinarily suppose, because there's only one thing that this world.. one thing that this world uh.. is proof against, and that is complete silence. And this world is not good at picking up anything - on the ether waves, or by rumor, and so when they start to yap-yap, do you know that a vicious and scurrilous attack is made upon any subject practically under the sun that you get the other 50% vector immediately at work? So where we have yap-yap of this character, no matter how cheap the publication, no matter how little read or respected, such as TIME magazine uh.. even that, if you can get any magazine that is in disrepute to put you on the pan uh.. you can of course uh.. expect a great deal more interest growing out. And one of the things with which I'd been concerned.. after a while I realized that I'd over-reached the news story level. I never released a news story on any of this - never. Now it has become what? Front page news. Why? Because it makes lame kids walk again, because it makes people who have been in continuous pain well again? No, no. Oh, no, no. No, this is Earth, 1952 AD. After the Death. It's now on nineteen hundred and fifty-two years of negative time track. It says right there on its dates. That'd be wonderful, somebody blowing in here from someplace and examining some of these customs. No, you wouldn't find it in there because it'd make somebody well or pick some girl with a postpartum psychosis up, or something like that. No, no, you wouldn't find that.

But, if we can just beat up a few more Marshall's - and uh.. if I can just scrape acquaintances with alleged millionaire oil promoters uh.. who throw everything in bankruptcy left and right and so forth, well, we'll get there, we'll get there.

And uh.. I want to call your attention to this.. this datum - Book One, SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL, it's human evaluation. It actually still stands as a unit and is the one text I'd done that covers human evaluation. Therefore, when you look across there, it tells you the kind of information something will pass on. And as we look across there we find out if they pass on this kind of information or that kind of information, these other manifestations straight on across the column will pursue. And if you have ever had any experience with this - as many of you have, I know - you have then seen it as.. as a constant. That's very very quiet.

Now, all you need to do, if you ever turn up any place, in order to know the tone or know how to hit a society, if you want to hit a society hard, is just know what is being published in its public prints. It is NOT different - never kid yourself from this - it is NOT different from the tone level of the society. It IS the tone level of the society, because that's very closely monitored. It is monitored by such things as advertisers, and such things as sales of copies, and if there was no pecuniary thought in it, if it were a government paper.. a government should always put out several papers if a government goes into publication in any way, and

they should be at various tone levels. And you'll notice this is the case when your government takes over the newspapers of a country - they'll put out the cheap one and the.. the sensational one and they'll put out the conservative one and so on; they'll do all these things in contra position to one another. You want to know the tone level, you pick up its papers. Because at the fine, far distance on this, it'll all boil down, a newspaper has to have readers. Whether it's paid for by advertisers or by a government, or by pennies or nickels or quarters or dollars across a newsstand, it survives only so long as it is read. Doesn't matter whether it's bought or not. And it is read as well as it matches the tone scale of a society. And you do not need to conduct any vast door-to-door survey here, there and everywhere on this subject - what is the tone level of the society to which I'm appealing -- you don't need to. Look at the newspaper. Look at the.. what releases the daily bulletins.

You go to Russia, you say, "Well, the Russian paper doesn't represent the Russian people; it is not representative of what the Russian people are thinking." Oh, no. It is. It is. They haven't even conducted a survey. They're putting out four-five papers, and uh.. one paper has to run to a thousand editions to get it all over Russia. Oh, no. The other papers only run to one edition, and uh.. another one doesn't even sell out half an edition I mean it's almost this extreme. Now their readers keep pounding them around and the editor is as successful as he is read. And as a result, even in a police state...

You.. never get fooled on this. I mean, the United States Government has been blind on this subject. When I was in Intelligence, we.. it was making a continual uh.. mistake in trying to evaluate the Russian or German people, particularly the German people, by telling everyone they didn't believe in their government, that they did not believe what was in those papers, and you'll go there and there'll be people in countries of that character who will tell you, "No we don't believe these papers," and uh.. they're just trying to be polite. That's all. A newspaper is as well read as it matches the tone scale of the society. Therefore you have someone in any kind of a culture of any character - that's of ANY character, ANY culture - you have a method of finding out what their tone scale is in general, and by finding that out, what you can expect from that culture. It follows right through - SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL tone scale chart.

The only error you can make is stepping above or below or saying, "It must be something else." You see? I didn't believe that chart myself when I first made it up. It was made up by, you might say, logic and uh.. inductive reasoning. And uh.. made it up on.. on the pure theory of theta, MEST and ARC, that was all, and said, "It probably falls this way," and it added up very nicely and very smoothly - do a better job of it now with the other material which has accumulated, but uh.. I don't think any part of it would change. I've looked it over very recently and I was surprised. And I didn't.. didn't do anything with this chart. It wasn't out in print, wasn't anything happening with this chart at all. It was just sitting there in my dining room, pegged down on a side table. And what do you know, one day I went over the chart and suddenly picked up a datum off this chart and applied it to the real universe.

