

Chart of Havingness

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 18. December 1952

This is the second lecture of the afternoon of December the 18th, and we are continuing here on this chart of havingness.

Now you may think that I'm making too much... too much action here – a little bit too much randomness for you by giving you this material. But I'm giving you, in this lecture, an option between one and two things. I could simply process some people here, and I intend to do so but uh... this afternoon, but I want to have in circulation and in your hands enough material so that you can actually do some extrapolation – that's a wonderful word, **EXTRAPO-LATION** – people look in vain in dictionaries for this word **EXTRAPOLATION** – uh... it isn't **INTERPOLATION** because that's „find the point in between...“ Someone... and so let's go out further and discover it.

Uh... mathematics could be called extrapolation. it... it's what you figure from, into. That's just what we're doing in present time, you see – it's approximation. We're predicting the havingness change and estimating the rate of change of havingness when we're estimating the future.

I want you to know about these thing's because you can do some thinking on this basis and you will discover probably some very interesting material from this, because this is only a barely, slightly explored field. When we start to talk about time's rate of change... time as a rate of change of havingness, or not-havingness...

Now therefore, its first and immediate value to you in therapy shouldn't be overlooked. This is possibly the first analysis ever made of psychosis that is really a good solid mechanical analysis. Why is a psychotic always in the past? Your neurotic is, at best, in the present. And your people who are sane are doing very well in the future. They're thinking into the future, consistently and continually, and it could be said that a man is really as sane as he can think into the future.

Why is this? That says, „A man is as sane as he can predict and estimate the rate of change of havingness and not-havingness.“ Hmm. As long as a man can predict the rate of change of havingness and not havingness, he is quite sane. And when individuals are unable to predict the rate of change of havingness and not-havingness, they are unable to predict. And are not sane. When they're unable to predict it, they're just unable to predict it, then it makes out of them what? An effect.

Now the rate of change of havingness and not havingness could be considered to be cause. Therefore, cause is motivated, then, in the future. Cause isn't in the future, though, because this tells you that cause is flow and energy. Oh, nonsense! You can't have time without, space, energy and objects. There isn't any time without those items. And the most pertinent of those items are and the best estimation done on those items is rate of change of havingness of the... you... now you have this...

Now let's... let's predict what's going to happen tomorrow on the planet Xerxes. Can you... can you predict that? What's going to happen tomorrow on the planet Xerxes? No, because you doesn't have any havingness on Xerxes, that's all. I mean, there isn't any present time there, so how can you predict a rate of change there?

Rate of change – my God! How could you possibly predict a rate of change when you don't even know what's changing? So you couldn't predict the future and as far as Xerxes is concerned, two conditions exist: You are not interested and it doesn't immediately influence you; or, if interested, it again doesn't influence you. So what?

Now it's only when a person is interested in havingness of a present time that he can become non compos mentis with regard to that present time. A person must be interested in havingness to be insane. And by definition here in this universe, a person must be interested in havingness to be sane. You also must be interested in not-havingness to be sane. Hmm-hmm-hmm. Where are we going?

Uh... now, an unknown datum doesn't disturb you a bit. The planet Xerxes, his state of government or what is going to be printed in a... publication there uh... tomorrow by some loose-moraled fellow doesn't even vaguely interest you. And yet it's an unknown datum.

And you'll find your psychotic has gone mad because of an unknown datum. He doesn't know what's going to happen in the future. That uncertainty concerning the rate of change of havingness and not-havingness. He's become so unsettled and so upset about it, he can't predict it, that he's become psychotic about it. And as long as he is...

You see where we're going? Interest. Interest is the monitoring action. Where there is no interest, there isn't any insanity. Of course, there's also nothing.

And so you get a... an interesting, but not monitoring or terribly sweeping, common denominator to past, present and future, and the state of mind with regard to them. And that... that is monitored by interest in it. „Do you care?“

Uh... ah... the great Rabelais tells a fascinating story whereby two characters were in battle and everybody is sweating and streaming blood and... and uh... brawling, and... and these armies are crashed together and interlocked, and it's toe to toe and slug, slug, slug. And... and... and these two characters, for some reason or other, to catch their breath, withdraw a short distance and uh... climb a little hill. And they look down in the valley and they see these little tiny figures down in the valley. And they're just moving like little tiny dolls, and it becomes so unimportant to them that they begin to laugh. And they laugh very heartily about it and, of course, just stretch out in the sun and that's the end of the battle as far as they're concerned.

You want to know why theta clearing can suddenly produce such a change of viewpoint in an individual, I'm afraid it's contained in that data that I've just given you. Estimation of the rate of change of havingness is either interesting or very interesting or terribly interesting or, „Oh, my God! We're lost unless...“ And that's being... everything is serious and important.

