

SPACE

A lecture given on
29 April 1954

Like to talk to you a little bit more about viewpoints. Viewpoints, of course, are basic in space and actually basic in havingness. And I hope that you have some inkling now of the fact that havingness is condensed space. And when somebody knows he can't create or look at anything easily, when you tell him to reach out into space or look at space, you uncondense his havingness.

Let's say this fellow is going along in life and he says, "Now look," he says, "I have a certain store of peanuts, and this is all I have. And if I do anything at all it will disturb this pile of peanuts. Now, here is this pile of peanuts and if I make some space I've got to take four peanuts and put them out in the room." He actually doesn't do this but - I mean, he doesn't even put out dimension points - but he thinks of this. "If I made any space, I'd have to take four of these precious peanuts and put them out in the room."

Now, supposing you said to this person who had this pile of peanuts as his total possession, "Now, take four of those peanuts" - see, he has a finite number of them - "take four of those peanuts and put them in the room. Now, take four of them and put them around the house, now take four of them and put them around the town, and now take two of them and put them in your childhood home. Now, put a couple in the center of the city." And he looks at this dwindling pile of peanuts and he says, "Oh, no, no, no, no." He doesn't like that.

Well, that would be the same thing as you saying to somebody, "Now spot a spot in the center of the room, now spot a spot above the building, now spot a spot outside the building." Or actually just this: "Reach and withdraw from your childhood home. Now reach for it, withdraw from it, reach for it, withdraw from it, reach for it." Of course, he's reaching and withdrawing from something illusory. He probably has a picture of the childhood home, he's not really reaching for the childhood home, you see. And the more he reaches and withdraws from the childhood home the more distance you are entering in, you see. It's just the problem of distance. Every time you enter distance in, you got space entering in. So you say "reach and withdraw," you're just taking his pile of peanuts to pieces.

Now, almost any process - or any process - which does introduce distance then reduces the havingness of an individual. Anything which condenses distances increases his havingness. So anything which reaches as a problem, anything which reaches, decreases his havingness. Anything that withdraws increases his havingness. You should say, reach and withdraw then balances. Well, it doesn't, mostly because he isn't withdrawing anything when he comes back. But that's just a rough rule of thumb.

Now, here we have this fellow. We should run him this way: "Now put four peanuts around the room. All right, you got them around the room?" You know, in other words, spot some spots in the space of the room. "Okay, now let's put four peanuts around you and pull them in on you."

"Okay." He'll take the peanuts quite ordinarily out of the corners of the room and pull them in on him again. Well, he's got his peanuts back. "Okay," he says. He got away with that.

Now, you say, "Put these four peanuts around the building." So he does. Now, you say, "Put four peanuts around you and pull them in on you." Well, he'll take those four peanuts that are around the building and pull them in on him and put them back in the pile. You know, he's conserving his havingness. Now you say, "Okay, now let's spot some spots in space." So he puts four peanuts floating in space, somewhere in the vicinity of the room. And then you say, "Pull four peanuts in on you."

“Oh,” he says, “I don’t want to disturb those.” He’s getting lazy now, you see, and he’ll just leave those four peanuts out there in space and he’ll put up four new peanuts that he mocked up and pull them in on himself.

He’s.... “What the heck is going on?” something is liable to say in his machinery. “Look-a-here. I had just put out four peanuts and I pulled in four peanuts, but I’ve got as many peanuts as I had before and there are still four more than I had floating out in the middle of the room. Hey-hey-hey-hey, what’s going on here?” You know, something alerts to the fact that the truth of the matter is he can create many more piles of peanuts than he’s got sitting there.

All right, so we say then to him now, “Put some four peanuts around your childhood home and put some out in space, and put some elsewhere, and put some elsewhere,” and he’s starting to watch this pile go down. Oh, he starts to get nervous. He doesn’t want one of them... You see, if he didn’t have any peanuts at all he would be a complete pauper and this would finish him. So you just go on. You say, “Put four peanuts somewhere else.” Nrrrh. “Put four more peanuts out,” you know.

“Oh, no-no-no, no, no. No, I’m sorry but peanuts have become very valuable right here at this moment.” And he starts to get nervous, so you better give him some new peanuts. So you put up eight peanuts around him, pull them in. You tell him, “Put up eight peanuts, pull them in, eight peanuts, pull them in, eight peanuts, pull them in.” Stack is getting bigger now. “Eight peanuts, pull them in.”

