

METHODS OF RESEARCH - BE, HAVE AND DO, PART I

A lecture given on
14 November 1952

I want to talk to you about time, space and energy in terms of experience. The name of this talk could also be "Be, Have and Do."

An interrelationship now exists between theta, its goals, self-determinism, space, time, energy and experience, behavior and activity, which make this subject much too easy. And I want to ask you to keep it quiet -- the fact that it's gotten awfully easy. Don't go out and tell what I'm going to tell you tonight to Homo sapiens as he walks around, because it all becomes too plain to him. Don't, by any means, tell a physicist about this because he's got to be an expert to go on earning his living.

And don't make the horrible mistake, when you're processing a preclear, to do it in the first three minutes, or he'll feel that he didn't need processing.

That's why we're running in now, at this time with these new techniques, an assessment -- a good, thorough assessment before every session. That's so the session will take up some time, you see? (audience laughter)

And on first glance, I want you to regard this material with great awe.

Actually, you probably should; I've been digging at it now for I don't know how long. But I want you to regard it with great awe, and take it so seriously and regard it with such awe and consider its importance so great that you'll never be able to use it. I mean, if you can just get serious enough about this material now, we can guarantee what I first said there will take place: that it will remain so difficult, and so forth, that you too can be an authority. And so there's two ways to go about this, now. If you will at least become very, very serious and concentrate very, very hard on this and know that this must be difficult -- because we are actually, throughout, dealing with factors which only recently were solved in a lower strata in physics -- and if you regard this with sufficient importance and awe then you'll never be able to use it and I won't have any competition on the thing. (audience laughter) I'm the only person that I know today -- it's very unfortunate -- who never seems to have any failure with these techniques. I just never seem to have that happen. Of course, that has mostly to do with luck.

Luck. It isn't because I observe the preclear or it isn't that I use the technique exactly as it is written down. Those two points wouldn't have anything to do with it. Think it's probably pure luck or maybe it's reputation or something like that. That probably has much to do with it. So again, it leaves me... I say that because the first class hasn't got any of its certificates yet. And the reason it hasn't got any of its certificates yet is because it's got an unsolved case in its midst. And I'm going to get awful bored with this and I'm going to take just exactly the principles which were taught the first class and solve this case some afternoon when we've got two or three minutes.

I mean, it's just as ridiculous as that to have an unsolved case. It's just that ridiculous. It's just also ridiculous, anybody being in this subject very long, to keep on wearing glasses. You shouldn't wear glasses; there's no point in wearing glasses. Do you realize that glasses actually absorb a considerable percentage of the photons entering? They're hard... they're hard to see through! And I don't know, you want to put up barriers for yourself or something, that's all right.

But now, sidestepping all this persiflage, let's get down to something terribly serious, which is the anatomy of universes. This is what's known as a small subject -- the anatomy of universes.

Universes are composed of space, time and energy. And these factors, combining, make objects and matter, in general. Now, that is the anatomy of a universe. And that's all you have to know about a universe, and that's obviously all we need to know about a universe, because that's all that modern physics knows about one.

Now, I'll go over that again. This is the actual scope today, stated in a round sentence. The anatomy of a universe is as follows: It's space, time and energy, which combining, forms matter. So you have matter, energy, space and time as the component parts of the universe.

Now, I'll explain this in the way one of my college professors would have explained it, back there about twenty year ago, man and boy. I had some very, very good professors, by the way. They have no peers, no peers whatsoever. Ninety-five percent of them were incomprehensible and the other five percent wouldn't communicate. My professor of mathematics was supposed to have been the only man in the United States who could understand the Einstein theory. He sat there proudly understanding the Einstein theory. He sat there for years doing that. But don't ever go in to him and say, "Say, I'm sorry this happened. I'm awfully sorry this happened, but in analytics, there are five unnecessary steps in solving slope formulas." Don't say anything like that. No, you have just reached up upon the altar and torn down all the sacred vessels and bitten holes in them and dented them and thrown them out into the barnyard.

He would say at that moment, "I think it is best for you to use those five steps. They are there for a purpose." I didn't understand him at first, until I at last realized that they were there for a purpose: to confuse people.

That's true, that's true. There is no subject under the sun which cannot be refined, no subject under the sun which cannot be simplified, and there's no subject under the sun which can't be made more complex.

Now, just because the last is true is no reason to go on doing it.

But that also applies to Scientology. Now, people watch Scientology and see it simplifying. That's wrong: it ought to be becoming more complex, but it's not doing that. It's simplifying, it's simplifying. And today -- today -- it is possible to say that the anatomy of the universe or the anatomy of any universe is composed of these four simple elements.

Now, as one of my professors would have said, "Matter? Matter, that's... that's energy; that's energy in space and time, energy which has combined in atoms and molecules in space and time." "I see. Well now, what's energy?" "Energy... energy, that is motion; that's change in space. That's... that's motion, and change in space requires time. And when this change in space occurs, the manifestation of its occurrence is energy." You say, "Thank you. Now, what's space?" "Space... space is that area occupied by the energy which is changing in time." You say, "Well, I... Thank you. Thank you very much. But, what's time?" "Time is that manifestation of change in space which can produce energy." You say, "Excuse me. I didn't quite know where we came in on this rat race. But it seems to me that we keep saying A, B, C, D; A, B, C, D. It just seems to be a circle." Now, somewhere somebody's got to find a hole where he can get into this exclusive circle which defies all breakdown. Of course, the second you start to say breaking down anything like a universe, everybody gasps in horror.

