THE "Q": HIGHEST LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE

A lecture given on
2 December 1952

This is December second, first hour, night class, and we have tonight the first lectures on the axioms.

We have the axioms more or less accumulated in Advanced Procedure and Axioms, and in the Handbook for Preclears. Advanced Procedure and Axioms is the later issue. There's a whole rundown of axioms. There's about two hundred and ten axioms.

These axioms are divided into the logics and in axioms, now; logics and axioms. All right. Why do we have this division? It's because the logics apply, and seemed to apply at the time, to a behavior level of thought which was persistent and consistent and didn't necessarily apply to Homo sap—sapi—sapiens. Excuse me, Homo sap. It didn't necessarily apply to him. But the axioms themselves as listed in Advanced Procedure and Axioms and Handbook for Preclears apply to Homo sapiens. That's why they're in that group.

For Homo sapiens every thought is preceded by a counter-effort. Now, that's one level of thinking. That's to some degree stimulus-response thinking.

That's not true of a thetan. And so the logics as listed in Advanced Procedure and Axioms apply generally to thought, thought and its behavior in any activity. And the axioms, I say, apply peculiarly to Homo sapiens. So let's pay, then, attention on these logics and axioms, particularly to the logics. And then let me tell you that there is a thing above the logics. And that's what I'm going to talk to you first about.

There is a series, a whole series, numbering about five, something like that, above the level of logic and above the level of axiom. Now just for pure cussedness, I've been calling these things the "Qs," just— just for orneriness; just the letter Q. a mathematical symbol which maybe stands for quotient, and maybe it stands for quatrain, and maybe it stands for quarantine. We're not interested in that. We'll just call them the Qs, just a mathematical designation to differentiate them from other things.

Actually, Q can be defined this way: It is the level from which we are now viewing, which is a common denominator to all experience which we can now view. This is the level from which we're viewing all experience, and which does, by the way, act as a common denominator to all this experience, and the Q is the highest level from which we're operating. This data then, these Qs, would stand behind everything else that we do.

And the first one of these and its corollaries would stand as something—you know Liberty magazine puts a good picture, they used to put four stars, give it importance, and in books they very often underscore and put things in italics. Well, you want to put this first Q in italics, about—in your auditing, this is in your auditing—you want to put it in italics about 125 feet tall and then put ten to the twenty-first power binary digits of asterisk after it. Because it took a long time to get this one, but what you can do with it is phenomenal, is nothing short of phenomenal, what you can do with this Q. And that of course would be the definition, the knowable level of definition now, of theta. And we can say, then, that the highest activity which we now reach is selfdeterminism in these terms: Self-determinism of theta is the ability to locate, in space and time, energy and matter, and to create space and time with which to create and locate energy and matter. That's number one.

Now, we ought to have a very good idea what this means. Can state it another way. Let's take, let's take self-determinism. We know that the more selfdetermined we make a preclear, why, that's fine. He gets better. His self-determinism keeps rising, he gets better and better and better. All right, that's fine. Then what is the limit which we can now attain on something

which probably has no limit? And what limit can we attain and define with accuracy? And then, having attained it and defined it, how can we apply it, and will it apply? All right.

Now that means, then, that here you have something which has—that's theta. See, it has no wavelength; it has no position in space, any space; it has no position in time. It hasn't any form, it hasn't any shape, but it has an individuality for the individual and it has its own ability to be its own beingness, and it can locate things in space and time. And when I say things I mean energy and matter. It can not only do that, but it can create space, in time, in order to create energy and matter. Now, it can do all of those things. Then, therefore, our Q is a potential. You could call it a capability.

Now, I won't say how many other capabilities theta has, but in this universe or in the universe which you create we know it has those capabilities. We're sure of this. This is a good anchor to windward, this is a brick wall, this is a fortress, this is stuff. This is really good!

Now, a datum is just as good to an individual as it's workable. It's no better than that. Even though it were going to be addressed to the aesthetic world, even though it were going to be addressed to aesthetics, does it produce an aesthetic effect? That means it's workable. So don't get workable down there with digging ditches.

Will it do what we're supposed to be able to do with it? Now, will it do these things or won't it do these things? When we make that statement

about theta, we follow that thing out, we say, "All right, this is the theory; let's now see if, with it, we can predict the existence of new phenomena which when looked for will be found to exist." And sure enough, sure enough this predicts data. It predicts phenomena and if you use it in auditing, it keeps increasing the individual capability up, up, up, up, up with a very sure, good, solid gain. So far, there have been no exceptions to this. It's not a variable then, it's a constant.

Now, this isn't everything that theta can do. This only says, this only says that we know for sure, from the plane we're operating on, that theta could have or does create the space and energy and matter which is the MEST universe, and can move the energy and matter around in the MEST universe, and that, at the same time, it can create space and energy to make another universe. We know these two conditions exist. We can see those existing and we can experience them.

And actually, for man, a datum is just as good as he can experience it. And if he can experience a datum very broadly it could be said to be a good, usable, workable datum. And if he—we might have some thundering, fundamental, capital-T truth here.

We might have some terrific truth and it could be stated, it could be stated by "X plus Y over the square root of the minus Zed equals cats' tails."

