

HAVINGNESS IN GENERAL AND BODIES IN PARTICULAR

A lecture given on 4 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

All right. This is what, January 4th, 1957, 16th ACC, second lecture. Your curriculum is devoted to three things. I told you this once and I'm afraid you wrote it in your notebooks and didn't record it in your heads. Now, look at this, just three things -- three things only: communication, control and havingness.

I don't care what you know about overt act-motivator, DED-DEDEXes or anything else. These things all have their place, and you would probably be vastly confused if you didn't know when a fellow hit somebody in the nose that he afterwards got his own nosebleed somewhere on the track. And if you didn't know many other explanatory phenomena, you'd probably go around wondering and worrying about where this fitted into what. But we covered all that, haven't we? We've covered all that.

Now, that's just as valid as it ever was, but it is subordinate - - in auditing -- to these three things that we are teaching you: communication, control and havingness. And those three things in combination, expertly used, will bring about a state in excess of any you have ever desired Dianetics and Scientology could create for you.

This class is being taught in a direction of simplicity and of result that no other class has ever been taught toward.

I've done a lot of talking about results; I've done a lot of talking about how good Dianetics was and how good Scientology was. Well, I didn't quite know how to make it that good for everybody until very recently. I thought I had many times, and each time I was obfuscated by somebody's inability to grasp some fundamental. I could not understand how the same technique, used by three different auditors, would result in three different results.

A lot of these things had to be ironed out. And they have been ironed out. In procedure, it's ironed. Just take it; it's ironed. We know. And in technique, we know. We

know what it is that blows a guy straight on up the line and through the top. It would be time alone which determined your preclear's level -- time alone - - given good procedure on your part and the use, an intelligent use, of these techniques.

Now, that's saying an awful lot to you. That is saying quite a bit. That's saying more than I ordinarily say by a long, long way. But it has been discovered, after all this time -- in 1952, while I was doing a great deal of research toward the end of the year in England -- that a datum that I wrote down at that time is a cousin, or a brother you might say, to the key data which we need to totally clear somebody. But it was not totally isolated. We thought there were many other things necessary in terms of technique. We thought many, many things were necessary in terms of technique, and therefore we didn't dare take our foot off of the things we already knew to work, to plunge on this new thing.

And it's taken these four years to completely sort out the fact that the little edge-in of 1952 was the whole root. And that had to do with havingness. I think, by the way, that it is in PAB 1 - - at least I remember mimeographing out in England the original materials at the same time for general dissemination. I haven't looked at PAB 1 as it appears in the book, and I haven't reviewed those old papers; I merely recall mimeographing it up, because I stopped the mimeograph machine and wrote an additional paragraph onto the stencil. It said „*Try wasting healthy bodies.*“ That was the clue. In all that material there's a great deal that was valid. All of it was true. All of it had its place and position, but the road out has to do with havingness in general and bodies in particular.

Now, you had to know practically all there was to know about havingness before you could bring that into a state of total comprehension. The old DEI Scale was the first lead: Desire, Enforce, Inhibit. And it was found that the DEI Scale had a C up above it. So it was CDEI, really, and that scale probably should be called the CDEI Scale. Curiosity brings one into a state of desire, desire brings one into a state of enforcement, enforcement brings one into a state of inhibition. Thereby and therefore, we get wasting as one of the lower mechanisms by which we improve a person's ability to be curious about, to have, to desire, to enforce, to do things, to act. So we get this I and waste as data of comparable magnitude. They're right together. So you have the CDEI Scale. The entrance to every trap has a big sign across it. It says: „*Be curious son, and you'll be in here soon.*“

Therefore, curiosity has a penalty. But just how does it have a penalty? Because a series of postulates are set up so that a penalty will occur. And they have to be set up by you. In other words, you have to set up the postulate that curiosity will bring about a closure. You have to set that up. You have to have already made the postulate. It wasn't something that was made for you. You had to, yourself, make that consideration in order to make this game come true. See?

You had to say, „*When I am curious about something it snaps to me.*“ See? You actually had to say that for curiosity to be the entrance to the trap. So that is the postulate which begins the CDEI Scale. „*When I'm curious about something it will snap to me.*“ That's all you have to say, you see? Isn't it a handy mechanism? You get the laziness back of it?

„If I'm curious about that book, it will jump over and sit down on the desk in front of me.“ In other words, if I want to know about it, it will come closer to me so that I can inspect it. Well, one had to assume, before he said that something else, that he didn't know about it.