Everybody knows there's such a thing as conservation of energy.

Einstein's last paper -- you ought to get that sometime; be some light reading. It's something like twenty-six pages solid -- twenty pages, something like that -- of solid figures. By the way, have you seen that? That's a gorgeous thing. One of my friends got ahold of it, and somebody had mimeographed it at Princeton, or something of the sort. It's not been published widely. And it goes page after page, and you've got these, ooh, just symbols and cube roots of square roots all divided by zero time, and their times constants. And then all of a sudden there'll be a big S and then there'll be a small s and that has to do with space, but that is space within space. And then you'll see something over here that's the strangest letter out of any alphabet you ever saw,

and that's the fourth dimension. It keeps sticking its head in. And when he gets all the way down to the bottom of the thing, he says triumphantly, "Conservation of energy!" He said, "Now, we have identified time, space and energy in terms of conservation of energy."

Now, that might not be exactly a rendition of Einstein's paper; that's not a direct quote. But when it comes to the actual last line, that's pretty close. It's sort of as if he said, "Now, look you. We got this all buttoned up, and we don't want any tampering from here on out because we have absolutely proven, at this level, an interrelationship which is so interlocked and so close between space, energy, time and matter that nobody will ever break through the cordon." Well, fortunately, I -- or unfortunately -- I put my foot in the wrong place not too long ago and broke through. And all of a sudden, time, space and energy became related to self-determinism. We suddenly found out that the goal of theta... And this works, by the way. It's a test of any theory, is does it work? It's all right to get a theory. I can get lots of theories. But the point is, let's get one that functions.

Well, 1951, there was this theta -- MEST theory, and this theta -- MEST theory just seems to function. And there wasn't any reason for it, it just seems to function.

Now, the theta -- MEST theory is refined to this degree: we have, on one echelon, something of no time, no motion, no space, nothing. The nothingest nothing that ever anybody conceived. Nobody ever conceived a nothing as nothing as theta. But isn't it interesting that that nothing-nothing thing has a potentiality and a capability?

The closed circuit, of course, has been in existence now for quite some time.

That is evaluation of space, time, energy and matter all by itself. And you can expect things to get into that state of affairs. They sort of evaluate everything... A person starts to describe cats and he starts to describe cats in terms of cats, in terms of cats, in terms of cats, and you keep -- and if he were saying all this time "Whumps in terms of whumps, in terms of whumps. And it's bigger than a whump, you see. I mean, but it's just a little bit longer than a whump." And you keep saying... you keep saying, "What's a whump?" And he'd say, "Why, a whump, that's very simple. A whump is... well, a not-quite-so-much whump." And you'd find him quite bogged down logically.

Now, you can do that same trick by saying, "A whump and a wag and a stug and a moog." And you say, "What is a whump?" "Well, it's a stag and a moog, as modified by a wag." And you could just go around in circles, and they might as well be those words. Really, they might as well be those words, because they don't interconnect otherwise. They're just four symbols, and each symbol is evaluated by the other symbols. Well, I got stuck one night on something or other, something came up, and this theta -- MEST theory came up -- statics and kinetics. Theta is a static.

Well, what is a static? We have the theory in the physical sciences that energy and physics and all those things are statics and kinetics. They're sciences of static and kinetic stuff. Well, all right. We take... let's take something that they say is static -- and they know it isn't static, by the way. Nobody fools that. You put this down -- this eraser. You say, "It's a static, doesn't move. There it is." Oh, boy, is that thing going like mad! That has eight separate motions just being connected to Earth. You know that thing is traveling at a thousand miles an hour? It's fantastic, the number of speeds and motions. In another direction, it's going twelve and a half miles a second. That doesn't sound like it's very static to me. It's changing location in space and time with rapidity.

But even more than that, it's only held there by an equilibrium of forces. In other words, it requires forces to hold this thing in an equilibrium of force.

Now, let's look at its real, actual anatomy. And we find out that it is composed of material which is composed of atoms and molecules. A Swiss cheese is very, very solid compared to a piece of matter. You start looking at a piece of matter and you start swishing it around in cyclotrons or

something of the sort, and you take a few electrons and push it around and then you shoot them this way and that. And you've got this steel bar. They don't hit anything. They just went right on through, that time. And then the next time they hit something and so on. It's almost as if you were firing a .22 bullet through the solar system, and then say, "Well, the solar system is solid. I hit Earth, didn't I?" Well, that wouldn't quite hold true.