Now what is... what does 'serious' and 'important' mean? 'Serious' and 'important' are words put down to „interest is intense because of penalty.“ And you could say „importance is an interest... an intense interest because of penalty, and it is as intense as the penalty is envisioned to be intense.“ That man who can not be made to feel any pain from hunger, rain, snow, ice or the other things they have in the post office department, he, you see, wouldn't be able to feel any penalty – unless it were the penalty of being bored and that is a penalty itself.

Boredom, however, is just not a state of inaction. It is a state of idle action, vacillating action, where penalties are yet in existence. And where they are great. But a state in which one has decided he can't really do anything about them, it's just a high-toned apathy. And it... it... there's a certain insouciance that comes along with boredom; there's a flippancy.

Now what, then, is 'sanity'? Well, let's rate it there... It would be „unable to predict the rate of change of havingness and not-havingness with regard to one's interest in those things which are changing, and with regard to the penalty which one believes may accrue from not being interested in those things. That's a clumsy definition. It will come down in size and shape. But let's look at it again: It... It's... 'sanity', then, is monitored by what one can gain balanced by how much one can be punished because of have and have-not, and the unpredictableness of the changes which might take place in have or have not.

The goal of a static is to be a static. The goal of an 'all motion' is to go in all motion. And as we see the interplay of a static against all motion, we find out that we have a theoretical point of action halfway between these bands where the penalty could exist, but would not sweep away all, where havingness is not the most important thing.

Now havingness becomes more and more important to the psychotic until he will give away anything, or he will take and hold on to everything. And he thinks... objects and words and everything else. So his interest is terribly aberrated. And his belief in pain is terribly aberrated, and if you get somebody who is very psychotic, they've either abandoned the body to a point where anything could happen to it, or the tiniest little scratch is regarded by them as destruction beyond destruction beyond destruction.

So, uh... theta clearing just side-steps the whole problem by deintensification of havingness; and by almost completely eradicating the penalty of not having, or the penalty of having. It is not a retirement from the lists; it is not an abandonment of anything. But it is an ability to come into the control and ownership of things, and therefore a person's stability as a theta clear would depend upon, yet, their interest and evaluation as pertained to their body and – what Freud called the 'alter-ego' – all the other possessions of the body, like the family and uh... uh... the car and all that.

A little light begin to break through on this.

But the funny part of it is, we can't subtract anything from this universe because of this doggoned rate of change of havingness. This universe will either blow up or solidify one way or the other, if one were to subtract from it, out of any one of its equations, let's say this: One, two, three, four, six, seven and eight – and leave five. He wouldn't go, would he?

Or, the universe, if he did make it, would blow up, on what subject? The fifth dynamic. You'll find, then, that inequalities of interest and an unbalanced state of interest on the part of the preclear – that is why we're interested in „can'ts“ – resolve down to an inability to draw out in a balanced state. He's got to take all eight dynamics out of the equation if he's going to leave this universe – all eight – simultaneously. The universe'll never miss him.

But if he tries to take all eight except two out – nnohhh! It's not just going to miss him, I... it's not going to let him go because, you see, the universe seems to represent a havingness and have-not-ness. It... it... it, to some degree, owns your preclear. Every time he has a line to it, it has a line to him. So any time he says, „Well, I'm just fine except for the second dynamic. I still seem to want this sensation from these bodies, and so forth. They're a disgusting thing, these bodies, but second dynamic – hummm!“

It... it... it doesn't just mean that your preclear is holding on, because it means that there's a great big cable around his neck and it's got him nailed down to a stake. And as long as he thinks he has to be in this universe in order to indulge that sensation, as long as he has to have something else to undo it besides himself, oh boy!

Now, you see, he is four parts, as e homo sapiens. And so when it comes to subtracting the thetan from the body, he has to have a body with which to enjoy other bodies, he thinks, at the state he's in. Now let's draw it up a little further and demonstrate to him that he doesn't have to have other bodies; he doesn't have to have a body of his own in order to procure this sensation from other bodies; it isn't necessary for him to have a body of his own. He can just take it off of any body any place. „Well,“ that fellow says, uh... „that's great!“ Your preclear is still nailed down in this universe, because every one of those bodies will put a line on him for every line he puts on them.

And uh... that's how he came down tone scale in the first place.

So, we have to then shift it over to 'own universe', and he has to be able to mock up a havingness or not-havingness on any one of the dynamics, and particularly where interest is involved. He has to be able to create anything he is interested in and continue an interest in it in order to get rid of MEST universe havingness and not-havingness. And nobody's recommending to you, really, that you get rid of this havingness and not-havingness in the MEST universe.