Now, maybe this time you decide to be real vicious about the whole thing and just make him do this for a while. Well, by golly he starts getting peanuts that are heaped up on the table and they’re flowing over onto the floor. He’ll tell you something like, “You know, I’m beginning to feel stuffed. I’m beginning to feel too full. I’m too heavy.”

“If I put in one more galaxy,” a fellow said to me one day, “I’m going to sink straight through the crust of Earth.” I don’t think he would have although the crust is only forty miles thick and below that is nothing but molten lava. But anyway, he was getting too heavy.

You’re overcarguing him. But it’s better to overcargo them anytime than it is to take it all away, because if you give them enough peanuts back, pretty soon they’re perfectly willing to take peanuts and fill up garbage cans with them and throw them in the river and dump them in fires and everything else. In other words, they’ll be more relaxed with their havingness, more relaxed about their havingness. Which is to say, not so worried about loss.

And you get somebody and you’ve repaired his havingness up to one of these superabundances, and you say, “Now look out there in space and locate that spot and that spot and that spot and another spot and another spot and another spot and another spot and another spot and another spot and another spot and another spot.”

And he says, “To hell with it, I can go on locating spots.”

Well, maybe you don’t achieve this for maybe ten hours of processing to a point where an individual can actually just go on locating spots in space ad infinitum without the least concern about the way this decreases his havingness. He has stumbled across the great truth that he can mock up anything he wants or needs in terms of havingness.

So in processing somebody we are going toward the goal of abundance, just like it says in the Factors - the goal of abundance. If a man cannot have abundance, he cannot have space.

If you have ever experienced a great loss, you can possibly recall the feeling that the entire environment pulled in on you at that moment. It pulled in on you from below and above and everything else. You’ll occasionally track back a preclear in processing, and somebody processed him very poorly and took away far, far, far too much havingness - you know, just got in there savagely and tore up everything and chewed up everything. Of course, he’d only have

done this in the old days if the guy had really been butchered, you know, as a preclear. I mean, he'd have had to have breaks in the Auditor's Code and everything else before this thing come about. And you can sometimes trace a case back who was occluded to a moment when all of a sudden it was brought to their attention by an invalidation or an evaluation or a mean auditor or something, you see, Auditor Code breaks - it was brought to their attention suddenly "Do you know that I am just losing everything there is." And the individual just sort of reaches out into all the environment around him, below him and above him and pulls it all in, crunch! Only what does he pull in? He doesn't pull in anything he mocked up, he pulls in a lot of electronic standing ridges he's got all over the place. Some of them belonged in Boston and some of them belonged in Florida and some of them belonged in the childhood home, and so forth; and he just pulled in Boston and Florida and the childhood home and everything else right on the top of his head. "Now," he says, "I've got all this havingness, but this is a rather intolerable situation so I'll paint it all black." He just does this, he paints everything black, and so forth. That's a sudden occlusion with regard to loss.

Now, let's say this fellow has been going along in life. He's been doing all right. He made his first million when he was twenty-two, and another million when he was twenty-six, and another million when he was twenty-seven, and eighteen or twenty million more, you know, like some guys could do once upon a time when we had a free country. And... It's against the law to make money now; you get fined for it. If you don't believe that, consult the income tax bureau.

By the way, I don't want to knock income tax. Income tax is merely a penalty for having, and a government has a right to penalize people and has a right to kill people, has a right to break the country. It owns the country after all, and the people have nothing to do with it. And so don't get mixed up politically here. The world today is gauged so that you can't have a thing. If you do have anything, you get your teeth kicked in. Anyway, I'm totally impartial politically.

And this fellow comes along. And then one day, one day, why, there was some senator who wanted a couple of constituents more than he had before so he passed a law saying "All people engaged in making money out of peanut oil will now be taxed 110 percent of their taxes that they have already paid to the government, plus 220 percent of their income." You know, some reasonable law. And this guy all of a sudden is presented lock, stock and barrel with a complete loss, you know, zoom! His bank balances were good, his industry has earned him some money, he got people working, everything was going along fine and then all of a sudden, zing! gone. It's the ratio. It is the speed of loss. And that is a little factor which is not terribly valuable in processing but certainly can be used to understand life. How fast did he lose it?

If you break the news of Papa's death to somebody simply by saying - you know, this person is very well attached to their father and you come up to this person - and you say to him, "Well, your father's dead." The speed of loss is too great. The person is liable to go completely unconscious or grief-stricken. You can really stick them hard.

But now let's say you say, "Well now, just got a telephone call from your home."

"Yes, yes, yes."