Now, quite in addition to that, you see the planets in motion, you see the sun in motion, and all of that. Similarly -- according to theory, which nobody has proven -- atoms and molecules in this. It's just a good theory. It doesn't necessarily hold all the way across the boards. In the science of chemistry and the science of physics, they have entirely different structure patterns which don't compare to each other today on account of nuclear physics -- what works as an atom for a chemist does not work as an atom for a physicist, and vice versa, but they're evidently both working with matter. They have different pictures of the same object. And they're quite different. But they work for them, so that shows that we're working with a theory. Now, that atom, which... You see that atom right on the end there? That little one? All right. Now, that atom is doing a migration of some sort into this or it may be doing a migration off. And if two or three years from now we came along, probably the atom that's there has been worked clear over to there. In other words, this thing is not a static at all. Even as it sits at a state of rest, we find that it is full of motion.

Let's take something else. You ever hear of a cosmic ray? Cosmic ray goes through almost anything. You have something like -- I don't know what the figure is -- something like twelve cosmic rays are bursting inside you every hour or every minute or every second or... There's something very explosive going on. And each one of them releases a megavolt. And first time I read this I said, "Gee, you couldn't possibly be here if this were taking place." That's what they assign mutation to. It's evident, though. You can watch an area with a photographic plate; that is to say, just expose a photographic plate that'll only record cosmic rays, and you get these explosions in a certain area. And jokingly enough, if you're running the genetic-line track, there is an engram back there called the Cosmic Ray.

And if you start running this on a preclear, you have a picnic. You don't tell him what this thing is; it's just simply an explosion, that's all. He was so tiny on the genetic line at the time this thing took place, that a cosmic ray explosion looked like the whole firmament blowing up to him. And its explosion is on the genetic line. It's very amusing. I just throw that in sideways. You find that on E-Meters. If sometime you haven't got anything better to do with a preclear and he's almost gone anyway or something, run the Cosmic Ray, just for amusement. The point here is that a true static, a true static would not have any of these properties. It couldn't have any of these properties. It might have qualities or capabilities or potentialities, but to have potentialities... It is evident, because this theory has worked out so beautifully and it's working out and taking in so much territory in seven-league boots, and preclears are recovering at such remarkable speed by the use of this theory, that it must have some validity. And if it has some validity, we have this on our hands, we have this fact: It does not require time, space, energy, matter, wavelength, substance, in order to have potential.

Theta can do something. Theta has a potential. It can locate energy and matter in space and time. It has a potential. And yet it doesn't have a beingness. It has a potential beingness. It doesn't have anything, though, in terms of matter and energy, space and time.

So right there, as I was telling you the other night, there's our Q level. Now, that's way up there, and that's inexplicable at the moment, for one reason only: A datum must be evaluated by a datum of comparable magnitude.

The God, the Devil. We understand God because of the Devil; we understand this, we understand that. These are double data. The basic unit of the universe is two, not one. And we suddenly announce, "Theta has as its potentiality the location of matter and energy in space and time, and can, as well, create space and time." Well, once we say that, and the same time we say it has no wavelength, it -- boy, we're really describing a beast here. This thing couldn't possibly have any position in the real universe. And sure enough, it doesn't.

But, we play this static... That is a true static, you see? And we play this true static against a kinetic -- space, time, energy and matter -- and what do we get? Life, life forms and energy and matter itself. That should become very interesting right about that point. The potentialities of this thing actually create energy and matter.

Now, it doesn't say that it can destroy out of existence time, space, energy and matter, but it can create into existence, evidently, time, space, energy and matter. It can do that. Well, if it can do that, it doesn't necessarily have to destroy them out of existence. And you'd get your explanation of the MEST universe being an expanding universe and the law of conservation of energy being true.

The law of conservation of energy does not say that energy cannot be created. It just says that created energy doesn't dissipate, it translates. It becomes something else. All right.

Now, here we have this no-motion thing playing against that. Well, does that have just to do with life? Oh no, it doesn't. The electrician, in forming... The first chaps who did the very wonderful work in forming the basic laws of electricity did well, however, any investigator is liable to overlook some simplicity. It's very easy to get complex, but it's not very easy to get simple for these people, evidently. And someday somebody can say that about me, I guess, and probably will. So... But the point is this: that in the basic and elementary laws of electricity they had left something undescribed. It was there all the time, they used it all the time, but they didn't say it was there. Now, you wonder how that came about. Well, it's just so obvious, but they never connected it up on a gradient scale of logic to find out where the datum led, and so they'd never considered the datum of any importance.

Everybody knows in order to generate an electrical current that you have a plus terminal and a minus terminal, and you put a magnetic field in between, and as you shift the magnetic field between the plus terminal and the minus terminal you get an electrical flow. Everybody knows that, and that's all you need. That's all you need. Every basic textbook on electricity, whether it's in high school or an electronics laboratory or in the hands or in the library of Einstein happens to be in error. That is not all you need, not even vaguely all you need.

You take an alternating current. In order to have -- you just start looking this over -- in order to have a flow, you've got to have a plus -- minus and a minus -- plus at the same time you have a plus and a minus. It's just one extra curve on that line. We'll let that go by the boards for a moment because that is subject to question.

Now, that's subject to question; we could argue about that.

But you look it over in the light of what I'm going to give you here, and you'll see that this is not subject to question but it looks just too idiotically simple. And those of you who do not know basic electricity will say, "Well, that's perfectly natural and I'm sure that could not have been omitted." Well, I assure you that it has been omitted, because it changes the formula, the basic formula known as the alternating current formula in graphs.