But I'm just telling you that the interest monitors it, and that is monitored by one's belief that it only exists – the other thing, scarcity, in this universe – that there's a penalty in leaving the universe, and the penalty of leaving would be the penalty of not any more having something, ugh... You see?

All right, this universe is rigged this way: Every time you want something in this universe, you can't have it. If you really want something, long enough and often enough on an

outflow for it, it, of course, if you do get it, it'll disagree with you. And so it's a dwindling spiral operation, and by electronics this goes down... As we were talking about very interestingly the other day, this DC flow problem. There could be no DC flow; if you changed viewpoint as fast as you changed polarity, you would think you saw a DC flow. Now, that's very good – that's very good. A fellow in class mentioned this – very interesting. But if you insisted there was such a thing as a DC flow and never changed your viewpoint, you would have to have lower and lower and lower and lower potentials. And the... the lower the potential, why, you get another flow, and then you get a lower potential and you get another flow to it, and then you get a lower potential and you get another flow to it. And there's, of course, no place to go but bottom, and it's mud from there on down.

Now if you got a... a viewpoint which decided that your potential was going to go up all the way, it would have to be a negative gain, and you would have to continue the negative gain. As long as you continued this, you'd go on up tone scale and out the top. But you would have to do it on all eight dynamics. This is not very... not very difficult. This is... this works out automatically. This is inherent in the techniques which have been proposed – inherent.

Now let's look over here at this chart again, and we find the rate of change of havingness – and of course, and uh... we'll put this plus and minus – meaning havingness and not-havingness – the rate of change of this determines... determines randomness; and that's what randomness is. You've been asking for a lot of definitions for randomness: Randomness would best be described as the rate of change of havingness and not havingness. This is randomness.

And if you want lots of rate of change, you want lots of randomness. If you want lots of randomness, you get lots of rate of change of havingness and not-havingness. You decide, „Well, now let's see. We're going in... going into a lot of action. We're going to choose out these teams to fight, and that means...“ And what are you going to get? Oh, boy! You're going to get loss and gain on an unpredicted level – every time. Of course, you get mired down in a universe which is operating, or an area that is operating all but automatically. No-ho. Any... almost anything you do in it sets up these automatic reactions. Automaticity is really there. Automaticity is there to such a degree that you cannot regulate the interdependencies of the eight dynamics and as a result the eight dynamics and all eight dynamics are to be found in any particle of this universe, no matter what form the thing takes, you'll find all eight. It isn't just that you find all eight in a man.

And that 'all eight' is your octahedron of filling space – just as an aside comment. Putting it into space, characteristics as well as particle characteristics, because, you see, your octahedron is not a particle characteristic at all. It's what you would, quote, 'fill space with', it would be the forms which fill space.

So you're not going to do any grand job of pulling your preclear out if he still has, and you do not know about, something that nails him down good and hard on this tone scale. What is that tone scale? As that tone scale descends it is ARC, it's a lot of other things. Something else more important to you – it's time. It's one's belief in his ability to predict the rate of change of havingness and not-havingness. And at 1.5 one has lost his ability to not-have. See, it's an ability. He's lost his ability to not-have, so he has to have everything, and that gives

you a terrific hold, and that gives him this enormously strange attitude toward all these various things.

Now, what happens at 1.1? This person has lost his ability to have and he's doing a terrific dispersal... pardon me, at 1.0 fear, uh... he's doing this terrific dispersal and it's all 'not-have, not-have, not-have, not-have, not-have' – see? He's lost his ability to have.

Now let's go down tone scale, and we'll find somebody in grief, and we find they've again recovered a little ability to have and not-have, and . then they went into grief on it, and we find somebody who has lost their ability again to not-have. Now what... in mock-ups. Well, how do you find this person? This person will be in the strange and wonderful manifestation of just... just not-having. This person can't stand a 'not-having' and now can't stand it because his interest is so intense in having, and the values he assigns and the penalties which could accrue to him as a result of not-having are so exaggerated that, of course, he can let go of nothing.

So what happens when you get somebody who is in grief on the tone scale? Why, it's very interesting to find that all you have to do is run Step Four and there you are, he's... he's... you'll cure him of it – Step Four. And that is Flow Balancing. It cures his ability to not have.

So all the way up the tone scale you're just curing people of their abilities to have, alternately, and not have with mock-ups. You... you can't upset the rate of change of this universe, but you're not actually working with energy. Your preclear isn't energy. He's a capability of producing energy – a space to put it in. So as long as you work with this material on the mock-up side, he goes right on up tone scale.

Why? You're changing his ideas. Thinking, then, actually develops to itself – I told you a little earlier, what one devotes energy to, one has. Or what one devotes energy to, one not has. You devote energy to getting rid of something and that means you'll have it, or devote energy to having it and that means you... it'll... you'll lose it.