And this datum was this: It said that a person would not communicate with me; under the most ordinary circumstances this person would not communicate with me. In the course of conversation, in the course of correspondence, in the course of this sort of thing I was running into a continuous communication block. It said right straight on across that chart, as you looked it up, a lot of other characteristics which weren't nice. They were BAD characteristics. And I said, "Well, you know, this chart must be off then uh.. must be off. Look.. look at.. over here. That person's incapable of that." Do you know that within the next thirty days, that person was suddenly exposed into the light and my God! Every one of those additional items were true with magnitude. Hrhrhr! I hadn't believed my chart and it caused considerable trouble - because I hadn't believed that chart.

Another one showed up and another one showed up and another one showed up, and each time I pulled this foolish, foolish thing. I would go ahead on what I amusingly called instinct or something of the sort and I'd say, "Well, that doesn't apply on the chart, or this doesn't apply on it or something!" And I'd read across the line, it says, "Brutal treatment of children. Sex as punishment," uh.. and so on, or anything across the chart level.

“Oh,” I’d say, “that couldn’t be.” One character particularly couldn’t be, and this fellow had been very good in Dianetics, been very good. He did have uh.. three or four of those manifestations across there that indicated that if in the remaining columns, if he pursued those things out he would practically be an outright murderer as far as associating with him was concerned. And what do you know -- he almost made the grade. Without being prompted even vaguely. It just worked out that way. He just put the right pieces in the right spot at the right instant to come very close to causing a sudden demise. You.. it was so bare- uh.. boned that it was.. must have been on a conscious level. Fascinating!

So, we’ve got psychometry available for any society. Therefore it gives you psychometry for a city in which you would dwell, or the people. Gives you a good psychometry for them and uh.. it’s.. they listen to what they hear at their own band of the chart, Homo Sapiens does, and very seldom listens to any other band of the chart. He’ll listen to a slightly lower band and so forth.

Hut uh.. you.. you will find.. you will find that your preclears will respond to the type of mock-up which you find in the daily newspapers. As the chronic level of mock-up. Fascinating. Now you want to know, you want to know what kind of a mock-up to use: look at that old SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL chart and look at your preclear and so on. You’ll find out that this is the mock-up he is dramatizing most, so it must be just above and below this band that you must hit in order to change his location on the chart. And it becomes an exceedingly uh.. interesting little operation.

Here’s somebody.. here’s somebody who has a BAD reputation. And uh.. he’s got a very bad reputation one way or the other, and you say, “Oh, no. He’s a good boy at heart,” or.. or something of this sort. You just look around, and you spot him on your.. your chart there. And uh.. don’t continually dream optimistically about a preclear and.. and.. and so on.

It says on SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL, for instance, “Sex as punishment” was a level of the chart. And that is a certain point of the chart. And that causes a lot of howling. Yeah. And the way you’d.. the way you’d go on and correct this situation is a very simple thing. You would just uh.. take your SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL chart, peg your preclear on it, and then go right straight across the chart, and hit above and below on each one of these subjects with mock-ups on various dynamics. It’s quite a therapy.

You could put somebody on the E-meter and you would find this very smooth. And by doing this, you won’t fall into the rut of simply putting yourself on the chart all the time and giving the preclear mock-ups which would benefit you or that you like. Because as you come up tone scale, you will find yourself going higher and higher up the level and your interest more and more something else. And one day you will be dishing out - to be very technical - mock-ups which uh.. won’t fit the case - won’t fit the case at all.

And uh.. you’ll, for instance, go along airily and then all of a sudden the preclear’s bogged down sort of and you don’t know quite why this is, and you’d say, “Oh, well, it’s probably something that we didn’t hit in the course.” No, that’s not the case. It’s just the case that you have gone up tone scale to a point where you aren’t thinking obsessively about sex all the time, or you’re not thinking about various other types of sensation.

Here’s your preclear down there in the tar pit, practically fossilized, and uh.. his state of case demands mock-ups above and below his level of the chart and at that level, predominantly, you see, at the level, but immediately above and immediately below. You don’t have one of these charts, do you, around, do you, John? Anybody got one of these charts right here? Well, here we go, here we are.

Now let me.. let me show you something about this thing. Handling of truth. Let us take somebody 1.5. This chart is uh.. sometimes uh.. has little misspellings on it, I see it once in a while. I seldom.. I never see this material before it goes into print. Uh.. it says 1.5, “Blatant and destructive lying,” under handling of truth. Courage level says, “Unreasonable bravery

usually damaging to self.” That’s what it says! “Assumes responsibility in order to destroy.” Well, actually your 1.5 is a pull-in.