You say, "Cats' tails? I don't have much to do with cats' tails."

And you would say, "Well, that's the truth behind cats' tails. X plus Y over the square root of minus Zed. Humph."

You say, "Well, so what?"

But you say, "Look, man searched for this answer as far as cats' tails were concerned; this applies not only to Persian cats but to Siamese, and not only to Siamese but to alley cats." No workability.

It doesn't matter how true the datum is, then. It's how well can you make it work and how much work will it do for you? Well, this datum, this datum is really a nice big draft horse. It's

a big super— superengine sitting in the local power station. It's atomic power. This thing—this thing, you can make things like—you can make things like, oh, I don't know. You could even make little things. You can even make small, unimportant and nonpowerful things like H-bombs with it. Because compared to it they're not the same order of magnitude.

What are you talking about? You're talking about this phenomenal thing, this phenomenal thing which actually has an existence.

How do we know it has an existence? Because you get a preclear up the line and all of a sudden he says, "Hey!" He's been telling you all the time— he's retreated into space to such a degree that he's dispersed, so he keeps telling you, "I'm not in space anyplace." Well, you know where he is, he's got to be collected before he can find the space he's in, in order to get out of that and get into his own space so he can get out of that and not be in any space.

Well, here he is, here he is, then, thoroughly collected; and then he controls space and then he, all of a sudden he'll say, "Hey, isn't this wonderful, there's no space around here." Otherwise he'll say, "Well, I don't think I'm there at all. Really I'm probably, probably out, I'm probably outside this universe." No, you don't want that. The guy discovers this as a wonderful datum—there's no motion, there's no space where he is. It's very comfortably so. No motion, no space. You say, "Make some space."

He'll say, "Okay," zing, zing, "there's a space."

"Now unmake it."

"Why?"

"Well, go ahead, unmake it."

"Why?" The guy says, "Why should I? I just put something in it! Hey, you know, that's very interesting, you know. That's very interesting."

Skip it. I mean, you're not going to be able to audit this boy. That's no kidding.

Of course, of course that is so high above any preclear you'll ever find, and don't ever let one get away with it, because he's w-a-a-y up there! He's way up there.

He'd be so able that he could actually mock something up that was brighter and shinier and had greater workability than this stuff, which is kind of old and messed-around with, and kind of stale and mildewed and it's—it's sad too. This stuff is sad. It says, "Here I have been serving you and we were built for you and you can use this universe and we have given our all to help you out, and so on. And we built all this for you and you must be careful how you use it," and so on, and so on. That's a fact.

You'll find preclears way down tone scale dramatizing this as auditors. You just get them to have the beautiful sadness of being the last auditor on earth. They're way down tone scale, can't get out of their bodies, they—nothing is so, but they're auditing like mad, and you give him, "Now get the beautiful sadness of being the last person on earth. Nobody else here, you freed everybody. Now get the beautiful sadness of everybody going away and the last couple of preclears looking at you and saying, 'Well, goodbye, I'm sorry we couldn't take you with us. ' Now get the beautiful sadness of that; and get that little statue, the small statue there that they made of you, and so on, and you can sit there and look at that statue while the others are all gone free. "

He'll say, "Yes. Hey, wait a minute!" he says, "This is the way I feel!"

Well, that's the way MEST feels if you really start penetrating and plopping around in it. It's interesting stuff. Well, anyway—of course you can make it feel anyway you want to. But it does have a native feel.

All right, your Q produces your universes along very definite lines, such as the MEST universe. Or it produces universes of completely ephemeral lines, or it doesn't produce a universe at all; self-determinism. But in order to produce a universe you first would have to be able to pretty well handle a universe. And a universe can be patterned to have eight dynamics; this one is. But you could have a universe with eighty-two dynamics, sixteen dynamics, and square-root space. What's square-root space? I don't know. I never made any square-root space. I've made cube-root space, and logarithmic space, but logarithmic space is a lot of fun. Let me tell you about logarithmic space—gee, does a guy get fouled up traveling in logarithmic space! Wonderful!

There's twisted space too. You can make twisted space. You can make all these, anything you can draw a mathematical symbol for, you can make that kind of space. Furthermore, you can experience that kind of space, which is better than you can do with a mathematical formula. And it's quite interesting to make some space, and experience it and so forth.

Yeah, well, anyway, getting back to earth again, we have—we have, then, this as our highest level of attack. This is above the level of survival; it is above the level of beingness. It is way above the level of action. Oddly enough, it's above the level of identity, as such. But it is way up at the top level of individuality.

People have had the idea that when you got up there along top—of course, you know you have to kind of get up there a little bit and take a look to see anything much higher, and people have had the idea that this—there was just a main body of theta and everybody became one when you got to the top of the tone scale. Fortunately, that isn't true.

Yeah. But you go down tone scale and everybody becomes one and the oneness is MEST. And there's no individuality whatsoever in MES.T. This chair does not care who lifts it around. Doesn't matter who lifts it around, could be a member of the Fifth Invader Force, or you or me or anybody. It doesn't matter. Somebody could jump in here from any place under the sun and move the chair around. It doesn't say "Excuse me," it doesn't say "I hurt." It is "the true brotherhood of the MEST universe." It's a brotherhood. It's gone to a point, though, where it doesn't even wear a badge.