Uh... you get an object in other words, which is the reverse vector of what it's supposed to be, and what do you get here? You get a person's future track getting solid. That sounds funny to you, but you see, in view of the fact there is no future, he's changed his rate of change of havingness and he looks at the future and the future itself has taken on a solidity.

Now this person can't change his postulates. Why can't he change his postulates? They're bogged into energy. He's making them inside of created energy and he has... he's actually operating in a more or less solid area when he's thinking. He's pushing particles around, so he can't change his postulates, of course. And any preclear that you get ahold of is going to be unable to some degree to shift his postulates readily. And as a net result, as long as he can't shift his postulates, he can't, of course, change his attitude toward anything. And as long as his mind is banked in on the idea that 'this future is solid' over here in area 'Z', as long as that thing is solid, he's tried continually to inhibit or advance the rate of change, and it didn't shift on him. So he... he gets something solid that doesn't change and this is a mock-up – a symbol for the future. This piece of energy, solid. It's almost like matter after a while, and you... you'll find this manifestation very solidly.

What do you do, then, with the future? If you can find the f... By the way, look around yourself and... and say, „When I predict something or try to predict something, which way do I look?“ All right, now let's 'see' your future in that direction. Take a look and see if you see your future in that direction, or see what you've tried to see in the past, or what you normally run into when you try to see your future. And now turn it red, then turn it blue. Then turn it green. Then turn it white. And then make it get bigger. Then make it get smaller.

I'm just giving you the exercise.

Now put it behind you. Now put it into shape of a corkscrew – and that's G-torsional future havingness now. And turn that purple, and then turn it black. And now put it down here at the corner of the lecture platform. Now tie it up into a bow and put it in a box with a lavender ribbon. Because that's not your future. That's a bunch of energy that you've gradually built up in an effort to predict the rate of change of havingness. You keep throwing toward rates of change of havingness a certain amount of energy and every single bit of this energy has the artificial and abstract mark on it: 'future'. And it's not future energy; it's present time energy.

And as we look down this track here we find out that finally the area of 'Z' gets solid and is very easily mistaken for the area of 'Y', and then that gets very easily mistaken for – because you see these are all solid objects – the area of 'X'. You see that?

So a psychotic, of course, becomes unable to differentiate on the rate of change of havingness because the future is solid; therefore the future is the present; and of course, the only real solidity there is is the past, so naturally it follows he must be in the past. And he is in the gradient scale of these particles which you – many of you... How many of you observed those particles, by the way? Quite a few of you, in other words. There... there is some direction there. Uh... there... there is a mass there somewhere. You just work it, just like you work any other item that you have around.

Uh... you... you have this... this? A lot of your preclears have this. Well, you... you've got this, then, a deposit. Now remember that that could be a 'not have' deposit. „In the future I won't have. In the future I won't have. In the future I won't have. In the future I won't have. In the f...“ and all of a sudden, why you haven't got it. You haven't got those particles. They're right there but you haven't got them. They all got a 'future' tag on them, and this says „This is the future and you are about to be butchered by this“ and you know you are perfectly in control of that mass of energy? That's yours. And by deducting that mass of energy you're doing the same thing as a mock-up, because you added that to this universe. Therefore, you're quite at liberty to subtract it.

Now there is where, evidently, your individual goes down tone scale and those levels on the tone scale could be mathematically adjudicated to be on the... units of energy which had become a solid deposit, with the label 'future' on them.

How many units of energy have a solid uh... that are in this solid deposit have the label of 'future' on them? And you get, then finally, how many... how many uh... units... how much mass is there there. You're down to 1.5. Boy, that 1.5, „Huh' The future's solid.“ He can't afford to not have in the future so all of his thinking is being devoted not to constructive

action as it goes forward, but very destructive action. And he is thinking all the time „Let’s see, I’m holding on to the present here. I’m holding on to the present. Well, I can hold on to the present“ – he’s demonstrated that to himself – therefore, all these not-haves, not-haves, not-haves, not-haves, – and anybody walks in ‘not-have’ – anybody walks up to him, he doesn’t want them. Anything else walks up to him he doesn’t want them. If he decides this, you see, he immediately takes hold of them. Reverse vectors – because he’s a great... he’s a victim of flows, so he winds up by having everything bad and everything good, and he says this is all future. And it’s solid mass.

So the future is solid. In Pogo, it says, „Which way is Tuesday?“ and he’s been told very, very emphatically, „Right in front of your face!“ Now that’s... that’s uh... quite pertinent.