I’m going to give you another column for this is why I’m talking about it. I started out talking about TIME magazine, got back into my subject. TIME magazine will be a forgotten thing possibly.. possibly someday.. someday its total claim to fame. Amusing. If one lets himself think in those terms then it becomes very amusing. By the way, you can’t let yourself think in those terms though. Go very long, you just completely separate from reality. And reality’s hard enough to keep in contact with.

I’m every once in a while fishing around with my big toe to discover a point in this universe. And I look around and look around and then I’ll sit down -- I have done this -- and I’ll sit down and think, “Now let me see, oh, wait a minute now, aaaaah yes. Ah, come on, you know of something interesting someplace. And there.. there.. it.. it’s true, uh.. there is.. there are several interesting things in this universe. You hit this universe any place you see and you can come on in the rest of the way.”

And there’s a statue - a white, white marble statue - in a fountain which doesn’t run; it’s the statue just sitting there in front of uh.. the Naval Park. Uh.. right down on the waterfront at Havana. You know that statue? Sits there. It’s beautiful, it’s just beautiful. It’s.. it’s...shape.. is just.. just a flow of grace. How anybody can make that out of marble, I don’t know. Maybe it isn’t out of marble; it looks more like alabaster. And that is a wonderful touch point. And uh.. you get to thinking of something like that, not the Taj Mahal particularly, uh.. you get to ‘thinking of anything like that, and you can make your contact back. Why? Because interest follows through with effort. Interest goes into effort.

Now we remember that as you saw your charts drawn, here you with - 40.0 to 0.0 as a line lying on its side - we had a stand up of wave lengths that demonstrated that the theta band, the perception band, that is, is way up. That’s the aesthetic band, not the theta band - there is no theta band. Adjacent to theta, aesthetic. On down through the various perception bands - wave lengths, you know? Any one of those wave lengths was present. In other words the 1.5 is capable of an aesthetic of sorts. He can actually contact a wave length, or not contact it. Of course he doesn’t contact it anywhere near as much as somebody higher on the chart does. But he is capable of a wave contact on aesthetics. You get.. you get the.. for instance, the uh.. the aesthetic of the Nazi’s Storm Troopers. They had an aesthetic. A very interesting aesthetic. Uh.. they uh.. were in a.. various categories of uh.. uniform, their uniformity, uh.. the very extravagant ritual which they established, all of which was below and behind the scene. They were all out on the subject, in other words they were big volume 1.5, and that bigness of volume managed to embrace the aesthetic band for them.

You.. you’d make a mistake if you said somebody was short on aesthetics because he was at some position on the tone scale. Every position on the tone scale contacts that wave length one way or the other. And yet these fellows, these fellows had a.. a fabulously horrible function and uh.. so on. You wouldn’t think for a moment that such people would have such a thing. I’ve just chosen them as the horrible example. Even they.

Now uh.. you’ll say a 1.1, uh.. this girl.. this girl couldn’t possibly be destructive in any way to anybody because, the truth be told, she loved him because he was an artist. Oh, that’s true. And she was 1.1 and she just loved him to his death. And if he was there very long, why, hmm - he wasn’t an artist anymore. You can just bet your bottom dollar. That’s your 1.1. That - and yet.. yet you hear this person chatter. Now have you ever seen somebody chattering about the arts that just sort of made them obscene? You just look at this person’s, quote, ‘appreciation of music’, and you just say, “Brrrrr!” Uh.. they seemed - anything they touch in the line of the arts. And yet they seem to be quite appreciative of it. Well, that’s that fact, that at any band on this chart, you get any wave length. Well, a wave length is a perception. A perception of one kind or another, a characteristic perception. Eyes for instance will gravitate to a certain perception. And what we’re getting here is the various harmonics of affinity that we’re looking at and we can get each one modifying the wave length of the aesthetic band. And as a

net result you will find an aesthetic, you will find an effort and you will find a regard for anything else, for perception or anything else - any one of these perceptions, you might say -- at EACH one of these levels on the tone scale. And that means that telepathy can exist at any level of the tone scale.

It is a tune-in, rather than going up scale or down scale to. I want to make that quite clear to you. Don't evaluate on the quality. Just realize that we have these things there, that's all. And the there-ness of these items and articles is uh.. all you're interested in.

So, we're running mock-ups. I could have called this talk "How to run mock-ups according to charts, attitudes."

We have then, 'complete cowardice' here it says at 0.5, 'complete cowardice' is his courage level. All right, let's just look at this, let's run it by the chart so we don't get too far off the groove, want to give him mock-ups around on this and that.