But it has an identity. This is a chair. And not only that, this is the chair that stands on this lecture platform, and it is a black chair, and I don't even think it would know if we named it, if we named it Mehetabel. But we could call this "the chair named Mehetabel." There it is.

And I notice after I let it sit there that it just sits there. It didn't get up. It didn't say—it didn't adjust itself back to where it was before. It didn't do anything at all. I could come over here and kick this chair a little bit. Did it say "ouch?" Maybe it felt "ouch." I don't know that, but it didn't say "ouch." It's just an identity, with no individuality.

Individuality depends upon being able to make identities. And what do you know about a little kid? He runs around, he's Buck Rogers, he's—in the old days he was Jesse James; in the days before that he was Dick Turpin or somebody else. I imagine once upon a time there, all little kids were running around being Richard the Lionhearted, and earlier than that they were all rushing around being Merlin, or earlier than that, why, God knows! I imagine in Rome the little kids ran up and down with—without even wooden swords in their hands, being Julius Caesar. But they'd be Julius Caesar this afternoon and Tiberius tomorrow and Caligula the next day. They didn't care how many identities. But if you asked this little kid, "Are you an individual?" Oh, boy! He sure was.

The mostest individuality he ever has in Homo sapiens' lifespan is when he's a little kid. His concept of dignity when he is a small child is something that would completely ruin some of

the elderly matrons who chuck it under the chin and say, “Itsy-bitsycoochie-woo.” This kid looks at them—looks could kill!

Now, here, then—here, then, we’re talking about an ultimate individuality that is attainable. And when I say ultimate I don’t mean absolute. There’s probably a lot of individuality left as we go up from there, probably a lot of it. There’s probably a lot of other things that can be done.

I know of three frames positively outside this universe. There’s a universe outside this universe, and there’s a universe outside that and its set of universes, and there’s a universe outside that universe. And I know of the one beyond that. And it’s not necess—they’re not necessarily getting thinner or more unsubstantial but they don’t run according to the same laws. E=mc2 won’t work in them. That is not a native characteristic of energy. It just happens to be.

Now, this universe might be called—it could be that this MEST universe is the inevitable average of agreement, the inevitable average of illusion. If you—if you had a bunch of people and they kept mocking up illusions and mocking up illusions, and agreeing and agreeing, you might say that it would become the inevitable average of this agreement amongst illusions. Now, I wouldn’t know that that holds good, but it happens that it might happen over such a long—the long periods of time, that’s horrible. It might happen over such a large mass as the MEST universe. The MEST universe is a large mass, not a long time.

Now, there being a large mass, this might have come into being because of that. I don’t know that. But I do know—I do know that I have already seen enough of universes to know that they don’t run on the same laws. That’s very, very astonishing. And I do know that every individual is perfectly capable of making one. While I don’t say that it has to be just a little tiny one that you’d keep in a jewel box or anything of the sort, it could be probably pretty big.

How many universes could you have in the available universes? Of course the number is infinity. This MEST universe, being a postulated dimension which you agree upon, could very easily—if we’re speaking of dimension, you have a postulated dimension, all you’ve got to do is change its space coordinates just a little bit and it can sit right there. If you see—the space can’t even be coincident. You get—the truth of the matter is you can’t even talk about one piece of space crossing another piece of space, in view of the fact that space is a postulated agreement. And if space is a postulated agreement, the only way you could get one piece of space sitting across another piece of space would be a very simple thing: You could have a fellow say, “Let’s see, up is, front is and width is, but width is also up here at forty-five degrees, and up is slightly down to the left, and this is width.” And he’s got those two sections of space simultaneously.

Now, wouldn’t he be in horrible shape! He’s got two sections of space simultaneously and he’s trying all the time he’s got these two sections, these two pieces of dimension—you see, the only reason they’re scrambled is because he’s on a maybe. And then maybe he has a space that he calls time and he keeps shoving this space he calls time around. Of course, it doesn’t go anyplace. And he’s all fouled up on the subject of time but he’s got another space that kind of introduces itself on him all the time.

What do you know, that’s your preclear He doesn’t know, he doesn’t know any difference really between MEST universe space and his own universe space. He’s never differentiated between the two. He’s still holding on to the one and trying to view the other. People who have directional reversals, people who do the darndest things with regard to space, it’s fascinating: You—some person will go out and he’ll look at the stars and he sees the heavens in three dimensions, just as nice as you please. Well, he’s got a pretty good idea of space. And the thing about it is, is he will tell you which is the furthest star, which is the further star. And you’d check it up on your maps. It isn’t the brightness of the star that measures its distance because some of the very bright stars are quite far away and some of the dim stars

are quite close. And he'll just say, "Well, that star is quite a distance and then all those other stars are way behind that. I can see that from where I am." You could say he couldn't possibly have that small a parallax and still be able to measure it. Couldn't possibly. And yet you look it up on an astronomy chart, what he's just told you, and you get the same dimensions.