So, we exploit this scale a little more widely and we find that it must be, then, the not-know postulate which lies immediately above C. So! Now, I don't know how we would say *„Not-Know“* as simply as we say *„C“* for curiosity -- unless it's NK CDEI. But that is the state. That is what it is. It's Not-Know, Curious, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit.

Now, one had to assume that he didn't know anything about a book so that he could then get curious about it. And he had to make a postulate that it would come closer to him if he got curious about it, so that he could know about it. So possibly, there is just a little bit of K (or Know) between C and D. C contains the desire to know, which is very curious indeed, because one had already to say that he didn't know. Therefore, we have Not-Know in there still as a powerful process -- still very powerful, because it works. But unfortunately -- unfortunately -- it's a bit out of range for most preclears. So part of a Havingness Scale, oddly enough, is Not-Knowingness.

Now, it's a very interesting thing that a thetan would turn his own postulates around on himself. He says, *„Now, if I'm curious about that book, it will jump from where it is, over there on the bookshelf, and will land here on the desk, and I can then look at it more closely without disturbing myself and going over to the bookshelf.“* Well, because he didn't want to go over to the bookshelf, he eventually, through resisting this one factor, then snaps over to the bookshelf every time he gets curious.

Other things refuse to move, by some chicanery or trickery on the part of some other thetan usually, and so he counters this and he must have a right postulate. His postulates must be right. He also must assume, you see, that there is some liability to not having his postulates be effective. And he must be right, so if he's curious about something and it doesn't come to him, then he goes to it. You see this? And that is the mechanism of curiosity as it works in an entrapment.

And there's no reason to be worried about being curious about things. The trouble is, you haven't been curious enough if curiosity is, to you, antipathetic. You tried to make other people curious about what you were doing. One day you stood out on the street or on Cloud 99 and you just hoped somebody would come along, you see, and say, *„What is he doing?“* see? Nobody stopped. Nobody said, *„What's he doing?“*

We must be right, and things must run right, so our next action of course was to be curious about ourselves. And we said, *„I wonder what I'm doing here.“* And after a while, we have a habit. It wasn't admired, so it persists. It wasn't looked at, so it persists. Why? Well, somebody had to be curious about it.

The thetan always takes over the role of the other person whenever it is necessary that he continue to be right. The other person won't make him right, so to some degree he takes over that role and assumes the attitude he desired in that other one. See? He says, *„Somebody's going to come along and be curious about this thing.“* Nobody did, so he be-

comes the hypothetical person and he gets curious about it. Interesting trickery. Interesting game.

Now, aberration and auditing are third-dynamic subjects. It's a third-dynamic manifestation. It isn't a first-dynamic manifestation at all. There are very many reasons for this, but chief amongst them is this reason I've just given you: To continue to be right, a person assumes the attitude which he postulated for others. That continues him to be right, you see? He went around and he told his mother, he said, „*Mother*,“ he said, „*I am just a poor little waif and I have nothing*“ And mother says, „*Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha*.“ Wrong attitude, see? Now what's this little child do? He goes around being a poor little waif. He just thought it up on the spur of the moment.

Now, what has he done here? He has actually assumed Mother's valence -- with her proper attitude. Her proper attitude is he is a poor little waif. So the question is: Is he any longer being himself? No, he's being somebody else. Any continuing postulate can thereby be traced to another being than self.

So, when we get this curiosity mechanism and any other of these mechanisms at work, we find out that anything a preclear is holding on to is the other fellow's. He's holding on to the other fellow's. He doesn't have any problems of his own! You wipe out all problems at once simply by saying „*How is it that a nonsurvival activity can occur to a being who is, himself, total survival?*“ It's impossible, isn't it? How can he assume a nonsurvival activity if he himself is total survival?

Well, you can say he postulates nonsurvival. But can he postulate it for himself? It's impossible. You try to do that some day and you go way back on the track, because you've evidently tried to do it before. You try to postulate nonsurvival for self. You say, „*I don't want to go on. I cannot continue and I will not continue along this track*,“ or „*It isn't any longer possible to continue*.“ (See, continue, survival, same thing.) „*I can't go on*.“ „*I can no longer write*.“ „*I can no longer paint*.“ „*I will not go forward any further*.“ „*I can't audit anymore*.“ You hear all kinds of weirdities this way. All he's saying is „*I'm unwilling to go on*.“ But it's always as something.