And we've got a person in grief. I know many people in grief, by the way, who.. who think they are probably 1.5's. They're not. Because they're holding on so hard; they've collected so much. And there are people actually in apathy who are still holding on to all kinds of MEST - ruining it. Just wrecking it completely but holding on to it. And at grief.. you would be surprised what a person will hold on to in grief. And they hold on again at 1.5, and they hold on again at 3.0. Now grief by the way is.. is .75, not .5. There's been a correction on this chart. It's a harmonic you see, of 1.5. And apathy is .375 - relatively unimportant except just to understand that.

Now, we're running mock-ups. We run up mock-ups that demonstrate being aesthetically cowardly. How would you.. how would you run a mock-up on somebody who's being aesthetically cowardly? Utter cowardice, very aesthetic. Voice: A beautiful thing to run away from.

LRH: Mm-hmm - sure - or put them in a church. Beautiful church, with haloed windows, and get them praying devoutly. You know that that really.. it comes under the.. has an emotion that goes with it. It's beautiful sadness. And that's right. You'd mock up all these various things - anything - things happening to beautiful things, afraid things would happen to beautiful things, and so on. How do.. how do you fit an emotion into these things?

Well, there's two ways: One, you simply put the emotion into it and feel it back, that's one method. That's.. that's one way you go about it. Another one, you put the mock-up text one way or the other. You just ask somebody to mock up a figure and then you can put various emotions in the figure and move the figure around with various emotions on it, till he gets these emotions clearly.

Had somebody last night who had a.. a terrible dwarf that had no neck. He kept mocking this thing up. And I was making him get the dwarf feeling.. feeling the beauty of life, and so on. At first he said, "NO! You couldn't possibly do that with this dwarf. It's a strange kind of thing," and.. and so forth, and I couldn't persuade him to change his mock-up. He was stuck with it.. it was his mock-up.

Well, he had to do something with his mock-up, so uh.. the next thing you know, why, we had.. we had this dwarf in a state of uh.. enthusiasm. And uh.. we had this dwarf in a state of all sorts of things. And finally we got it loosened up and running around and he could change the mock-up easily. It should interest you that the mock-up was persistent because he couldn't alter its motion.

So how many kinds of mock-ups are there? That you could run on Homo Sapiens? Well, a long time ago I did a map. It's a good one.. serve you very, very well. You think there's a lot of mock-ups on this map? Look at it. Yards! So we go back into it again, and I would recommend to you - uh.. we're trying to publish uh.. again Book One of SCIENCE OF

SURVIVAL under a title called 'Human Evaluation'. Derek Ridgeway of London is trying to get this out. It takes them a long time, but they eventually get there. And it becomes a pretty good little handbook for mock-ups.

You can go through this thing, and you can look these things over and it says, "He'll do WHAT?" And "He'll do so-and-so," and so on. Well, that means such-and-so will be done to him, because he invites those things being done to him, and so on.

Well, if you just keep tearing up and down this chart here, it'll suggest an awful lot of mock-ups to you. Oh, a terrific number. Just loosen him up, practice, and so on, and breaking him out of the rut he's in. That's your main difficulty.

This man has a chronic position on the chart. Well, locate it. Maybe this chronic position on the chart uh.. is somewhere here in the vicinity of.. of 2.0. This guy is obviously in.. in antagonism. There's an aesthetic for antagonism. There's sight for antagonism. There is uh.. sound for antagonism. He will do certain things with all of these things, but we're not worried about what necessarily he'll do with them; we'll just look across this chart here and we see, "capable of destructive and minor constructive action."

All right. Now let's mock up a big car. Now let's take a sledgehammer and now let's smash it. Now let's fix its rear light. Do that a few times, a fellow'll say, "You know, that's kind of like me." He'll look puzzled. Why.. why, this would come close to home.

We.. we're taking that in the most literal possible sense: it's destructive, but capable of some minor constructive action, see? And there we go into this, we have.. you say, "All right. Now let's repair a light switch. Now let's mock up a light switch so that you can repair it. And now let's just tear the room to pieces around it, and let's tear the roof off, and let's tear the basement out from underneath the house. And let's throw all these things out in the street. Now put all that debris behind you. Now let's take a screwdriver and take one screw out of the light switch and let's finally get the light switch repaired," and we can make sure that that's just.. just the light switch sitting there repaired.

You'd be surprised at what happens when you start hitting the guy in his own tone level. It becomes fascinating to him, and he'll break out of the rut. Because what you're dealing with actually is not a mechanical flowing gimmygahoojit called an electronic computer. GE's got one; I've been interested in examining it lately. Fascinating gimmick. I never had.. never had done any what the GE would call 'thinking', and uh.. by throwing in some attention units into the area, we.. I started some thinking processes going on. Oh, no! "Now I will think!" So away he runs - fabulous. "Now I will think." Nothing happens of course!