Here is a motor. Here we take a motor. Now, there sits the motor and there's the terminal and terminal. Let's take these two things and we'll call these terminals. Now, we put a magnetic field between these two terminals.

And this is a plus terminal, this is a minus terminal. And we put a magnetic field between them. What happens when you take a plus side of the magnet and the minus side of the magnet and you just suddenly turn them loose?

They'll snap together, won't they? Well, according to present design, that is exactly what would happen to terminals.

You can't make electricity with the present formulas. If you... It's just that everybody has seen this generator, and they keep looking at the generator and they know what a generator looks like, and then they go and look at the formulas and then they make one. But if you took a savage out in the bush and he just took the formulas all by themselves and he says, "Gee, that's wonderful." And he'll take this terminal and he'll take this terminal and he'll lay them together and he'll put a magnetic field between them, and they'll go clink. And he'll say, "All right. Now, I'll turn on the electric light." He'll say, "That's very strange. It says right here in the book, all you have to do is impose a magnetic field... All right. I'll do that again. We'll lay these two down here. All right. Now, we'll put a magnetic field between the two of them and then turn on this electric light again." Clink. "Okay. Must be something wrong. White men are crazy. We always knew white men are crazy. Shoot the next one and have him for dinner.

We have done, at this moment, with modern electronics." What's left out of this? What is left out of this? The base -- the base of the motor, now... the base of the terminals. That sounds to you terribly idiotic. It is idiotic. It is idiotic, but boy, it certainly took us with seven-league boots into a lot more knowingness than we ever had before. Because all of a sudden we looked at this and we said, "Where is the base described?" No place.

How important is the base? Terminal, terminal, fixed to the base. We put a magnetic field between these two terminals and they will stay fixed. They do not collapse. And is it a plus terminal and a minus terminal together which is giving us an interplay? Or is it effort and matter? Are we putting mechanical energy up against this base in order to get electricity? Yes, we sure are.

We're pouring effort in between these two terminals, and the effort translates into energy. And the reason we can do this is because we're working the dichotomy between effort and matter -- effort and matter. And so we get an electrical flow.

But here's this base. It holds these two terminals apart. And unless these two terminals are held apart -- in other words, unless they are located in time and space; unless, as you turn that electrical field, it imposes time on this and then time on this and time on this and time on this -- and unless this base holds them apart and says, "Space, space, space, space, space" all the time, you'll get no flow. And what happens out of this?

So help me, the anatomy of electricity falls out in our laps and we don't have to go on saying till the end of time, "Well, the first thing you know about electricity..." -- which is what they say in the textbooks -- "first thing you know about electricity is that nobody knows what electricity is." Well, we can at least know a little bit about what electricity is. Electricity is a dichotomy which comes about through locating things in time and space. Now, if you have two poles, you might say -- a plus and a minus -- and they're located alternately in time and space, you're going to get current flow.

And this becomes very interesting, because it means that the thetan, of all things (theta, in the form of a thetan), actually sets up facsimiles. He can not only set up a facsimile, he can dream up and set up a facsimile in time and space which he has dreamed up, evidently, and then set up another facsimile and get an energy discharge between -- just like an electric motor. But on what wavelength? Whew! Way up here, see? It's not the kind of a wavelength that lights this electric light; it's another kind of a wavelength. It's way up there. And evidently that doesn't require very much anything. But here's this fabulous characteristic.

Now, let's take this motor base which is... We'll talk about the base - not this ashtray here -- we'll talk about the base which is under the steam generator not too far distant from here which is holding the terminals of that big generator apart. We'll talk about that base. It's located here; it's probably not... a few miles, at the most, from here. We'll talk about that base.

Now, because there's time and space taking place there, and an alternation of time and space, you pour some coal in the thing, you see, that gives you heat and that forces some effort onto a rod. And because those terminals are held there, every time that thing turns over, it's grinding

out an enforcement of time and space on the dichotomy of effort and matter, effort and matter, effort and matter, effort and matter -- gives you time -- effort -- matter, effort -- matter, effort -- matter, space, space, space, space. And all the time that's happening, it raises the devil along these electrical lines. And that agitation which you see up there is the agitation which pours through as a result thereof, because the goal of a static is to be a static, and this static is very badly being upset.

Well, let's talk about that base. What's that base fastened to? It's fastened to a concrete floor. What's that concrete floor fastened to? That's fastened to a planet called Earth. What's Earth fastened to? Well, believe me, Earth's really fastened. It's got centrifugal and centripetal forces. It is held in equilibrium in a nearly circular, but actually elliptical... It's very nearly circular. You'd be surprised how close to a circle Earth makes around the sun. It's called an ellipse almost for politeness's sake. And it swings around the sun, and the gravity of the sun and the gravity of Earth interlock, one against the other, and we have Earth held in place -- but severely held in place. And the sun is held in place by the general magnetism -- gravity, you might say -- between itself, other suns and its force vectors as it travels through space. It is bound on a certain course in relationship to the hub of the universe. And it is part of a galaxy which is going in a certain direction in a certain part of the universe.

And that is traveling in relationship to other galaxy's ...