He himself can conceive (because a thetan can conceive anything) an unwillingness to go on, but as far as the actual fact of going on is concerned, or not going on, we have unlimited difficulty for the thetan. It's just total difficulty. It is nothing else. There just is no other thing in there but difficulty. He says, „*I am not going on*.“ Now what's he got to do? He's got to become unaware of going on. He has to become unaware so that he doesn't know that he hasn't obeyed his belief that he shouldn't go on, you see? He has to get anaten; he has to say, „*There is no life after death; I am an atheist*.“ As a matter of fact, before that, he had to say that there was something connected between his going on and God, you see? Interesting state here.

He actually is not capable of not going on. All he can do is pretend that he's not going on. And the way he does that is again the same answer that I've just given you; the same exact answer is „*somebody else*“ -- „*I am now somebody else*.“

And you look at the basic mechanism of life, and we see this fellow kicks off as Ebenezer Snouzer and gets born as young Billy Jones. And nobody is more convinced

when he becomes young Billy Jones that he has never been Ebenezer Snouzer. Does this have any liability to him? It certainly does. Because the inescapable truth of the matter, contained in earlier postulates, is that he was and is Ebenezer Snouzer. And so Ebenezer Snouzer, to some slight degree, goes on living. And we have past lives cropping up, and fellows going around pleading with us to believe that they can't shoot, can't ride, girls just begging to be believed that they have no charm, you know? That's to keep Ebenezer or Betty Schnouzer from living on, don't you see?

A thetan's total fight is with his own survival. His own survival is inescapable. It's evidently an utterly unalterable fact. Could be said it's the one unalterable fact in the entirety of thetandom. It's evidently contained in this: He is; he communicates with a universe with a time continuum; he allies himself with that time continuum by his own postulates of continuing time; or he, in conjunction with others, postulates a time continuum and commits himself to this time continuum; having so committed himself to this time continuum, that time continuum is inescapable. Well, why is it inescapable? Well, that's because there's no time there anyhow. He is a being who is alive. And we get right down to the uttermost simplicity: He is.

And he can say he is by moving through time, but that is a slight complexity. He can say that he is because his name is. You know, in other words, identity. That again is an additional complexity. He is because of this and he is because of that and he is because of something or other. And this is all very interesting, because the truth of the matter is, the only truth of the matter is, he is. And that, as I've been telling you, is an unalterable fact. And practically all of his activities then become devoted to being something else in order to have a game, in order to introduce some randomness, in order to escape this unalterable datum.

A thetan tries to make nothing out of himself. Numerous ways. He says he doesn't exist, that he is somebody else, so on. So, just chopping it very fine, right from the first entrance into the problem, we enter then into these other mechanisms: Not-Know, Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit. We enter into the problems of masses and spaces. One of his handiest methods of changing his identity so that he won't be what he is, is to have some space and be somewhere else. That's a somewhere-elseness.

I want to call this to your attention, that these are all solutions. All solutions to one thing: He is.

Now, any complexity or combination on any dynamic, whether it's political, sexual, individual -- anything else -- is a solution to being. A person has problems; any one of his problems is really a solution. And therefore, we get the limited scope of running Problems of Comparable Magnitude. It's a very limited scope. It runs; a person gets so he confronts specific problems. You can handle any specific problem this way. But the funny part of it is, every problem is a solution. And so if we labor this one too hard, it doesn't run all the way; it doesn't go all the way to the top. It simply fixes up a lot of things. It's very useful. Tremendously useful, but it doesn't go all the way to the top. Why? Every one of these problems is a solution. To what? To isness, to his own aliveness, to his own beingness.

To enter any kind of a game, he has to negate his own aliveness and beingness. Now, how could one have a game with a city if all one had to do was look at the city and it vanished? If at any moment, one could say, „*Wheew. No city?*“ Where's the game? Where's the continuing data? Where's the randomness? Where's the interest? Where's the action? Where's the purpose? In other words, total power and total ability gives us no game. Well, why did he think he needed a game in the first place? Well, he knew very well if you played games you really got loused up -- just to be technical. He knew that if you went around doing this, that and the other thing, and so on, why, you'd be less.