And by the way, pertinent to that, just give you a little note here on that. Uh.. the future is a 'will have'. What is called future, by which you would mean future time, also could be called 'will have'. It's a 'will have'. Now, when you get all people in agreement, and tick-ticking off, everybody in agreement with everybody else, the 'will have' component alters, and becomes uh.. very standardized, so that a person can't very well control his 'will have's'. So he has to think about having all the time. He thinks about having in the future and his thought is mainly concerned with thinking about having in the future.

Of course, he.. he will think when he gets very sad and upset and quite neurotic about.. think about what he has had in the past. Some people will just stick on the track, you see. And do you know why they do that? Because they can't think a 'will have' on the future. And that's why a psychotic evidently goes back down track. And a very important datum! Why does a psychotic go back in time? Well, he has to go back to a 'had' because there is no 'will have'.

And a person's activity on the tone scale - this very tone scale here - could be said to be: "How much 'will have' is he capable of imagining?" That's all, and as less and less 'will have' is capable.. is there, less and less 'will have', he gets more and more reassurance for himself or 'I have'. There's where you get ownership very heavily, you see. He's come down to a level of

ownership. And then he says, "Well, I don't have now, or if I do have now I couldn't possibly have done it, so the past is the only place I knew I had." And in trying to contact something in the past that is good, he contacts something that is very, very bad. And if he's in terrible condition about all this, it takes these other conditions before he really starts getting ridges caving in on him. Of course, what he had, his ' ' in the past, cave in on him with a crush. and that cave-in follows through - dramatizing, computing psychotic - his 'will have's'.

Now you just get a preclear to examine his 'will have', and I'll be a son-of-a-gun if you won't find it to be a deposit of energy! Why? Because so much thought has been devoted to it, and there's this little law connected with all this, very good little law: What one devotes energy to, he will have. That to which one devotes energy, he will have. And then because it's a dichotomy, that to which one devotes energy, he won't have! Particularly if he agrees with what he finally obtains. Then of course he won't have it, so that's a secondary consideration that sets in.

That to which one devotes energy he will have. Why? Well, let's look at this in its most mechanical form. Energy packed into space becomes an object. And so energy packed into a space becomes an object; factually, that is the way you make an object.

So when you think in just terms of "will have, will have, will have, will have," one is devoting time to 'will have's' - devoting time to future. We find out that the saner the person is, the more capable he is of sighting forward into the future. And actually a very sane person is living waaaaaay up in the future. He's very happy about the whole thing, quite excited, enthused and so on. Way up. And as the world caves in on him and takes away more and more and more, he starts thinking more and more and more into the present, and finally he's thinking for the present. And he.. you can't think for the present by the way, you have to think for just a split se.. second ahead because of the activity of the mind. You.. you got to think of the next minute at least, in order to be there. But the second you slide away from thinking about the present, you think about the past, and when you start thinking about the past, God help us all.

Because when you think.. can only think about 'hads', what have you done? Let me draw you a picture of that. Here's uh.. the past, and here's the present, and here is the future. This is the Chart of Have. Chart of Havingness. We'll dignify it with a title, even though there isn't very much here. And here we have, coming across here, a time track. The preclear can be located at any moment here, at position PT. And position PT is regulated by an agreement of co-havingness. He got it by something else, got it by the other person - everything is sound, he has the sound -- co-havingness goes on all the time in behavior.

Then there's another spook thing. You know I told you that every.. every once in a while in these lectures, in going so fast, I.. I sort of work like putting it all on a tape recorder and then reeling it off. Not that tape recorder. And once in a while I get enthusiastic about something or something and the thing will skip a couple of turns on the reel. That actually is what happens. Uh.. just too much data and one becomes quite impatient about jamming that much data into MEST time and it just gets.. so we get slices and so on, and once in a while you... you just miss it completely.

I told you once in these lectures that there was a cute theory, oh, awfully cute theory that somebody was going to think up - ooh, sweet, very sweet theory. And it's going to have to do with the fact that - well uh.. let's see, "Those people back in 1952 were wrong." Uh.. they all start out this way, particularly anyone to whom they owe their all. Anything they know they always have to qualify the statement. Do you want to know what a man's source is, or what a man's fair opponent is or who is holding down his MEST that he ought to have, why he's qualifying statements and tearing them to pieces with these people's names.