"And ... it's about ... your father."

"Well, what about my father? Something wrong with my father?"

"Well, you know your father was a pretty old man."

"He's sick."

"Well, he's "He's dead." The person will orient this fact. They themselves have done the realization. You haven't poleaxed them. The same person with the news imparted in that fashion would still be standing on their feet. If the news were broken too fast, that is to say speed of loss was too brief, too much loss in too little time, why, they would go unconscious.

Now, you can stand to lose a body over a period of seventy years. You do, scrap by scrap, little by little, but when you lose one in seventy microseconds, it makes an effect. As a matter of fact, it'll put a standing ridge there that is very interesting to behold.

Well, what's the fellow do who is fined for having made five or six million dollars and put a lot of people to work in the society, who is fined his total income. At the second of loss, an enormous loss of his character... See, he could have lost a hundred thousand this month and a half a hundred thousand the next month and, you know, stretched it out and he would have made it all right. But he lost all this all at once. What's he do? The material objects go away so fast as to leave him with no actual havingness. So he reaches out into the entire environment and pulls in every standing ridge he can get his hands on. His spirit when he does this is a sort of a self-punishment. "Well, I will make a good mess out of it." You know, he sort of has that feeling.

Well, he will bring in every engram he's got in the bank, just whing! And you'll find him a little bit later sitting in a solid ball, and you wonder what the hell he's sitting in. Well, what he's sitting in is something very easy to recognize. At some time or another he has had too much loss in too little time under circumstances which themselves were very antagonistic. And when he recognized that he had lost this, he reached out to every part of the environment he could reach almost simultaneously and pulled the whole darn environment in on him.

Now, this left him in a state of not being able to have, because it was very uncomfortable having all this electronic material which he pulled in on himself That was very uncomfortable. So he says, "I don't want any more, believe me. Not only did I lose everything, which convinces me I can't have anything, but now that I have pulled in what I could have, which is to say engrams and ridges and things like that, they're so uncomfortable and painful that I want nothing to do with them either." And you find an individual negating against havingness. He doesn't want anything to do with havingness, and yet he has to have something to do with havingness.

So you tell him to locate some space. "Oh," he says, "that's easy, I can throw this stuff away, you know. I'll let it go, that's all right."

"Some more space, locate some more space, locate some more space, locate some more space, locate some more space." He starts to get sick, because the truth of the matter is he needs a certain amount of havingness.

You know, on a sort of a self-destructive impulse he's perfectly willing to unload the whole bank. You'll find these individuals who are very heavily occluded will run out and eat up and chew up energy, and waste it and do the darnedest things with it. They know they can't have.

Well, you process this individual by locating some space and then increasing his havingness by making him mock up something acceptable. Person probably can't mock up and pull in anchor points, but he can mock up an acceptable grandmother or an acceptable body or an acceptable pair of eyes or an acceptable tooth, you know, decayed and aching. He can mock up some sort of havingness. His acceptance level is right there for you to tap, just like that. And so you repair his havingness a little bit, and you then have him spot some space and repair his havingness and have him spot some space and repair his havingness and spot some space, and all of a sudden, "Oh," he says, "maybe I could have something." He says, "It's quite amusing here. I seem to find that I could have myself in total rags and starved. I can have something. I can have myself in total rags and starved." The funny part of it is, is that's more than he had as he was sitting there in the chair before you gave it to him. Totally starved and in rags is in better condition, really, than he actually is in.

He's carrying along on the third dynamic, the society, you know? He's just carrying along with the society. He dresses well because he's just running on other people's postulates in the society he should dress well. On his own self-determinism, however, his level of acceptance is starved and in rags. If he could have some starvation, at least the sensation of starvation, he would have more sensation than he's capable of experiencing. You know, it would be

experience. If he could have some rags, they'd really be his rags. The clothes that are sitting on him aren't his. He's a sort of a kept thing. He doesn't feel like he owns anything. He doesn't feel like any part of life belongs to him. And therefore, starved and in rags, which is acceptance level, makes him quite happy.

You wonder occasionally why somebody says, "Gee, you know, look at those crushed eyeballs. Oh boy, aren't they beautiful, you know. Sure. I can sure pull those in."

Well, he can't have his own eyes. You're giving him the first pair of eyes that he's been able to call his own for a long time, a pair of mocked-up, crushed eyeballs. Well, you'd say, "This bird sure is poor. He's sure poor. He's a real pauper."