Now, he shifts through so many identities, each one of which he seeks to continue in some state of mind, that he at length poses a labyrinthine problem: We cannot trace him back easily. He is so far removed from his basic isness, and he has gone through so many valences on such mechanisms as „*I must be right, therefore Mother...*“ See, there is no reason he must be right, except that he says he must be right. And he goes into his mother's valence so that she will think that he is a poor little waif -- that he is now his mother thinking of himself as a poor little waif, you see? We discover at once that nothing really can alter his basic beingness. And if you're trying to alter basic beingness with auditing, you'll come an awful cropper, because it's unalterable. What you are trying to alter with auditing is all of the sub-beingnesses in which he himself has gotten himself lost. It's really true that he can get himself lost. He's a champion. He's just a wonder at it. He can get himself lost so that he really, after a while, doesn't know whether he is his mother or a fig tree, see? And he says, „*How'd I get in this state?*“

Well, I don't know how you got in this state, but you sure are.

Yeah, well he finds himself with a wife and kiddies, and he is riding in a car, going down a mountainside at eighty-nine miles an hour and no brakes, see? He's got a wife and kiddies at home, they depend on him utterly, and they need the car to go shopping with, and here he goes down the hill. And there is a blast and a tinkle of glass and that is the end of that identity, you see? But going down the hill, he says, „*You know, this isn't going according to plan?*“ There's something been planned too well here. So he picks up another mock-up, and they teach him spelling and arithmetic again. And he sits right there and learns spelling and arithmetic. I mean it's the most marvelous thing you ever saw.

Every once in a while, one of my kids, I just startle them: „*What do you mean you can't drive a car?*“ The kid looks guilty. Very amusing.

But if you just get an idea of something that went flick-flick- flick-flick through a bunch of consecutive identities, you see -- here's this isness -- and now no longer is one his basic isness; he is something else. And then no longer is one that, but he is something else, something else, something else, something else, something else. We see at once that our preclear is a concatenation of something-elses. That's just about the first thing a good auditor better know: That given the least chance, he will again do it again and become something else -- to such a degree that you, if you fell for it, would only then jump from a something else, to a something else, to a something else,

to a something else; and an auditing session becomes nothing more than a concatenation of something-elses.

The difference between a bad auditor and a good auditor is that a good auditor runs the session, and a bad auditor lets something else run it. He lets all these something-elses run it. He lets the session go alter-is, alter-is, alter-is, alter-is, alter-is, alter-is, on and on and on and on and on, see? He's going to run the preclear on touching walls. The preclear sneezes, so he runs sneezes. While running sneezes he finds that the preclear is allergic to petticoats, so he runs petticoats. See? Something else, something else, something else, something else. You get the idea? And the auditor himself is simply going along with his preclear on becoming and being something else all the time. They never then get anyplace. Why not? Because that is the course and continuance of aberration: Becoming something else.

In view of the fact that a thetan cannot have a problem of his own, really, every problem he has is somebody else's. And every somebody-else's problem that he has or is, is a solution to being.

We see at once, then, that a session has to be kept very simple, and it has to do with the isness of a person. We don't care what he gets curious about; we don't care what crops up. All we're going to do is audit him in a direction where he can tolerate anything cropping up, and even do it all over again. The one thing you will not cure him of is his basic isness, and the most powerful, ethical, able thing about him is his basic isness. We're just lucky that that's the case.

See, everybody else that has worked in this field (forest) always assumed, to a marked degree, that man was basically evil and you had to alter-is him into being good. All right. That's exactly incorrect. It's exactly reverse polarity. You only alter-is a person into being evil. Alter-isness goes toward evil, badness, inability, incapability, and so forth. This is the dwindling spiral. It is the pattern of alter-isness by which one shifts from his own isness into the beingness, problems or states of mind of others. And the further he gets from his own state of mind, the more detached he gets from his own isness, and his own isness is the only thing which is there that can or will control anything.

So you have a picture of somebody going out of control and just getting into the tumbled confusion of what we laughingly call a culture. He just goes into this tumbled confusion; he gets more and more confused, and more and more dependencies, and more and more alterations, and more and more confusions; and he drifts to greater and greater individuation. Well, that is another trap. A person doesn't become more individuated; he acts more individually and less a part of things to the degree that he is obsessively a part of everything. He is merely asserting his individuality while becoming buttered all over the universe. He has to assert it after a while because he's lost it. It's back there 1,000,675,000 beingnesses earlier, see? One thousand light years on the time track. Here he is with his own beingness -- that is to say, his isness; he is -- and then we find after a while he gets worried about it and he begins to assert it. Why does he begin to assert it? He begins to assert it because he begins to get buttered all over too many other problems, other individualities, other things, you see?