Now, with this you get an approximation of what he was trying to tell you. Yeah, those—that bright star is further than those two dim stars. They see depth in space. Well, they'd—they'd have a pretty good concept of the dimensions of this universe if they were doing something like that.

The other fellow goes out and, gee, some of those stars appear to be floating about a foot above his head; he just doesn't have any distance to those stars at all and they're all flat. And somebody else goes out and they're all tipped some other way, he can see plainly that the heavens run off that way and he goes, "As you get further to the south, why, they're going up." Maybe you'd observe this closer if you'd just ask a few people how stars look to them. And if you ask them searchingly they will tell you that there is a difference in observation of space, which is the only point I'm making here. There's differences.

What's this got to do with auditing? Well, it has really everything to do with auditing. You will notice (give you a practical example of this) I have consistently with mock-ups told people to move it to the right, to move it to the left, to put it above their heads, behind their backs and under their feet. I've told them put it a distance from them, bring it close to them. Told them to put it out in the street, up on the wall, here, there. What am I doing? I'm changing the position of an object in space. And it is more important to change the position of the mock-up in space than it is to change its color or anything else. Location in space, and that starts up and becomes about the high—a high-level function in processing, then, because why? The effort, the effort and thought of your preclear is to attain self-determinism and self-determinism could be said to be an effort to attain the goals of theta.

And the goals of theta which we can observe (and it maybe has many more goals) is to locate energy and matter in space and time; and to locate additionally (quite in addition) and create space that you can locate energy and matter in. So when we start in with processing, why, we be very sure that we're relocating all the time.

What's the biggest trouble he has, the first little trouble you run into with a pc? He can't move it around. This surprises him a great deal. He knows you need ten-ton trucks, winches, chains, everything else to move something.

Well, now, we'll have to take up time later on, but time is a quite finite and very, very easily understandable thing so let's not stress time right at here, at this point.

Let's take that as a goal level of theta. This means, then, in processing to restore self-determinism you make your strongest effort (actually your only effort) the attainment of the goals of theta; and the goals of theta are its capabilities. Capability is theta. Q1: Theta is—no wavelength in it, no position in time and space, has no mass, has no duration, hasn't any one of these things, but it has the potential or capability of locating in space and time, energy and matter, and creating, creating space in which to create energy and matter. And that's—it's all there are to it.

Now, that's—how did anyone get to any such a conclusion? Then you'll, you'll watch this work. You'll watch this work with a deadliness that you will begin to wonder, "For God's sakes what have I got my hands on here?" every now and then. Because actually it—you're working all out.

Now, someday I'll find a higher Q or you will or somebody else will. They can do something out and beyond and broader than that. And when that is attained, why, we'll have another big surge forward in capabilities.

But this Q about which I am telling you now was a goal. I said that there were several echelons and that we were going through the second echelon of knowledge with Effort Processing. And we're slightly into the fringes of a third echelon. Well, we just busted through the roof of the third echelon. Now, what lies in the fourth echelon? I don't know.

But I know that visible and usable, and for the first time really satisfactorily usable on a broad level, is this Q 1, because with this, the second you start using this your preclear stops asking that inane question. This question is something. It becomes very hard to understand this question, that anybody would ask this question; but they say, "Why are we here? What is the reason for all this?"

You say, "Reason, that's point zero, about—point about fifteen zeros one five or something like that, wavelength, capability, perception, reason, I mean, so on, reason . . . What are you talking about?"

And he'll say, "What is the reason? What—when I—what—what's the reason? I mean, why are we here?"

"Well, you mean," you say, "prior cause. Oh, you mean there must be a prior cause in this universe?"

"No, no, no, why are we here?"

And you say, "What do you mean by 'Why are we here?' "

"Well, just that. Why are we here?"

You say, "What do you mean by that?"

"Well, I want the reason why we're here."

"Well, look, look," you say—reason has to do with associative processes. Now, if you could associate anything you would eventually find the association coming back to the same point you left. And you could keep going around in this circle, or you could make a spiral out of it, anyway you want to. But when you say the reason for something, you're asking for a gradient scale of data. So if you've got a gradient scale of data, it takes a space and a time in which to have a gradient scale of data. And this can go round and round this way. Don't ask about the gradient scale of data in a space and a time because it'll wind up with itself always. It can never do otherwise.

Your reason applies to one universe at one time. You would apply reason. Now, you have to—before you can have a reason you have to have a rationale. You have to have—have to have a cause.

And when they say, "What is the reason I'm here?" they're talking about, "Now look. There's— you well know there is a cause prior to cause." Oh, the Greeks got around this. They did a beautiful job, did a beautiful job of this whole thing. They said, "Well, now. . ."

Well, I could probably tell you about a much better one than the Greeks. This Hindu, I've mentioned this occasionally in a lecture, the Hindus, they had an awful time. The priests were asked and asked and asked, "What's the world like?"

They finally said, they finally said, "Well, the world is a hemisphere," and people were satisfied with that.

And they finally said to the Hindus, "What's the hemisphere sitting on?"

And they said, “Well, this hemisphere’s sitting on—humm ! “ And they went and did a big study and they came back and they said, “The hemisphere is sitting on seven pillars.”