[gap]

Now, they talk about this universe being expanding. That's cute. That's very cute. That is a wonderful way of just skipping the whole point. See. How could you have some space that was expanding? Well, it'd have to be expanding in relationship to more space, and that'd have to be expanding in relationship to other space. And you get this cat-chasing-his-tail proposition around of matter is energy which is congealed in space and time and all that sort of thing. Well, we're not interested in that.

Let's take a look at this and say that there's a finite limit on the universe. We have no right to say that. In other words, just say there is. There's a finite limit on this here universe that we've got here, and it doesn't go on forever in all directions. And let's look at an axiom. This axiom works out.

We find everywhere we look that absolutes are really unobtainable.

You can't even attain absolute zero. Guys have gotten awfully close to absolute zero; they've really gotten things cold. But absolute zero would be absolute motionlessness, and they haven't attained it yet. All right. It's unobtainable, so let's say infinity is unobtainable, too. Doggone it! Somewhere theta could be said to be holding a conceived time and space to achieve an energy and a matter, and that makes the material universe. Now, that solves very nicely -- I mean, we could say that very nicely. Actually, we've only removed the problem one step further on, but we do have a connection here. We do have a definite connection. Here's the base of this generator down there in the electric-light plant, and the base of that generator leads right straight back to theta, as we have described theta. The second I saw this, "Oh, my God," I said, "there's self-determinism. Aha, self-determinism. Ya-pa-pow" And it sure didn't take very long to take an ice pick to that little cat-chase-the-tail matter, energy, space and time and just bust up that happy little group, because we had a higher Q. And any time you have a higher Q and you've adequately described a higher Q, even if you've postulated or theorized that it's there, if it is a workable Q, you can evaluate things below that level.

And we stepped up, and all of a sudden got the qualities of something which was above the level of matter, energy, space and time. And we got what the quality was and we look around at a man, and let's take a look at this man and we see that this man is trying to be self-determined. That he's very interested in being.

And let's find out why people are sick. We've already found this out. Their self-determinism has been upset in this quarter or that, and when we relieve that, they get well. Empirical. All done by theory, but empirical evidence kept bearing it out. Now, let's take this definition... let's take this definition of self-determinism. We say self-determinism is the effort of an individual to attain the goals of theta.

What are the goals of theta? Goals of theta seem to be the ability to impose matter and energy, time and space -- not just on time and space. It can create... theta can create, conserve, alter (and I'm not sure about the last; it would hold, on every other theory, but I'm just not sure about it) and destroy matter, energy, time and space. That could be said to be a goal of theta -- a goal of theta.

And you'll find universes running in cycles. You'll find a single life span running in a cycle. And everywhere you look, you find everything has beneath it the common denominator of this cycle of creation, growth, decay and death. And that is the repeated, continuous cycle everywhere you look.

And let's look at energy, and we'll find energy has three characteristics: start, change and stop. And that compares to creation -- all the other things - alteration and death. And we find that's what energy does: it can start, it can change and it can stop. Oh, boy, are these things starting to fit together very nicely.

Now, let's see if that applies to an individual. Does it apply to an individual to such a degree that by using the definition of self-determinism in times of the highest electronics so far extant here, do we suddenly get a preclear weller faster? Oh, boy, do we. By about ten thousand to one. It's just fabulous! The technique works.

You can ask any early first class. They'll tell you, "Well, yes, Standard Operating Procedures works. Yeah, placing things in time... yeah, yeah." You try it yourself, "Yeah, yeah, that works." That's how you get a fellow well; that's how he becomes more self-determined; that's how he becomes able to handle this material universe. He goes on up the line. Now, let's take another one: Creative Processing. Creative Processing, Scientology 8-8008, the rehabilitation of the individual's own universe and the reduction of the MEST universe in terms of importance to him. Now, we just take that process; let's look at it. Is it a good valid process? Yes, we can take Creative Processing all by itself and make a person well. Just like that. Isn't that fascinating? Don't have to pay any attention to this MEST universe at all. Tells you immediately there's tons of universes. There'd have to be. There just have to be. All right. You're in the high and rarefied air of theory. But that theory actually boils down to something very simple: a static and a kinetic. You have a no-motion acting against an all-motion. And a no-motion acting against an all-motion gives you energy. And what's motion? It's time and space. What are the capabilities of theta? Creation, conservation, alteration, perhaps destruction, of matter and energy and time and space. What's self-determinism? Same as theta.

And so, if you want action, if you want these other things, can we just shift these factors around, just willy-nilly, and fit them this way and fit them that way and fit them any other way and invent six processes now and a hundred tomorrow and you can't think up a good one, just remember your definition and say, "Well, it ought to work this way" -- zing, zing -- and bang, break a case? Sure. Yeah. That's very interesting.

All of a sudden, we've burst out into the sunshine of a very, very clear concept. Highest potentiality of theta is evidently the creation and management of universes. The way you create and manage a universe is you invent some space and then you have to invent some time. And between the time and the space you have to have something in them, so you put something in them. And you... to do that, you have to use energy, and that... congeal that into matter and you got a universe. And that's very simple to do. Nothing much about this, and there's actually no limitations upon the creation of this; I mean, that's all you do.