Here we have, then, the ‘X, Y, Z’ where ‘Y’ would be your present time. And that’s why people begin to believe in linear time, and why their facsimiles begin to haul up and park in quote ‘present time’ because obviously the future is solid, so when you start to address the future, you’re addressing a solid object, obviously. And when you’re addressing this solid object called ‘the future’... You see, he devoted all this energy to thinking about the future, and all that energy is still there in the deposit. And the solidier that gets the more it gets like present time. And you’ll get these people saying, as they st... just start down the tone scale „Well, things’ll be pretty much the same in the future as they are now.“ Conservatism. „Everything’s going to be the same as it is now. Nothing’s going to change.“

What you’re... you’re going to have a rough time with these people unless you know what I’m telling you now. You’re going to have a rough time getting somebody to change a little bit. You’ll be puzzled as to why this preclear won’t change. Well, this preclear won’t change because this preclear can’t change because he knows he’s sitting right there looking at the future. If you were to put a meter on it you would find out that this future was uh... so many ergs of energy, and it was a deposit, and therefore it was a piece of matter. And when he becomes quite psychotic, that piece of ‘future’ has be... he becomes neurotic, the piece of future is the present, because the present is solid. And he... he has to think somewhere in that... that band there. He starts thinking with facsimiles, as I showed you on that graph, that wheel. He thinks with facsimiles; he doesn’t think with postulates.

He doesn’t think „Let’s see“; he doesn’t uh... he doesn’t even say this to himself: „Let’s see, how do I want things?“ No-no. That’s way up. He says, „There will be light. Umm, that’s nice: light. Umm-hmm, enjoy this motion for a while. Well, we can enjoy this. Let’s put some darkness in there,“ and there we go.

Now when he gets quite neurotic, the present time, the ti... the energy he’s devoted to present time and trying to keep everything stable in present time, he knows he can’t predict anything out here about the future because he’s got the future right here. And the more he changes these things which are right in front of his face, the more horrible things happen to him as he goes forward into – what future has he substituted for the future? He’s made a time deposit that is a havingness, right there in front of him, and then he tries to change that instead of changing his conditions. Because the conditions which he tries to predict along all eight dynamics demonstrate to him to convince him that they are unchangeable and that they’re

inevitable and that the gods do it and he doesn't do it and nobody does it, that the rate of change, the interrelationship is, of the eight dynamics, unchangeable – by him, but is inevitable and just continues anyway.

And that is a lot of balderdash, because a fellow can go out and change his future all over the place. It just depends on how much he wants to stay in contact with the existing eight dynamics of the MEST universe, that he will monitor and reduce his ability to change the future, or how much credence he wishes to give to other individuals that he refrains from changing future. And that's all there is to that. The future becomes a deposit and then that deposit becomes kind of solid, and it is, of course, in present time because it is a state that's solid and unchanging – it's a state of unchanging havingness.

And that goes into the past and the person has got facsimiles in restim and there he sits. And of course, he's got a piece of energy which he... he's got it all mixed up with energy that he says is future energy and this is past energy and it's already happened. That's agreement with the MEST universe.

Well, there's your... there is your dissertation on the tone scale. You can count, then, as a person goes down tone scale, that the future looks more and more unchangeable or solid to him, or inevitable, and that he can be defeated more and more and pain and penalty is more and more there, and desirability is less and less there.

So up tone scale the future looks desirable because he thinks he can change the rate of havingness. And the present becomes undesirable, gradually, as he finds he isn't doing it, and the past, then, takes on and absorbs his interest. And as he goes down tone scale you could say that the upper part of the tone scale is the next thousand years for man. The upper part of the tone scale would be the next thousand years and that would be merely the rate of change of havingness and not-havingness in the next thousand years of havingness.

And uh... there the band immediately below that would be the next dozen years. And the band below that would be this coming month. And then there'd be tomorrow. And then there'd be today. And all that's uncertainty. What's an uncertainty? An uncertainty is a 'maybe' and that's an indecision and that's a double flow. And what is a solid piece of matter? A matter is a solid piece of confusion and chaos, and this is double-vectored and, of course, matter itself is the biggest 'maybe' there is. Indecision. There is nothing travelling in one direction and there is nothing in alignment, that is chaos. An indecision is... is 'yes' going thataway, and 'no' going thataway, cancelling each other out and you don't get any action.

If you want to see your preclear in a big 'maybe', get him something in which he's very interested, first and foremost thing, and he's convinced concerning his... his liability for punishment, and uh... you've got yourself a mighty confused fellow.

Well as you go down tone scale, he begins to believe that pain-pain- pain-pain-pain, pain consists of force, and the heavier bands predominate on the lower part of the tone scale. Although all bands are there, all the pain is dominant.

Now this, then, uh... and up above that... you have to be up above a certain level, then, in order to obtain pleasure, or you have to obtain pleasure of the type that is on the band

and the experience of being in the band itself or the operating of the band for its own sake, and using force in it, is, of course, pleasure too. Very odd kind of pleasure.