That held them for a while and then some wiseacre, some revolutionary went in and busted the whole thing up and he says, “What are the pillars sitting on?”

And well, the fellow said, the priest said, “Sitting on elephants, they’re sitting on the backs of seven elephants.”

“Oh?” Well, that stalled off the mental, intellectual revolution probably for many centuries until some wiseacre finally says, “Hey, you know, I wonder what those elephants are standing on?” And he came back and he says to the priests, “What are the elephants standing on?”

And the priests had it already and they’d already

figured this out, see, and they’re just waiting for this and they had it all answered, and they said, “The elephants are standing on a mud turtle and it’s—and the mud turtle is sitting on mud and it’s mud from there on down.”

That finished off that one.

The early Greek tried to get around it: He kept talking about the Prime Mover Unmoved, Prime Mover Unmoved. He had a very MEST-y concept of all this. He said if you have a universe, then you’ve got somebody who made the universe. Well, who made the fellow that made the universe? Never occurred to him that it might be that the fellow who made the universe didn’t have to be made. That would be just as reasonable as the other, you see.

But, when people are asking for the reason and prior cause, they’re asking for something earlier on the time track. And of course, a time track would always be a finite length, so someplace this time track started. And if you’re going to explain to them the reason why, you’ve always got to have a prior cause. And it doesn’t matter how far back you go, you’re going to go around this way on prior causes and the only inevitable place you will wind up is just where you started. And you can take any rationale, you can take any subject and you can explain it circularly. You can always explain it circularly and even though you are apparently taking off a big chunk of knowledge and you are moving it forward for people to look at very nicely, you’ve got a circle. Only you just haven’t carried it all the way out here and all the way out here and brought it all the way around here and locked it up here again.

So we could do, for our purposes here—for this universe you have a circle, and this circle is a very interesting circle of reason. And this applies only to this universe. And that starts out here.

And let’s say that we’re going this way, and down this way you have inductive thinking. That goes that-a-way. Now let’s look around the other way and let’s say we have deductive thinking.

And you know what those are. One is you get a pile of data together, deductive thinking is you get this big mass of data and you go out and you hire a lot of pack rats, and you hire all kinds of people and you just have them haul in data. And they haul in data the way we were having heads hauled in there today. And they keep hauling in data and hauling in data and they keep mounding it up in big piles and there’s somebody sitting there coordinating the data, coordinating the data, coordinating the data, and trying to learn something from coordinating all this data. That is deductive thought.

And they finally get enough of these data related, and so they’ve got the data related and they come to an inevitable conclusion through having observed all collected data. That’s one way of doing it.

Here's the other way of doing it. These are both extremes. This is a philosophic method. The philosophic method goes along this line. It says, "You know, I guess so-and-so and so-and-so and so-andso." And the fellow looks around to see if there's any data to support this and finds there's one or two, says, (snap!) "Well, that's all right." Otherwise, no.

Inductive reasoning comes a cropper very easily because most of your ancients, you take somebody like—let's take, let's take modern ones, let's take the repeal of Ohm's Law. Yeah, Hegel was a very interesting boy. The—Piazzi went out and discovered by the way an eighth planet and the same day practically that he announced the discovery of the eighth planet, Hegel had written a book proving that because seven was a perfect number, there could only be seven planets. And so Piazzi's discovery of the eighth planet was like to get lost in the intellectual world because they accepted Hegel. Seven was a perfect number, they thought, in that bracket. I mean that's that, ah-na-na, this is all, hm-hm! And you come along and you say to them, "Hey, why don't you go out and take a look at least at this universe?" And they wouldn't have understood that.

Science came into being on this other route: deductive. They got so fed up with the repeal of Ohm's Law and the lack of cooperation here. Practically every one of Newton's laws has been thrown into the ash can by so-called philosophers in the past. I mean—and people were more likely to accept it. They'd sit around and they'd say, "Well now, let's see, let's see, on the banks of the Nile there are crocodiles. Ah, yes, there are crocodiles on the banks of the Nile. That's a lovely word, crocodile. Here are all these jars on the banks of the Nile. The crocodile therefore is inanimate."

You say, "That's completely non sequitur." Well, so it is. But they take crocodile and they say a crocodile must have been named because of crocks, so that proves that a crocodile is inanimate and therefore crocodiles don't move.

Explorer comes back in and he says, "I was down on the banks of the Nile and there's—there's this little child down on the banks of the Nile, and this great big crocodile jumped off the bank and was about to work his way "

"Wa-a-ait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. We know you're lying because crocodiles can't move."

"Well, why can't they move?"

"Well, it's out there in that latest philosophic text, and so forth, that crocodiles sit on the banks of the Nile motionlessly." And he proves it conclusively.

So inductive logic came into disgrace and science made a terrific leap forward by insisting that it be real, and when they said real they meant "Does it compare with this universe?" And they went out and they compared all their data to this universe, and then they come a cropper too. They come to an extreme. They gather data, and gather data, and gather data, and they take fifty million monkeys and set them down to fifty million typewriters, or something of the sort, and they think if you wrote for fifty million years you would eventually come out with all this stuff.