All right. When we have this condition... Let's.. let's.. let's look at another condition. We got a whole big universe here. And somebody's gonna say, "Now look, these thetans..." They.. they could start a cult on this, so I'm gonna spike this cult right now. If you guys remember it, it's spiked. But uh.. they say they have these thetans and they wandered into this universe and

so on and that was the theory there used to be. Actually.. actually what it was is: "You were once an atom and you're graduating up the tone scale. You are graduating up scale and uh.. you are actually developing and you're getting bigger and bigger and the fact that the presence of the ridges demonstrate adequately that uh.. uh.. one is really just a large atom with electronic rings. This.. this is backed up by Lucretius, and also uh.. Pope Pius or somebody, and with a papal bull, which of course is different than philosophy because a papal bull's true." Uh.. the uh.. MEST universe definition of truth. It's true.

So we have to go back here and look over the track in the past and trace forward how Man is getting "bigger and bigger and more and more developed, and you are developing up toward galaxy size. But at the moment that is a natural thing, that's what you'll eventually do, come up toward the size of a galaxy and the thing for you to do - and they were very wrong back there in 1952 - is to collect a lot of MEST and a lot of ridges because that's what moves you up in size and at length gives you greatness.

And it happens that the galaxy is a sort of a parent, and a galaxy is a parent, and out of this galaxy is born small galaxies. And these little galaxies are born with more or less the same sentience that they get from the larger galaxy. And then the small galaxy develop, and of course the smallest' of galaxies is an atom. And some of the atoms succeed, and they develop.. and they develop on and at length become animals. And then the animals at length become thetans powerful enough to be men. And then these develop further and then there are thetans that are sort of solar systems. They get that big, you see. And then there are thetans which are as big as an entire galaxy and that can have little galaxies and we can start the cycle over again and that's really the way it was. And that's how they're wrong back there in 1952 and that's why you should collect a lot of MEST and be shot with electronics and a lot of other things, you see."

You know that somebody could sell that?! Tremendously salable commodity. Mmmm! Why, it matches up with a 180 degree vector of this universe. Obviously he can't have all this stuff so that's the best reason he must have it. Uh.. he's got all this demonstration of havingness - it's time. So there you go. Somebody else'll come along and try to explain that the reason our time runs concurrently is our havingness of electrons, which themselves are all -- monitored by the larger body or the larger beingness or brain of the galaxy.

In short, brethren and sistern, we're going to run into a lot of squirrels before we're through.

Now that.. that's.. that's theory. Uh.. you.. you'll find somebody buying that little galaxy theory one of these days. They'll probably go down to Fairhope or Wichita or someplace and.. I betcha what (bet you what)! I betcha they get a five-page write-up in TIME magazine!

Okay. We got a present time here, and present time is established by co-havingness - not by cohabitation, as the Freudians believe. And this co-havingness here is just an agreement that at this time, at this instant, this much IS! That's.. that.. that's what you're agreeing to. You say, "Now look, right now that's in that state of repair, and that's in that s.. position and state of repair," and so forth. No, not present time then, because present time - oh hey, this whole thing goes out of gear, doesn't it? Isn't that terrible. Let's see what else is changing. Oh, thank God. We have.. we have a change going on over here on the tape recorders. There's less tape on one and on the other and what do you know, we use that in this room to tell how long the lecture is.

Of all the havingnesses in, this room which are used for time, none of them is reliable except that tape, because it spins and gets less and less on one reel and more and more on the other reel. See?

That's uh.. fascinating. All right. There's present time. If I want to know what present time, is, I have to look over at the tape recorder. Usually I turn on my own time mechanism. My own time mechanism doesn't work too well.

Hey, you know, here's a wonderful gimmick! Do you know that you could probably convince everybody that 24 hours had gone by and they didn't know it? You know, there.. there's a wonderful way of doing this. Everybody thinks that, well, they would wake up with another date, but date's got nothing do with it.

You just say, "Do you realize.. did you have a moment yesterday, an instant yesterday when you felt sort of suspended or felt an instant when something went like that? Did you feel that? Ohhh, you did. Just for a moment there - if you think it over you can probably pick up such a moment... Well, you know, what happened was.. is this entire solar system stood still for that length of time, and of course standing still without any change of position there was no motion, and people who had one foot raised, naturally couldn't fall down because there was no gravity during that period, because there was no motion.

So there couldn't be any energy flows or interchanges or magnetic waves or anything else to influence them, and the fact of the matter was that this is demonstrably true because nobody noticed it! And it would take every single being we.. we have present, would have had to have experienced it to put it in a situation where nobody noticed it. And so therefore it obviously happened! Why did it happen? Because it happened to everybody. And how could we prove this, because there isn't ANYBODY who saw it happen!"

And the way we do this.. this is for.. this comes, by the way, from associating with this GE thinking computer, wonderful gimmick.