Now you... Let's take a writer sitting at his desk, and he's pounding a typewriter, and so what's he doing? Inventing time and space, and energy and matter and so on. Only trouble is, he takes it out and he compares it to the real universe and the real universe says, "I'm real because I can kick your shins in, but that cliff you just invented in that story, it isn't even vaguely going to hurt anybody." And the fellow has been beaten down like this for an awful long space of time, so he doesn't bother to fix up his cliffs so that if you kick them they kick back. This doesn't say he can't. Doesn't say he can either, but it just doesn't say he can't. Now, when you guide this poor writer, who has been comparing his universe toward the MEST universe, the MEST universe has been saying, "I'm real, yours is not."

Everybody tells him that, by the way. All criticism and everything sums down to this: "What you've just thought of is not real because here is the real universe and it's much bigger and tougher and it's an ally of mine, and we're going to crush you with it." If you're going to get into an involved argument -- criticism of arts, invalidation of Joe Louis as a boxer, the way you wipe out companies with stocks and bonds sales, or any of these things -- you'll have somebody rushing in with a conclusive, proven fact which crushes out an imagined or unsupported fact, and there you go. So this universe was designed on the beautiful basis of "You'd better agree with me or else." And so is that a basic design of any universe; otherwise it won't hold together. But of course, very few universes get so slopped over as this one seems to have done.

Now, this universe, of course, doesn't occupy all the space there is and it doesn't occupy all the time there is. You could compose another universe and it wouldn't go at right angles to this universe, because this universe, if you knew the truth of it, isn't here. But boy, it's sure got a way to say it's real. This universe really isn't here; it's an illusion.

The most interesting part about it is, as hard as physicists have worked to prove, in natural history, all sorts of things and so on... Natural philosophy, they used to call it; yeah, that's right. Way up since the time of Aristotle, one of the things they really concentrated on proving all the way along the thing: materialism -- it's real, it's real, it's real, it's real. And they kept pointing at it. They kept saying, "It's real, it's real, it's real, it's real," and then their finger went through. And when you got up to that stage, why, you walk up to a physicist, he doesn't know whether he's a monk or a scientist today, because he has proven conclusively that what he's working with really isn't there.

You get Sir James Jeans and others and they think and they think and they think and they think and they finally say, "It finally boils down to a thought, as near as we can think it out." And it's very fascinating, but that is physics. Its evolution has been toward the direction of demonstrating with great conclusiveness that they are working very materialistic with something that is quite illusory and really isn't there.

But if you agreed and everybody else agreed and if you're... as a theta being, if you were forced to agree continually that it was there and it was there -- do you realize that you're able to create time and space? So if you create time and space, if you've agreed and agreed and agreed with the MEST universe, the time and space which you create is the MEST universe time and space. The energy which you find in the MEST universe -- you can create it and put it there.

And so you all sit around and here's the MEST universe, here's the MEST universe -- create time and space, time and space, time and space, and oh, boy, we mustn't get out of agreement on this. Let's put it in there very carefully. I bet if one of you went away and stayed on a desert island for several years, and stayed very much out of connection with things and there was nothing there, like a sun cycle or something, to demonstrate things to you; you'd come back and find that you have missed it. You'd probably get back here in 1954 when it ought to be 1955 or something, and it'd be very embarrassing to you.

Men get very anxious about this. Even Robinson Crusoe, with no calendars, time clocks or anything to worry about, carefully kept the passing of each day. Great. Awful concern about this -- horrible anxiety. That's because you don't think, anymore, you could create one. Of course,

you've got to keep this one. Now, the funny part of it is, is there really is no real concern about that, because this universe is very easy to find. There's too many people concentrating on this moment of time and space.

What happens to your preclear when you send him back down the track?

He can create the time and space of his past, he can put it in there. Or he can read it off actual energy, which is sort of suspended.

Now, what's all this have to do with be, have and do? Well, it has a great deal to do with be, have and do because when you translate, now, from self-determinism into matter, energy, space and time, you can get a direct result in terms of experience. You can say "time is" in terms of experience, "beingness is" in terms of experience, "doingness, then, is" in terms of experience.

And if you can do those tricks, and if I could communicate it to you, you wouldn't be wandering around in a fog about what time is.

What's time? "It just sort of goes by, I mean..." Only it doesn't go by, because you're right here. "Well, it's change, you see, in space. Well, oh, clocks. Heh-heh." Big relief, you see, you say, "Watches! Yeah, watches. They..." Then you stop to think for a moment. "Those hands are in the same place; they're just making a motion in space. Hmm. Closest we can get to time is motion." Gee, as close as we can get to time is motion. That's obvious, isn't it? Very, very obvious. Well, that's not as close as you can get to time. I'll tell you how close you can get to time: motion. But that really isn't the way you ought to say it. What you ought to say is "Time is the illusory word which you put up to describe as the existence of motion." And the truth of the matter is, time isn't there at all, but motion is.

What's motion? Well, that's great. I mean, you could go around in circles like this just for hours and hours and get dizzier and dizzier and it wouldn't do your preclear any good at all. And that's what Homo sapiens has been doing. He has been agreeing to this motion, agreeing to this space, agreeing to this time, agreeing to this motion, agreeing to this space, agreeing to this time, until he doesn't feel he can create anything anymore, and so he just goes on agreeing and agreeing.