In other words, there's a lot of pleasure in... in strangling somebody – 1.5 feels. 1.1 would take enormous joy out of the idea of... of uh... he might get an enormous amount of pleasure – he'd have to be interested first and have a conviction that he could do it in order to carry forward this action – in poisoning somebody very adroitly. And if they're... this person is high on aesthetic – a 1.1 and high on aesthetic... there could be a 1.1 low on aesthetic and a 1.1 high on aesthetic and so forth, and a 1.1 kind of null and neuter. There's where you get your randomness in personality. It's just which bands of perception and action will they use. Why, this 1.1 would put the poison in a rose and dip the rose into a wine glass as a touching little gesture so the lover could drink it all down. 1.1 could then say „Oh, dear! What has happened to you? Does your stomach hurt?“ Typical.

All right, then maybe you understand, then, that the past is solid and the present somewhat nebulously solid, and the future doesn't exist for the psychotic. 'Cause for the psychotic the past is solid, and that's the only solidity he's got. Why, he can't pervade any further than his immediate self environment, and that is solid energy. He has no pervasion any further than his own energy. He can't pervade out into any greater space than that, so he's dragged down in space, he's very, very centralized in himself, and there he goes. There you have it.

All right, your neurotic finds the present solid and every once in a while convinces himself it's solid by pinching himself. This he considers his conviction. And he's still enough under penalty... he's terribly under penalty so that he can be punished if he doesn't have this solidity in the present. And your person who is really sane, who is able to think, able to predict the rate of change or cause a rate of change of havingness or not-havingness, is, of course, handling the future. He can not only handle the past, he knows that; he can handle the present, and he can, of course, broadly handle the future, he thinks. And he's interested is doing so, interested in handling that future.

Now the volume of effort that he will put into the future depends upon his amount of interest in the future. So if you have a person on... high on the tone scale who is sitting on Mount Olympus doing absolutely nothing, and a person who is fairly high on the tone scale with terrific amounts of randomness all over the shop, still high on the tone scale, but in action with regard to the future, and you're getting a difference of what? You're getting a difference of rate of change for the individual.

Fellow on Olympus is at no different point on the tone scale. He just doesn't have as much interest in it as the fellow who is in action. And the interest doesn't happen to be psychotic or neurotic or anything of the sort. It doesn't matter what you're interested in or how much you're interested in it; it does matter how well you're able to handle something after you get interested in it.

That is the thing that parents find wrong with children. The child will be interested in chemistry and want a chemistry set. He's very interested in chemistry and he gets a chemistry set and he's still very interested in chemistry, but his ability to estimate the rate of change of havingness on the thing is kind of bad. And he starts to run into a not-have, the second he gets

this 'have.' And of course reverse vectors start to hit him and he's no longer interested in it. Hmmm!

Well, the parents say, well, he ought to continue and be constant in their interest. And the reason they ought to do so is because parents don't change, do they?

And they consider this a great virtue. Unchangingness is NOT a virtue, And you start to hit a society and change it too often in the field of objects, and it will rebel. But uh... you can change objects all over the place.

Some of the old-time pilots used to change objects from coast to coast and around the world and that sort of thing, and everybody was tremendously, vastly interested. Why? Well, the rate of change was very fast. And it was above their level of rate of change, and somebody seemed to be able to get rid of this, and away with this rate of change, so they got very interested in it. Why? Well, they... they wanted a higher rate of change themselves, but they didn't dare have a r... higher rate of change themselves. So they got very interested in that line.

Well, your old-time pilot could do that, but let's take somebody who starts changing very close to the static level. I... I've been shifting things around close to the static level like mad, by just the change of growth. Of course, an idea doesn't grow; you just get more and more certain on a certain level and it can be associated with rate of changes of havingness and not havingness more closely. And the first thing you know, you can either exist in the static level or you can exist in the energy flow level – either way. People get upset because you change ideas; in that level they get more upset, about it. They really get upset because they're looking at a static. They... they've got a ghostly idea that there must be a static there, 'cause it's theta, isn't it? And it's probably motionless. That's right; it's motionless.

But when it enters into the field of energy, it demonstrates the fact that it's not motionless and that there's a motion connected with it. They get very confused.

The one thing you're not supposed to do is change your mind. You can change almost anything else, but don't change your mind, for God's sakes! You'll find that in more banks!

Now, your tone scale, then, is also an estimation of how long it's going to take to change the future estimates of this individual. Of course, the lower on the tone scale, the longer it's going to take. Why? You take the same process, you're getting more and more factors entering into it which are varying the matter involved. The energy has turned into matter, to a large extent, and there we have it.