And so you see, what happened was that there had to be certain major changes made in the orbital action of the roody rods in this universe. And the thetan who is the monitoring agency of this universe of course has to suspend action to that length and he just zeroed time here for an instant. Then of course everything stopped - nothing could possibly have deteriorated because nothing went on. And this co-havingness was.. of course, wouldn't be thrown out of balance, it couldn't be, because the thetan - he had 24 hours' worth of work to do, and he did it, and finished it off and then everything went on. But of course as far as they were concerned they were just in continuous motion all the way along the line anyhow- as far as they were concerned. And as I say we have the adequate proof of this because nobody noticed it!"

The scholastic used to prove things that way. The Germans.. you'll find in old German philosophic texts the most dissertating dissertations that prove themselves along that line. I'm.. I'm sure TIME magazine would approve of that theory. Do you suppose they'd put that on page one! Let's elect somebody to be the greatest scientist of all time. And let's have him advance a theory.. let's think of a good theory. Oh, yes, it has to be that he found another science wrong, so that would be Planck. He finds Planck wrong and he finds out that the quantum.. the quantum theory of nuclear physics is wrong. Now.. now.. that's.. that's the way you start it in this society. "The quantum theory is wrong." All right. "Now he found the quantum theory wrong, for the good reason that..." - let's see, let's find a good reason that would fit in about the same tone scale.

Oh, "Atomic bombs have to be manufactured, they're not instantaneous." Do you follow that? Well, I don't. But uh.. that's a good theory. Now we can start in from there and then demonstrate conclusively that the quantum theory is wrong because of the complete non-existence of atom bombs, and therefore, the quantum theory is wrong. Now we can further prove that gravity really doesn't exist and prove all these other things don't exist, and in view of the fact that we can prove all this, that's apathy, because nobody wants anything to exist in apathy.

There you are. That's the whole thing. So don't make this kind of a mistake on havingness. Don't make this kind of a mistake on havingness that you.. you just see it as havingness that then therefore wipes everything out because believe me your desire to have and your desire not to have aren't foisted off on you. You.. you have those, and they're not illusory. When some people want or don't want, they want or don't want with exclamation points on some things! If

you don't believe this, back a U.S Marshall up against the wall and put a gun in his stomach. He'll beg.

Now, present time then, is just this existence and.. of havingness and your agreement on it. And your future? All is present time on the idea that we must have a rate of change. Rate of change is as mathematics, known as calculus. Calculus is a very interesting thing, it's divided into two classes. There's differential calculus and integral calculus. The.. differential calculus is in the first part of the textbook on calculus and integral calculus is on the second part of the textbook on calculus.

Uh.. as you look through the book, you'll find in the early part of the book on calculus, 'dx' over 'dy'. A little 'dx' and a little 'dy' and they're over.. one above the other on a line, predominates in the front part of the book, but as you get to the end of the book you'll find these 'dx' and 'dy's' have been preceded by a summation sign, or are equating to a summation sign, and the presence of this shows that we are in the field of integral calculus.

Now I hope you understand this because I've never been able to make head nor tail out of it! It must be some sort of a black magic operation started out by the Luce cult. Uh.. some immoral people who are operating in.. up in New York city at the Rockefeller Plaza. Con.. thoroughly condemned by the whole society.

Anyway, their rate of change theory - I.. I've never seen any use for that mathematics by the way. I love that mathematic because it - I.. I asked an engineer one time, who was in his sixth year of engineering, if he'd ever used calculus. And he told me, "Yeah, once. Once I did," he said.

"Uh.. uh.. when did you use it?"

"Well, I used it uh.. once uh.. lemme see, what did I use it on? Oh, yeah, yes, something on the rate of change of steam particles in boilers. And then we went out and tested it and found the answer was wrong."

Calculus.. if you want to know, there is room there for a mathematics which is a good mathematics, and it would be the rate of co-change, or the rate of change when something else was changing, so that you could establish existing rates of change in relationship to each other. And for lack of that mathematics, nobody has been able to understand present time! You just can't sum it up easily. Or, let us say, for lack of an understanding of what present time was, nobody could formulate that mathematics.

So actually there's a big hole there that could be filled and it's trying - ca.. the thing called calculus is trying to fill that hole right now and it can't. But the rates of change - it comes closest to it. I think it was one of Newton's practical jokes.

Uh.. here we have.. here we have calculus as trying to measure a rate of change. Well, if we had something that was really workable and simple, it would be formed on this basis: The present time and gradients of time were gradients of havingness, and as one havingness changed, you could establish a constancy of change for other related havingnesses. But because the basic unit of the universe is two, you would have to have a rate of change known and measured for every rate of change then estimated. The mathematics won't.. I mean a mathematics won't operate in this universe unless it has simultaneous equations. If you have two variables, you must have two equations with which to solve those two variables. In other words you have to compare one to the other simultaneously. Otherwise you just get another variable.