And how sick can he get? How sick can he get? Just take at random a strata through the society and pick up your real sick ones, and what do you find? He has agreed almost 100 percent. How do you know he's agreed 100 percent? Because he has no more illusions of his own. He has no more hopes, he has no more dreams, he's a sick guy. In fact, if you want to find that fellow, I invite you to go out to the graveyard, because he's dead. He is no longer a living organism. Now, you want to find how bad off your preclear is. As a matter of fact, you can just take a look at a preclear and you'll know how bad off he is: how thoroughly he is agreeing with the material universe. And the more thoroughly he has agreed with the material universe, the worse he's going to be.

That's horrible, isn't it?

Because... Several reasons for this. Agreement, by the way, is a one way flow. You start to do something to the universe and the universe says, "Gonna do something to me, huh? Bap!" You go out, you're going to play.

You're going to be a steamboat, something, and you... little kid, and he goes running down the street, "Choo, choo, choo, choo, choo, choo" -- Crash! Well, he didn't run into a dock, and he hasn't got any fenders out. He fell on concrete and it skinned his knee. He said, "I am a steamboat." And the MEST universe says, "You're a little boy in a very destructible body. We've got you taped. We've convinced you." And every time this little boy tried to put up a big illusion, every time he tried to do this, what happened to him? MEST universe said, "Nuh-unn." And yet, horribly enough, the only parts of the MEST universe that are habitable, the only

parts of the MEST universe which have any meaning to life itself are those parts which have been conquered by life. The lichen, the moss, in operation together, in terms of soil. And you get some soil, then you get some little plants, and pretty soon -- so on.

It'd only be a psychotic that would devote his lifetime to making a pet out of a pebble. He would not be interested in any life form or anything of the sort. He'd just have this pebble. And this pebble, he'd pet it and this was... Nuh-nn. Life is fondest of life, and only life graces this universe, really. The stark, utter chill of the outer dark above the ionosphere and the Heaviside layer is quite emphatic, quite emphatic. It's cold up there.

All right. Now, what's an illusion? An illusion is a universe, in embryo - unformed, thin, gauzy. But gee, a universe of the illusion characteristic, theoretically, could be as strong and as tough and as resistant as this stuff. Theoretically. And what is the thing which delights audiences most? Stage magic. People are always showing that something solid has just turned up where it shouldn't be.

He can create matter. Fascinating. He can also reduce space, and so on. These are the tricks of the magician.

Audiences are delighted with them. Why? If the audience was just supposed to agree with the material universe, they'd get awful mad at that magician. He just keeps on telling them, "You can disagree with the material universe." All right. Let's look this over very carefully and not strain too hard on it, because it's awfully easy. And the definitions which are necessary to an auditor and to a very good understanding of Scientology are that self-determinism tends to attain the goals of theta. The goals of theta are to achieve the potentialities of theta, and this is the creation of matter and energy in space and time, and the creation of space and time in which to create matter and energy. And that puts you up above the level of space, time, matter and energy, and we can get off of that racetrack for the first time. And how do you get off the racetrack? You're waiting to hear about this. Here's space. Down here at the lefthand corner of the triangle we have time, and over here we have energy.

Now, what on earth... how do you relate those things to experience?

Well, that's very simple. Except you can't relate time to experience, because that's an abstract; you know that. And space, of course, doesn't relate to experience either, because, well, actually, how big is a piece of space? Well, it's as big as it's bounded. Mmm, that's awfully suspicious; it's as big as it's bounded.

And energy -- well, nobody sees the motion of energy, so... but energy is obviously there and we kind of take that one for granted, too. And now we know all about the material universe, and we don't need to know any more to relate this to experience. And now that we're all straightened out, why, just the realization that we know all about it should make us all Clear. Well, it hasn't made physics clear, not clear for anybody for an awful long time. It's been getting worse and worse and worse. They're at a frantic stage now. They have a mathematics born out of Planck's quantum of energy.

And quantum mechanics are the most gorgeous mathematics -- if you want to call them that -- that you ever laid your eyes on. They throw three factors and a guess and equate it with a maybe and they've got it! And that is a symptom of getting frantic. By the way, they don't work any... I'm sure they don't work anything, really, by quantum mechanics. I think they go in and they take bars of uranium, or something, and they juggle them around, you see? "Yeah, quick! Write up the formula. Yeah, we found out it's this many bars and that much ener---- Write up the formula, huh? That's right. That makes forty millicuries. Now, put down the answer there. Now, write backwards. Now, we'll put in the constant and the c and the quantum, so on. Now, turn it in to the front office, quick." I'm sure they must do it this way. All right. What can we put here then? We know these three factors. What can we put here? There's something belongs here. Mm-hm. Space is "be." Let's relate this to experience. Space is "be." Now, the reason space is "be" is because one can be without acting. That right? He doesn't require motion to be.

Let's just look at that. But he would require -- let us hypothesize -- some space to be. He'd have to be where? Well, all right -- there.