So, here, then, is perhaps a better understanding of what you're looking at when you look at the state of a preclear. He's trying to hold himself up by being interested in one dynamic maybe, or another dynamic. He isn't interested broadly in all the dynamics. You can lead him with interest into almost anything. You can! You can lead anything. You can lead nations to destruction. You can lead planets to hell and back with the loopiest subject matter imaginable so long as an interest level is maintained.

Let's take sound solid subject matter which is a very tight, close evaluation of the situation, and subtract the interest from it. Let's not make it colorful. Then your people who are really spinny don't pay any attention to it. Why? Well, they haven't got any interest in it be-

cause they can't associate that with something else, and they can only identify. And they can obey force and that's about all.

So, you can walk straight through a society and as long as you do not introduce anything interesting in the material, you can tear it to pieces. But you introduce something like '74 trillion years old', some magazine pick it up. It's interesting – it becomes interesting. That's truth. That'll go around. People will begin to wonder, „Well, that's nonsense!“ or „How's this?“ but they wonder why Time's printing it and so on, and get upset about this. You've introduced a level of interest.

Well, from that point on it can start to get uh... a little bit hectic because your interest level starts increasing. Well, boy, when interest level starts to increase, you had better be – as I once was not – very well located on a static as far as ideas are concerned. „You do so forth-and-so-and-so.“ In other words, the non-motion thing called an idea shouldn't be subject too much to change. And so you ought to have a good, broad, workable, precise body of knowledge which sits there and will sit there and which will endure and which is not subject to misinterpretation, because why? It has a workable, routine, easily understood application.

And the second you do this, then if you start stirring up interest in the society at large, interest, and you've got a static idea that society can shift. When I can say that a world can be led to hell and back with interest, you can package anything, no matter what garbage – anything – and cloak it in certain tones and it will be bought – without question!

Scholarly language is simply a method of toning up straight corn. People buy in the field of sciences, not knowledge or truth, they buy tone scale. And they feel that science should be at 3.0 on the tone scale. There is just that much estimation of the rate of change of havingness. „And whereas we don't take any real responsibility for this, it has occasionally been stated and so on...“ They buy tone scale.

The... is... this is, perhaps, not as... as completely hilarious to anybody as it is to a writer. A writer can look at this and it isn't something that amazes him. He's been doing this for a long time. „How does Professor Blink talk in the story?“ The writer knows. He establishes tone scales all over the place, up and down and back and forth and around and around. He has to, to have any randomness of characterization. He has to characterize people as people think they know people. A writer doesn't write about how people are; he writes about how people think people ought to be when they are written about.

Dialogue is not what people say, but the things people think people should say when written about. Highly conditional. And so we could get out a book under some guise by just – on any subject under the sun, any subject – and if it were properly written on the right level of the tone scale, believe me it could become THE tome on the subject. All you'd have to do is study style.

What the hell has an aesthetic got doing, walking in on knowledge? Beware of knowledge which is too well-dressed in an aesthetic. Knowledge is that thing from which you should be able to deduce, acquire and abandon aesthetics. If you are in a high level of truth, you can acquire or jettison aesthetics by the skillions, because to that interest may be added. But if you are in an aesthetic alone and you find there nothing but an aesthetic? 'Cause what is

a piece of writing but an aesthetic? Even... even though it appears in the *ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA* it has, or not has, a certain aesthetic balance.

Do you know that there's enormous room in this world for a good data encyclopedia? „How do you make penicillin? You make penicillin by...“ Not... not uh... uh... „in the early days of chemical research, it was suspected that, when certain bacteria were bacteriarized, they were so bacteriarized that the bacteriological bacteriazation took place almost instantaneously. But later on they found out they could drag it out a bit. And Professor Wumph said, although this is controverted by Professor Battleboof, that the earlier suppositions regarding this subject were not supported by the ancient Greek. Of course, when we have studied more deeply into this subject...“ You poor boob! You couldn't understand this subject. We have to interpret it for you, you boob! Uh... that's not in there in print. That's just there. Uh... when you get through you say, „How the hell do you make this stuff?!“

That used to torture me because I was manufacturing the wherewithal and the havingness in this society necessary to the production of Dianetics and Scientology and the study of the mind. There wasn't anybody else going to throw any money into this. I had to throw money into this, so I made the money to throw it into it.

Well, I ca... you can always make money. That... that's the easiest stuff in the world to make. Sometimes you get a little bit short. For a few weeks, why, you're chewing shoe leather or something uh... like Charlie Chaplain did when he ate his shoe, and so on. But uh... what the score is in any one of these aesthetics is that there's either data or there's an aesthetic.