Of course people laughingly do this; they.. they take an equation with two variables and then they solve it. And then they.. you say, "What you got?" And the fellow says, "K." You say "Now just a minute. You got K, huh? Well, what is K?" "Well, K we have established arbitrarily as being..."

You say, "Why did you work the equation out in the first place? You had a K, didn't you?"

So present time's advance into the future -- rate of change. Present time's advance over here to the right is indicated by the arrow, is sort of apparent to people, but they're in it all the time so they have a feeling of travel. And let's take this time track now and see what does happen. We'll draw this time track 2 here, and below it we find another arrow, but it's track. And what's changing here? What's changing is the rate of havingness. And we get this track coming back here to PT, and the track is proceeding out that-a-way. Now, what is the track? The track is the rate of change of havingness. And what is the rate of change? The rate of change of havingness is what we agree to be a rate of change of havingness.

People's intolerance for speed and people's intolerance for slowness are themselves an effort to maintain a constant rate of change. And in view of the fact that these people -- as I just commented some facetiously, your desire to have and your desire not to have are real and they are actual - both - and give the universe the backbone of reality and actualities which universes have. You want them there, for lack of something better to have there.

That's earlier talk; unless you gave the preclear a good reason to have something else he would continue to have exactly what he has. You give him interest enough, however, and he'll want something else, see how that is? But he's got the MEST universe. That doesn't mean he's satisfied, that means he doesn't have anything else to want. If he doesn't have anything else to want, he won't have anything else.

So if he just uh.. has this and it's a certainty and not enough imagination or thought to produce anything else except immediately what he's got, you're not going to get a shift. Not even a vague shift, time.

So we have over here on track 2 what is happening here. And this is why they keep showing time in vectors, is this rate of change. And of course we see that its rate...

Now, the dynamics, the eight dynamics demonstrate amongst themselves an interdependency which is covered in writing best in -- of the works that I've done on this - in Book One. It's just the viewpoint of what's good. Viewpoint establishes what's good. Viewpoint establishes what's bad and we get these interrelated viewpoints and we get from these then an interdependency. Not one of these dynamics can exist without the other dynamics existing. And so you see that?

You're looking right at the heart of the problem called 'time'. Unless these stay in agreement one with another, they can't co-exist, and if one of them steps out without an able support from all the rest, and steps out of line, you're liable to get a collapse of all those dynamics.

We find that the thetan in a good state is actually all dynamics. Therefore he can be a universe, and that he turns up missing in this one due to the complete uh.. plethora of thetans around, it doesn't seriously damage this one, because he is not removing from it an integral portion of its energy. He's removing something else that has nothing in mass, and that's an idea.

He is a capability and a zero of mass, and his havingness is a time monitor. That is to say, he has or doesn't want. And you could keep taking thetans out of this universe and nothing would happen much to the universe because you really aren't upsetting these because you're subtracting what? You're subtracting 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8! It's the only way you can get out, it's the only way you could add anything to his universe is by adding 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8 to it.

In view of the fact that your thetan is a balanced eight dynamics, when he is subtracted, he subtracts almost exactly equal - don't.. you don't have to ever worry about this, I mean this just happens to work out -- he subtracts almost exactly equal quantities on all eight dynamics. That's why he has to be well up tone scale to get out. Now what do you know! He has to be balanced on these dynamics, otherwise the imbalance freezes him in. Think of that for a moment. So he's got to be up into a level of practically pure thought. And the reason he can be

up into pure thought is he's not going to take any MEST with him, believe me, and he's not going to withdraw on that.

Let's take a look at - what's a balanced equation, then, for this universe? Any stability in this universe contains as Its balances the rate of change of the eight dynamics' interdependencies. The eight dynamics are all interdependent in any stability equation in this universe. And you get any equation in this universe that demonstrates its stability and you've got all eight dynamics present. One way or the other, you've got them present. And their stability means that they're present in a stable or balanced form. Now you start to unbalance one of these things, and of course nothing is going to happen at all. If you don't unbalance it by subtracting 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8. An exact balance from it. See?

You can take out of this stability what, let's call a beingness, a quantum of beingness, if there could be such a thing. You could take this out all the way along the line and if you took it out wrong, or tried to take it out wrong, you'd blow the whole shootin' match. In other words, you tried to take it out down tone scale you'd practically blow the universe up, and when the boys try to go out the bottom of the scale with apathy and all that, the rest of that thing, by golly they blow up cultures, cities, so on - everything goes to pieces, because they're trying to move out of the universe with their hands on all this MEST.

The rich man tries to go to heaven; of course he can't go to heaven on account of those ridges, they won't let him through the eye of the camel!

All right, let's take a break.