No, I'm afraid that thinking takes about half of each. You get an inductive idea. You say, "You know that sort of looks like it's so," and you push that around a little bit and you find some data there. And you say, "You know, that ought to predict a whole lot of data." All right, it looks like data in this field, therefore let's sort through all the data in this field and see if it comes back to that same conclusion. Does it? (snap!) Okay, it does. That's all we want to know. That's plenty.

So here you could say that we're working from all data and over here one datum. You have a map of logic. You're working over here from all data in this universe and you've got yourself

a whole circle, so it goes from one datum and it keeps on winding right straight back to this datum here.

Now, the usability of one of these circles is as good as it encompasses. And you've actually got to step out of this time circle, because that's a time circle, in order to get anyplace and look at anything very broadly.

You've got to get off of this "why." "Why" means "What is the cause of it?" And you say, "What is the cause of it? Well, the cause of it is—oh, you mean what made it? Well, all right."

And this guy says, "Well, what made what made it? And then what made what made what made it?" And you just back up and you get all the whole world, everything in the universe, all this pile of data, everything that's in the universe, is right next door to one datum.

Now, if you get that one datum, and if that one datum would evaluate everything over here, you have an expanded circle about as big as one universe can take.

And now supposing we're embracing a lot of universes. They're disrelated in times, they're disrelated in location, characteristics, and everything else. How in the name of common sense would you relate them? Well, here you would get something that would look like this. There, there, there are circles, there, there are circles. And each one of those is one of these circles, see, it's that one and that one and . . .

Well, you want to get these things adjusted around until they all coincide here. What's there? Now, you have three or four, three or four disrelated piles of data with which to evaluate a datum. Now, you say this one datum explains all of these, and here from this one datum you've got to be able to make all this data, and for each one of these circles of logic there's got to be an all data circle.

And then you can evaluate this one by this one by this one by this one. Your minimum number of this is two. You have two. That'd be the minimum number. But it's just like, you can't take a navigational position on which you can count even vaguely unless you have three lines. It takes a third line to check two lines, so let's put this in terms of navigation and we'll take three and we'll have—there's its wheel and its wheel and its wheel. What's there? Is that still there? Yeah, that's Q 1.

Q 1 evaluates the data of any universe. You don't have to have specialized data. And you see, we fortunately have a large number of universes available, have a very large number of universes available.

Available to you right now, you have the MEST universe and your own universe. You also have somebody else's universe available, somebody's universe as far as logic is concerned, and so forth, so you've got three universes. You've got the data I'm giving you; that's a universe. You've got the MEST universe; not order of magnitude, what I'm giving you is far more important. And you've got your own universe. And of these three the most important one is your own because you can be certain of it. Mostly because you can be a hundred percent in control of it. And if you just start working up to a hundred percent in control of this universe, these two other universes fall into line as a category.

And what's standing there at the venter of the three universes is that datum, the capability of theta.

That's a theoretical capability, it's not something on which you can chew. It's not something on which you can feed the dog or advertise, or anything of this sort. It isn't something which traditionally they say "sense, measure, or experience." That's very great: sense, measure, or experience. It's a good thing that experience is sitting there, because you can experience it. You can experience it with your own universe, and as you go on up the line—as you go well

on up the line you start to experience it very broadly. You would experience it more and more broadly and all of a sudden you'd say, "Well, I don't know what capability I might be able to obtain but I certainly have this low level capability of being able, this kindergarten stuff, of being able to manufacture, in any space, energy, matter, objects, and manufacture space in which to have energy and objects. I can do that, that's very simple, nothing much to that. I wonder what's above that level?"

Well, as long as a fellow is sitting using energy in a MEST object in the MEST universe, where everything is very nicely interdependent in such a degree that he has to talk in terms, and can only talk in terms, of action and symbols for objects, now to try to go up and explain a nothingness. . . You see? Because it isn't a nothingness.

Theta is not a nothingness. It just happens to be an exterior thing to this universe so you couldn't talk about it in this universe's terms, that's all. But as far as this universe's terms are concerned, we can define it. And that is just a little bit of a triumph, to tell you the truth.

How did this thing get located? Well, once upon a time, sitting down in Phoenix, and I was monkeying around, and I knew there was something there; I kept bumping into it.

You know the two-dimensional—story of the two-dimensional worms? There's a two-dimensional plane and these two-dimensional worms go running around and living on this two-dimensional plane and having a perfectly wonderful time and they're running around, and one day one of them runs into a pole. Crunch. And he says, "No pole there."

So I went off and sat down for a while and said, "You know, there isn't any pole there, couldn't be any pole there, no pole there." But of course, I'm a professional pole-looker-forer. I have a mania. When I get bruised or something or other on some pole it's a personal affront (it isn't just a matter of calm orderly discovery) that a pole could be there without getting my permission for it.

That's the way almost anybody feels, by the way. That a pole could be there without getting your permission—that's an insult. There's only one thing you can do about it and that's go back over and look at the thing. And I passed right over the ground again and there was no pole there.

Well, I turned around and I came back and I ran square on into it and took a good look at it.