And after a while, he wakes up and he says, „*You know, I need a slight ingredient of truth here someplace to get myself straightened out. The basic truth which I know is that I am me.*“ And it's bad English, but it's true. And he says, „*Well, I'm me. That's what I know. And I am an individual.*“

And then, after a while, you get him screaming about being an individual, and you get him becoming a great labor leader because he's such an individual, and he just sort of mushes out into a totality of identities, none of which are differentiable from any other. Somewhere along the line he begins to assert this thing we call individuality. He begins to say, „*I am a rugged individual.*“ That's a silly thing for a thetan to say. How could he be anything else? Yet the harder he says it, the more buttered around he gets.

Well, let's look at this thing. Let's look at this problem which you're taking apart. It's a simple thing, really. A person is. Well, he's in the state he's in because he is unwilling to be so many other things, finally. He's unwilling to be a great many of these things; he's unwilling to confront things. You realize that confrontingness is above -- on the Tone Scale -- above beingness; that beingness is below confrontingness on the Tone Scale? You'll get used to that. We have found a higher order of existence than beingness -- when we speak, of course, of being all these problems and other people.

We get the problems of valences. We get all sorts of oddities, idiosyncrasies. We get these problems stretched out into a pattern of complexity nobody can make any sense of after a while. And if your preclear is in bad shape, it's because he can't make any sense out of them anymore. And you can do some fantastic things with a preclear by making just a little bit of sense out of all the individualities that he's been mixed up with. In other words, you strip valences. Whether you use old-time Dianetic Straight-wire, or anything else, you strip off a valence or two, and you get rid of a habit or two, and you flick this problem out and that beingness out, and the next thing you know, why, boom- boom, the fellow feels a little bit better.

Remember, it's just a little bit better -- because the pattern of individualities and problems is so huge and so complex that it would probably take you 8,762 hours to penetrate one one- millionth of the identities he has assumed.

Well, why have we arrived anyplace? We've arrived very easily, to tell you the truth, because we simply assume that there are certain tolerances which an individual ought to have. And his statements that he cannot tolerate certain things are hogwash. He can. He must be willing to live. He must be willing to associate. He must be willing to experience. And if he is unwilling to do these things, then he is obsessively getting plastered all over everything. So increase that willingness.

The funny part of it is, the willingness we're trying to bring upscale is the willingness to be himself. What is himself? Well, it's himself. I'm afraid that that is about all there is to it. But it's unfortunately himself without complexities which he thinks, by this time, that he doesn't want. He doesn't want himself without complexities. And unless he gets over this hurdle, he gets nowhere.

So we are trying to rehabilitate the basic isness of a thetan -- against his contest of trying to make nothing out of it. He's just spent the last seventy-six trillion years making

nothing out of his own isness. That's his game. How's he do that? Oh, in lots of ways. He's said, „*I can't confront this, and I am intolerant of that, and I can't do this, and...*“ It's all inabilities, inabilities, inabilities, inabilities, of one kind or another.

Well, we have to find out, first off, „*What is it that a thetan is least able to tolerate?*“ Well, it would be that thing which he was least capable of duplicating. And immediately, we find that there are three things, not just one.

Now, you get auditors around who will gladly and happily audit everybody on ideas. See, they'll audit on ideas, ideas, ideas. Yes, that's what you're trying to change, basically -- ideas. That's the truth. But the funny part of it is, that it can't be very aberrative for a thetan to have an idea. See, it can't be very aberrative for a thetan to have an idea. This is very peculiar, because he can duplicate one. See? He can duplicate a thought.

Well therefore, you'd have to handle things he can't duplicate in order to change his willingness to change a thought. And that's what you want to do. You can always change a thought with an ax or something, or under threat or duress, or kneel on somebody's chest and say, „*Oh, you're crazy, are you? Well, I want you to change your mind about that.*“ And you get off, and he'll be sane for an hour or two. You can change ideas with duress. They don't stay that way, and he's not happy about it at all.