But you notice, also, that even in the English language, the verb to be does not require an object. In fact, it can't take one. All right. That's true in practically any language, by the way. In other words, beingness; isness. Isness. All right, that's just space. That's simple; be is space. Now, here you are; you're sitting in this space. Now, we can chop it off, as far as time is concerned. And even though we chop that very thin and stop time down to zero, you would still be in this room. You wouldn't fly out of this room, just because we stopped time. But boy, you'd sure fly out of it if we stopped space. All right. So, we have space is "be." Well, now, over here we have time. And everybody knows that time is just an interrelationship, but it's a very funny thing about time.

Let me tell you how I ran into this.

I kind of collided with this thing on a dark night with a preclear that was mighty skittish. I had tried everything on this preclear including paragoric and this preclear kept insisting that this symptom was still there, and the symptom was still there, and the symptom was still there, and the symptom was still there. I started running -- well, all right... She seemed so proud to have it; that was what started to get me. "Now, get having it." "Now, get not having it." "Now get having it." "Now get having to have it." "Now having not to have it." Ptock, ptock, ptock, ptock, ptock, ptock. The dichotomy of "have" and "not have," you see -- back and forth. She says, "It's gone." "Oh?" Now, I had run a lot of other things, and any one of those -- I'd run responsibility and I'd run this and I'd run that and I'd run other things, and Papa and Mama and husbands and pet cats and pet cows and anything I could think of. And all of a sudden I ran that little simple dichotomy -- which is the first time I ever ran it, by the way -- and kaboom! The symptom's gone. So, not too long later, I run into this preclear and this preclear is one of these can't see, can't hear, what space? what universe? what wall? sort of a normal. And I started running this and that, and this preclear was very anxious to get rid of a bad knee. So we started in on the basis of whose knee was it, and let's get a communication line through it, and he kept saying, "Ah, yeah, what knee?" And, "Oh, the knee. You know, the one you complained about." "Well, what, what... oh, oh, the knee. Yeah. Yeah, all right. All right. All right. All right. No. No, I don't like Chaucer." I mean, the case was not very good.

But I finally pinned the case's attention down on a number of things and ran a number of things and we got a little bit of alleviation, we got a little bit of change of mind about this and that. The person got happier. Then all of a sudden I said, just out of thin air, "Well now, get having to have that knee." "... not having to have the knee." "... having to have..." zig-dig -- ptock, ptock, ptock, ptock. No knee pain. I thought, "That's peculiar."

In this whole mess, it suddenly occurs to one that having does not quite compare with being. There's something strange and peculiar about having that is different than these other things, that sort of hits a button." Boom! Hits this little button. And you can sometimes produce results with this confounded "having" and "not having" that you don't produce with this enormous battery of terrifically logical this-and-that.

I mean, some of this stuff is almost as logical as Germanic logic. And havingness, havingness. Till I was fooling around the other day -- and you won't credit this when you first look at it, you won't credit it at all, but that's time. That actually works out to be time. Fantastic, but true. Time is "have." "Had," "have," "will have" gives you a time track. Now, you stop and you say to a preclear... Hey, by the way, take this little exercise right now. I'd say: Mock up something. Just mock up anything. Now put it in yesterday. How'd you put it in yesterday? All right. Now, put it in present time. Now put it in tomorrow. How'd you get it into tomorrow?

Male voice: Moved it along.

Hm.

Male voice: Pushed it along; pushed it back.

Sure, you moved it along and moved it back, but let's have it right there. Right there. All right.

Let's put that item again that you thought up, and it's right there, it's right there. Now let's put it in yesterday. Can't do it? Hm. We were using space for time, and that's quite aberrative, because a guy gets confused about it. All right. I want you to put here, I want you to put here a little girl with curls, little girl with curls right in the middle of her forehead. Put this little girl with curls there. Now, put her right there yesterday. Oh yes, you can. You got her there right now? All right. Just remember she was there yesterday.

Male voice: But she wasn't. I just put her there.

Ah. I said, though, put her in yesterday. That's part of the exercise.

All right. Now, just remember she was there yesterday. That's -- how could you put her in yesterday unless you did that? All right. Remember she was in yesterday. Can you remember she was in yesterday? All right. Now, let's put her there tomorrow. Now, that's an easy one. That'll become on your consecutive track. Put her there tomorrow, now. Put her there tomorrow. Now, how do you get her there tomorrow?

Female voice: By not having her today.

I'll tell you, the actual...

Male voice: The whole time she's there.

The actual way you do it... the actual way you do it, is you kind of say to yourself, "Well, I'll walk in tomorrow morning and there she'll be." Now let's go through that again. This will straighten you out on time faster than anything else I know. Put this little girl here. Now, put her in yesterday. How do you get her into yesterday? You just pretend she was there and you remember it. It's easy. All right.

Now, let's put her in present time. Let's put her right there, now, get her good and solid. She shouldn't use pomade on her hair. Put her right there. All right. Now, put her in tomorrow. Now, how do you know she's going to be there tomorrow? All right. Now, blow her up. Actually, that's the way time works and you will find about 88 and 8/3rds of your preclears are completely fouled up on how they do thinking with ...

[Editors note: This lecture ends abruptly as did the original master recording.]