Now, here was the funny thing, here was the funny thing. I started to examine—I started to examine facsimiles and I found out that electronic flows were generated by facsimiles. Now, I was waving a few meters and cathode-ray tubes around in the air and I was doing a very Einsteinesque, who has only—"The observer has the right to look at a meter and no other right." He can observe, he preferably would stand with a blank everything in front of him except a hole, and that hole would be on the needle of the meter. And the only thing he's got any right to say or see or do anything else is just that meter, and the number on it that he reads. Now, that's the way you have to do this stuff. You have to limit it down with terrific severity.

Well, I—very good boy, I sat there, I read ohmmeters and cathode-ray tubes, and E-meters and so on and it was just becoming more and more obvious. So I one day said, "I wonder if—ha, that's a funny thing, I wonder if—you know, you should be able to get a dc flow. Yeah. All right, let's get a dc flow. (snap.t) Hmm . What do you know. " And I said, "Well, you can take an old facsimile here and an old facsimile there and you can put these two things in proximity and if you put them in close enough proximities you can get a trickle of electricity going across the terminals, isn't it nice? And it measures on a cathode-ray tube, now isn't that fascinating? Ha!"

Well, that's fine. That's what facsimiles are for and that's one of the reasons we have experience. All right, now let's go on a little bit further than that. Now, can you take this

current and start reversing it? Zing, zing, zing, zing, zing, zing, zing, zing, zing, zing, zing, yup, yup! And all of a sudden it starts to speed up, and what do you know? It reads on an ac meter. And you say, "That—that's wonderful! Look, man is basically an ac generator."

Well, now let's just go just a little bit further than this and let's look this over real good, and let's see if we can't get a condenser action. Now, if we can get a condenser action, we're smack, Mac. And so I set it up to get a condenser action by holding and getting the preclear to hold one facsimile there and to hold another facsimile there, and not let them discharge in any way or shape or form, just hold them there. I don't care if it requires two hours, I don't care if it requires six hours, if it requires twelve hours, let's hold those two in place and not let them vary even vaguely.

And of course, you do it for a very short time and those facsimiles go boom! It's just inevitable. You could set those things up just as nice as you please.

What you're getting there, you're getting—you've got one facsimile here and one facsimile here and you insist on them not going together, and of course there's a flow already established which is trying to drive them together, so you just insist on that staying there. And sometimes you have to hold it there for a couple of hours, but if you hold it there long enough, you will eventually get it going flash! right in your face.

It's a very fascinating experiment. Leave it to somebody else to make future experiments; it gives you a cold. It blows your nose up and explodes a ridge or two in your face.

Well, I already knew from running incidents on the track that facsimiles could explode. This was fairly simple. Now another datum wandered in. You could put a mock-up up there, you could put a— imagine an aesthetic scene of some sort and it would get dark. And you could put another aesthetic scene up and it'd get dark, and you put another aesthetic scene up it would get . . .

You say, "Hey, wait a minute. You mean the guy's discharging himself onto these aesthetic scenes. It's just as nice as you please. Isn't that fascinating! "

Discharge, discharge, and he keeps wiping the scenes off and he puts another scene there and he wipes that off and he puts. .. Well, what do you know? Now, wait a minute. If you took that scene, is that scene really an electronic scene? All right. Let's find out if it really is.

We're looking at a meter, you understand. When we get an explosion, it isn't what the preclear feels with his intuition. It knocks the E-meter pins off, or it burns the coils out or it does something like that. I mean there's nothing mild or hard to read, if there's any meter left after one of these explosions.

One of the boys out in California, by the way, knocked a hole, not only knocked a hole through the electrode of an E-meter—that is, knocked a hole right straight through the tin of the can—but also through the hand of the preclear.

Well, anyway, we took this thing, aesthetic facsimile, and took another mean, ornery, no-good facsimile, see, and took the two things and said, "All right, now: one, two, three (smack!)." Boom!

Sure enough, you move the aesthetic facsimile onto any old kind of a facsimile you've got from yesterday or something of the sort, and you put the two things together with relative suddenness and you get an explosion, and it registers on a meter. Good, good. Man creates energy, obvious!

Now let's try and take and move a couple of other old facsimiles together, we can get energy there. But—"Now wait a minute," I said. "Look, he created that aesthetic facsimile. That

wasn't MEST universe experience." The old MEST universe had left the latchstring out on that one. And there it was right there.

There's a factor that wouldn't quite figure. You've done a mock-up, and here's this mock-up and obviously it's just your imagination. Now that obviously doesn't have any energy in it, and if it did have any energy in it, it must have gotten it someplace else. But here's an instantaneous mock-up appearing. You look up there, there's no ridges, there's nothing. You just make this mock-up. And you take that mock-up and you slap it into another facsimile and it goes pam! and zing! goes the meter on the machine.

Hey, hey, hey. Is it possible that man is actually creating electricity? If so, then what would take place?

So I started figuring—already knew a lot of wavelengths—it comes down this way and that way, and it would be from zero to an aesthetic band. Aesthetic band's evidently along in that band someplace, and then that comes right on down the line and gets into heavier and heavier material and links and forms and energy contents and masses and efforts, and what do you know, he can evidently create this. And what's this stuff we're looking at? The stuff we're looking at is evidently some manifestation of thought.