No, he has certain things that he has made up his mind about, and all of the things that you're interested in are his intolerances and his unwillingnesses and his can't-nesses, his inabilities. And he's decided that he can't -- he's unable; he's intolerant; he is unwilling -- he's decided these things, and you just show him two things: one, that it won't kill him to be wrong. It won't kill him. Honest, he won't die. He can't die anyhow, so don't worry about it. And the other one is that he can tolerate. In other words, you make him change his mind back again. You make him turn his mind in a direction of saying, „*Well, all right. I know I'm kidding I know I'm joking I know I can tolerate tin cans. Okay, I can tolerate tin cans. Been an interesting game though, not tolerating tin cans.*“

You tell him, „*You didn't think so a half an hour ago, that it was an interesting game, tolerating tin cans and... We pulled fifty-five facsimiles of tins cans out of your chest. You thought that was sure painful.*“

Well, he says, „*Well, I can change my mind about it now.*“

How do you get him to change his tolerances? Change his mind? An auditor runs somebody totally on „*change a mind,*“ just totally on that. Remember, we're running something the thetan can duplicate; he can duplicate a thought. But he cannot duplicate a particle -- particularly an invisible one -- and he cannot duplicate a solid, and he cannot duplicate a space. And those are his three basic inabilities, on which all other inabilities are based.

Under particle we have light, smell, radiation. Ever see this? Can't duplicate any of those. Can't even see them so he can be them. They're very mysterious. So we get this total order of fears and allergies, and so forth, about the unknown, the invisible, the invisibilities... You could probably put out an advertising campaign to tell everybody that the atmosphere of the present moment was being saturated with „*bluetonium scoof,*“

and not even define it, and have people blowing their brains out, and so forth, all over the place. But all you'd have to say is, „*You can't see it, you can't feel it, and you can't smell it.*“ Just like they said in the McCall's article on „*Radioactivity is Killing Your Children,*“ or whatever that article's name was. Well boy, he certainly is pulling an awful long arrow. What's he mean I can't see radiation? Who's he trying to invalidate now? I will admit that very few people can, and that I didn't used to be able to, but it's quite visible. It's quite visible -- if you can tolerate it.

If you yourself as a thetan are willing to confront radiation, it becomes visible. Remember yesterday's lecture? It becomes visible! How'd it disappear? Well, you didn't want to confront it! So you said, „*Runh, it doesn't exist.*“ You went along carrying stone axes and running around and doing all sorts of things, and saying, „*Well, here we are, a barbaric society. Isn't it lovely?*“ And we never even said to ourselves, „*You know, I haven't seen a guy with a ray gun for -- ah! must be upwards to half a million years.*“ Never said that to ourselves at all, see?

All of a sudden, somebody jumps up with a ray gun, and colds become very dominant and prevalent, and nobody knows what this is. And then, after a while, it turns out that the atmosphere is getting supersaturated with radioactive substances, and that's that.

And nobody is aware of them. Well, I don't know that nobody is aware of them. I don't know that it's true -- that you can't see them and can't smell them. I found out all about them, and I found out I could mock them up. That was all I needed. Almost knocked my body off. Didn't know it was not in that thorough an agreement with me. I always thought it was a companionable, friendly sort of an attitude we had, see? Now, if this wasn't the case, when it came to radiation, we were no longer friends.

That's that particle. Well, I tell you, if you were to ask a preclear for an hour or two to keep that light from going away, you would get into the most remarkable arguments you ever heard of. But you would undoubtedly change his eyesight! You ask a person to put unknown -- see, put the curiosity angle in there, see -- put unknown smells into the walls, round and round and round, you will utterly change his ability to smell. You're liable to turn him halfway through the one smell he is avoiding.

I've had a preclear come to me who had a smell of dying cattle; dead cattle rotting in the August sun. (I remember now the way she described it.) Boy, she smelled these cattle all the time, day and night, no matter what else she was smelling. And I handled it with mock-ups. That was the end of that. But it could have been handled with particles, invisibility of. The dangerousness of the particle. Isn't that a nice game? Particles are dangerous. Well, the fellow can't duplicate a particle, but he almost can.

Now, a thetan thinks of himself as a bright little spark that radiates.

Why does he think of himself that way? That's a silly way to think of yourself. Well, there's dozens of ways you can think of yourself, but it doesn't alter the facts of the case: that you're not a bright spark that radiates. That, that is a radioactive particle. You close enough terminals with it, and you become it. You see? And true enough, it's very dangerous I suppose.

Well anyhow, these radioactive particles are nothing, more nor less, than particles which one has said he's unwilling to confront. Now, you have people around who say they're unwilling to confront life. They're blind. Just like that. You have people around who say they're unwilling to confront certain odors. They have allergies. They get hives and everything else.