Now if you simply sit there – you're not trying to teach Scientology, you're not trying to tell anybody about Scientology – but you are merely using Scientology either to put an industry on its feet or put preclears together, your rate of change of havingness and not-havingness to a large degree depends upon your aesthetic, not the exposition of your knowledge.

Your havingness and not-havingness, then, is changed by the interest level which is elicited towards you, and interest is invited by aesthetics, not by knowledge.

That's why there are so few who will ever learn this subject. Really, there are very few out of all the beings there are.

You can take this knowledge – if you know this knowledge well, you do not have to parade this knowledge. You can teach people the knowledge. If you do that, for God's sakes, just teach 'em data more or less like I do. The amount of interest that I've put into this is very minor – very minor really. Make a wisecrack once in a while, throw some randomness in – don't do very... very much. Give 'em data – tha... that's what's important if you're teaching.

But if you're practicing, don't give anybody any data at all. They say, „I hear that you think that so-and-so.“

And you say, „You do? Well, there's no accounting for people, what they hear. Now people,“ then you look at them searchingly, „people who have a great thirst for beauty and love and that sort of thing, often invite into themselves information of a kind which is...

they're afraid will be true. And do you know that they will often hold to themselves data that... for fear other people will be hurt by it?"

And the patient will look at you and say, „That's sweet!“

You... you look into this preclear's eyes and say, „Yes, you... you've had a thirst for human love, haven't you?“ I mean, you talk about obvious data. They jus... just take this tone scale and take a look at the girl. This tone scale is lying here under the blotter and you can only see in that direction, see. And it says... it says, „Apathy: Relatively uncontrolled anxiety...“ You wouldn't be able to talk to her uh... too much. Uh... here: „Capable of destructive action, psychotic, depository.“ „Oh, no. Let's get up higher. „Boredom: Relatively inactive but capable of action.“ She comes in, boy, is she a bored... a bored character. And uh... yet so-and-so and so-and-so. It's right cr... across the line. Put the aesthetic band on this thing: „Boredom: Normal, neurotic, halfway between, occasionally ill, susceptible to usual diseases.“

„Well, you've... you've often regarded yourself, I am sure, as average in health, haven't you?“

„Yes – yes I have!“

„Uh... and really your... your interest in life has vacillated to a large degree between indifference and boredom, hasn't it?“

„Well, that's... that's right.“

„Yes, I know. I know it very well that... how this thing is, 'cause life isn't very interesting, when it really comes down to that. One can certainly agree on that – it's terribly uninteresting. It's a terrible bore. Awful bore, isn't it? Dreadful.“

And they say, „Boy, you know this guy's right in there pitching with me.“ He just looks across and you're agreeing with him.

„Now you... you've felt this withdrawal from people for some time. haven't you?“

„How'd you know I withdrew from...?“ „Well...“ „I really don't, you know. It's just that they bore me.“

„Well, that's right. But people are very uninteresting. One can't be blamed for that, can one?“

„No, no!“

Uh... now we'll go along here... „Uh... the routine ordinary humdrum life that one leads is, of course, a good safeguard against all this.“

„Yes, I've found it so.“

Agreement, agreement, agreement... Let's just go right across the boards here and we find out that uh... „Disinterest in procreation; vague tolerance of children.“ Huh! In other words, you can just make it up – „Insincere, careless of facts.“ Well, what do you know? You're talking to a 2.5. Careless of facts.

You say, „Well, the appointment began at 2:30“ – it didn’t. The appointment began at 3:15. They’ll say, „All right, it began at 2:30,“ – doesn’t matter – „, and it continued until 5:30“ – they’re not interested in anything. And these people, of course, are very easy to take things away from so you simply say, „Well, that fee for this session now...“ patting them sympathetically on the hand a little bit, but not as sympathetically as you’d pat somebody way, way down tone scale here, see. You really pat somebody down around... pat a 1.5 on the hand sympathetically some time. They just go „Slurp“; they’re Just people who have driven away every possible thing that they really want, and you show them a little bit of sympathy „Well, It’s pretty rough, carrying the world on your back kind of, you know? And getting things along and trying to get people to do things. Overcoming these various inertias and so on. That’s pretty rough. Yeah.“

Oh, boy! That guy will just empty out his soul in great big coal buckets. Why you...

But you’re not interested in that to any great degree. But is... what is the aesthetic? The aesthetic isn’t knowledge, it’s putting it to use. And it’s the amount of interest which we’ll be given to you because you know. And that’s about all there is to it.

When doing mock-ups, you find in following this material along and in matching up the interest in aesthetics of people, and keeping them marching on up that your cases wall keep advancing.

This chart can help you and I hope this data about Time helps you an awful lot, because it’s going to help an awful lot of people if you use it. Let’s take a break. (TAPE ENDS)