If thought makes something else, makes something else, makes something else, and that finally winds up something else. Now, you know if you've ever listened to Technique 88 tapes that we're right down the groove on the Technique 88 tapes, saying that this universe is evidently a composition of thought energy of some way or another which has become timeless. There's quite a bit of talk in there about the timelessness of something.

If you ever try to run an apathy somatic out of anybody, you'll understand what I mean about timeless. MEST universe and apathy are very closely related. You start to get an apathy incident, the preclear feeling apathetic, you start running this out and, boy, that's a slow freight. You just gri-i-i-ind that thing out and you gri-i-ind it out, and you might as well be rubbing his head against a rock. And all of a sudden one day it occurred to me that, sure, timelessness. The timelessness of MEST was a sort of an apathy. All right, we were already on that track, so we could say there's a gradient scale of thought that leads down to this. And it wasn't this: Thought is no good because it is just the same as electricity—I mean that would be a materialist standpoint.

A lot of people like pastoral—or some field of phrenology, I don't know what they call themselves, phrenologists? Something on that order, philatelists. No, that's not, that's not right. I'll think of it in a minute.

Anyway, we got all this whole field was saying, "Thought is something else and the energy of thought isn't existing and it is something else than electric lights and that's kind of electricity." You'll find that everywhere you see that written up, it'll be very careful to say, "Well, it's something else."

It never occurred to anybody—never occurred to anybody that thought was good enough and high enough and powerful enough to create something like that. That this would be the result of a heck of a lot of energy piled up which was actually a generated energy, which would eventually get into masses, and which therefore could act and react and so forth as masses.

Well, we got this energy mass and when you get an energy mass next to an energy mass you get all sorts of dis—wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. There's something about that. Let me think, there's something about that.

Oh, I know what the name of those people are— psychologists.

Well, anyhow, it suddenly occurred—this is just the line of approach; I just mention it to you perhaps for clarification of what we're doing. We have— astonishingly enough, they left a

hole in electricity. So therefore, if we knew this much more about electricity, we should be able to look over electricity and find out if there wasn't something left out of electricity. And so I just started thinking over very hard and so-and-so, so-and-so, and so-and-so, and all of a sudden I was looking at the alternating current formula. And the alternating current formula won't furnish alternating current, if you evaluate it very sharply, because there's one ingredient they don't talk about. And there's this ingredient. And you've got a terminal there, you see, and you've got a terminal—they can be in the term of two magnets or coils or whatever you want—two terminals: positive and negative. And they sit there; they sit there and something revolves between the two things and then it goes this way and that way and you get alternating . . . It won't do it!

If you just had that formula and you didn't have an alternating current generator, and if you'd never seen one, something of the sort, it's very doubtful if you could build one. Unless by intuition or something of the sort, it suddenly struck you that there was another part to the machine they never mention. And that's the base.

I know, that's too simple. That's much too simple, but it happens to be horribly true. You've got to have a base.

Now somebody says, "Is that the logarithmic base you're talking about? And, or is that—that the— the—the base of conclusions? Or something of that sort?" There's even something more than that, which I won't bother to go into, about ac, but there has to be a plus-minus for the minus side and there has to be a minus-plus for the plus side in order to get an interchange between these two. But more important than that—the dickens with that—is the base. And we're talking just about the base of a generator, or the base of a motor. We're just talking about the platform on which it stands which is made out of iron or wood or steel or something of the sort, and which supports and keeps apart the terminals. That's all we're talking about. Just that horrible little simple thing. That base is sitting there keeping those terminals apart.

What's keeping the terminals apart? That base, of course.

Oh no, it's not! That base has to be—that base is bolted down to the table. And we have this base and we have a positive terminal and a negative terminal, and there's a wheel goes round and round and round and round. And the wheel, big generator spinner, well, nothing could happen there at all if those things weren't held rigidly apart, because it depends on their being held apart that they be permitted to have tension put on them.

If you just took two terminals and just set them up according to the formula and so on, every time you tried to turn anything over or furnish any effort in the thing, why, the two terminals would simply go bang! and there'd be no current. And you'd separate them very carefully and you'd turn the thing over again, and (smack!) they'd just go together. Their magnetism, in other words, would keep pulling them together. And you wouldn't get a current through that line at all. They've got to be held rigidly apart.

Well, to need something to hold them rigidly apart you have to have a base. And the base is bolted down to the top of a table. And the table is on the concrete floor of a—well, hey, wait a minute! Where are we going here? Concrete floor of a building and the building is on earth, and earth is by centrifugal force and gravity riveted to the sun out here, and the sun is in an equilibrium according to some other star—wait a minute! and those other stars are in equilibrium with accordance to a galaxy which is held in equilibrium—what do you know?—by another galaxy which is by an island—where are we going?

Well, brothuh, we's on the way to God!

And you extrapolate all this back again and you'll find out—what do you know? That it's absolutely essential to locate something in space and time in order to produce an electrical flow. And the highest order of action, then, that you could figure out for an electrical flow

would be something that located, in a space, some somethings which could discharge from one to the other and then, and only then, would you have an electrical flow.

Okay. Let’s take a break.