I used to know a writer -- a fair writer. He and I were awfully good friends until his wife became a friend of mine. A cat used to walk in the room and instantly his right eye would turn coal black -- this writer's right eye. He'd just have a black eye, just like that. And then he'd go to bed and be sick for three or four days. And you know, I waited in vain for some cat to punch him or confirm this. There evidently was no further action involved in it than a cat walked in the room and it gave him a black eye. All sorts of interesting allergies and oddities. Why? He said, „*I am not able to confront cat dandruff*,“ I think was what registered on him on allergies -- cat dandruff. I didn't even know cats had dandruff. He evidently knew it; he evidently knew it very well. Cats did have dandruff.

Well, look at this now. There is an unwillingness to confront a particle. Particularly a (quote, unquote) „*invisible one*.“

Now, one of the greatest games you could ever concoct would be „*there are invisible particles*,“ and by postulate, you see, have all particles of that category be invisible so they never could be identified. But I am afraid that such a postulate would not be enough. I'm afraid that any particle one is afraid of would turn out to be, to some degree, visible. And that the postulate of invisible particles would never hold.

Because how would one then sense the existence of the particle if it were so invisible - - which is to say, unsensible -- that he would never know it was there? Of course, it's an interesting game. But there'd have to be some signal involved. And any signal system tells you, then, that the particle was to some degree sensible. It could be sensed. And sure enough, any particle about which we're interested can be, to some slight degree, sensed in some manner. So „*invisible*“ or „*unsensible*“ would not work.

Light. There is a theory of light that it flows from a bulb to the wall and lights the wall, you see? That's a theory. Possibly true. I don't know, maybe the wall merely runs an „*I'm supposed to*.“ Maybe the wall is on an „*I'm supposed to*,“ and when you turn on the light, the wall then says, „*Now I'm supposed to be visible*,“ and becomes visible. I mean, you could work out a whole theory of light this way called „*the reactive theory of light*.“ There doesn't have to really be a flow between that and anything else but, by general agreement, there probably is. But those particles, again, are not invisible if they are particles.

We have this enormous class: we have air. I've had a thetan, under drilling and so on, suddenly see the air. You know, he sees the air. Man, it looks crowded to him. That looks awfully crowded.

But a person who is unwilling to confront them gets an invisibility out of them. And then these things can become an effect upon him. You get the channel by which he disintegrates on this one subject? He says, „*I am unwilling to tolerate air*.“ No matter how

he got into that condition, he said, „*I'm unwilling to tolerate air.*“ After a while, he's the victim of air.

One of these days, we'll probably be fishing thetans up on some other planet. The guy got a smell of air. Well, he got a smell of air and now, therefore, he's suffering from air poisoning.

I imagine there's a lot of people around right now that have odd illnesses and asthmatic conditions, and so forth, who were simply poisoned by air. See, a person became dependent on the air and he followed the DEI cycle with it. After a while, he inhibits air and he can't confront air. All on his own postulates.

[Please note: at this point in the lecture, a gap exists in the original master recording. We now return to the class where the recording resumed.]

.the particle, the solid, the space. Just those three things, and that's it. Now, if one is to remedy those three things, well, he had certainly better start in where the guy can remedy them and begin the thetan's willingness to confront, and show him that there is some part of one of these three things that he can confront. And when he has finally demonstrated to him he can confront all three, and create all three, do everything he has to do with all three, you have what you've been calling an OT -- Operating Thetan. And that's the total substance of it. We call those three things „*havingness*“ because we're all familiar with the term. But all the techniques that we are doing are actually more or less havingness techniques, but not totally and only on solids. It's on these three things.

Space is the viewpoint of dimension. Therefore, when one can confront a solid, one can then have space. Only then can one have space. If one is willing to look, one has space. If he considers the space is full of little invisible particles and things like that, and so on, of course he doesn't dare look across that space. And he's again unwilling to confront. And the interweavings of this we call, today, techniques. And it is necessary to solve those things in order to solve a case. There are, however, many significances which an individual believes are absolutely necessary to such a solution. Many significances. There are certain solids, certain particles, certain spaces, which are deadly. And therefore, he has to pick those out first.

For instance, the solid called a body is what he is stuck in. So therefore, he must consider this very, very significant, and that's one of the first things which you remedy.

Well, there's the length and breadth of auditing today.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]