Well, actually, that's what he is. He's poor. What can he have? Well, that's acceptance level. So you have to find out what he can have because his total belief - before you processed him on this - his total belief was simply this: He couldn't have a thing; he could have nothing. Well, you disabused him of this. How did you do that? You found out what was acceptable to him.

Well, the society is saying to him all the time, "Now look, you can't have crushed eyeballs. You can't have rags." It actually denies him these things. The various social agencies won't even permit him to starve comfortably. Somebody'd pick him up and feed him a bowl of soup. Society denies him these various things and yet they're the only things he could have. Well, he of course is caught there between the third dynamic and the first dynamic. And he, by the way, will begin to hate the third dynamic. It's denying him the only things he can have. He can't have anything that other people can have, such as a good body and a nice suit. Yes, his body isn't in bad shape. Yes, his suit is well pressed, he's okay, but it's not his. And the society says, "You couldn't have anything worse than this, we just won't permit you. Your family, name and your reputation and all that sort of thing won't permit you to have anything less than you have." Yet his level of havingness is filthy and ragged and diseased and sick and so forth. Well, he could have a body if it were in that shape; nobody else would want it. The society, however, on its social acceptance level, says, "No-no, you can't have the very things that you could have." And this catches him in between here and he's just lost. He's already practically shot, and when he comes to realize that he doesn't dare wear any old clothes, he doesn't dare go around and deny himself food. Somebody's always picking on him, saying, "Oh, you gotta eat three meals a day," and so forth. And when he recognizes that, he just throws in the sponge.

Now, you've repaired his havingness by giving him the things which he actually could have. Well, he can only have these in mock-up at first, and you're going to process him all the way on up through, and it processes very rapidly. So you're going to process him up to the point where he is able to have the things the society says he should have. Therefore, he can be in agreement with society, and at that moment his reality on the third dynamic will be very great. Why will it be great? Well, that's because he's reached agreement with it. A person out of agreement who is having trouble with ARC is always below the point demanded of them. You see that? An individual having trouble with the third dynamic is always below the social demands of the third dynamic. A person is not above the social demands of the third dynamic and having trouble with it.

These people who go around, you know, saying, "Well, these programs, you know, they're just made for the masses, they're just made for the mob, they're no good, and they're cheap, they're this, they're that, protest, protest, protest, protest, third dynamic, protest, third dynamic, protest, third dynamic." You know exactly where he's sitting. He's sitting way below the third dynamic acceptance level in terms of pictures.

What kind of pictures or what kind of books or stories would he read if given a choice? Fine, beautiful, esoteric things that he says the mob should accept. No, huh-uh. Junky, horrible mean stories about apathy, apathy, rape, murder, treachery, stuff that would not only be banned in Boston it would be banned as well in Hollywood. It'd even be banned in an executive's household in Hollywood. I mean, stuff that bad. Oh, you think I'm slamming now the motion picture industry. I'm not. They're through anyhow.

The whole woof and warp of the social structure is measured in acceptance level, a structure of the third dynamic acceptance level. The acceptance level of the third dynamic, however, is not made up of a composite of acceptance levels of its individuals. In other words, if you found out the acceptance levels of twelve individuals, to get their group acceptance level you would not add up or summate and average these twelve individuals. That's really funny, isn't it? The third dynamic is not actually composed of the individual characteristics and idiosyncrasies of its unit parts. The third dynamic is not a composite of its unit parts. This doesn't sound arithmetical, does it? But then arithmetic isn't true. If you were dealing with matchsticks, this would be true, but you happen to be dealing with living beings. And you get twelve, fifteen, twenty human beings together and they will establish a culture which is made up from their experiences on the third dynamic, and it will only be vaguely monitored by the first dynamic.

This is very, very strange. I mean, people working in social economics run up against this all the time. They just don't understand it. "A government, a people, a culture is obviously made up of its component parts. The whole is merely the sum of the parts." See, they've tried to reduce man to MEST, and they come a cropper this way. The whole is not, where a society is concerned, the sum of its parts.

Let's take a whole bunch of guys. Let's take fifty guys and get them together, and each one of these guys is pretty bad off and he's stumbling around and he isn't amounting to anything in life. And he's, you know, just pretty bad off, that's all - each one of them. So we say all right. Now, we average up these fifty people and each one of them is really bad off so therefore we've got a third dynamic, this group, then, is bad off and in bad shape. Oh, what a shock some people get sometimes when they figure that way because it doesn't figure that way.

Here was a third division one time on a battleship, and some officer came aboard and, I don't know, he flirted with some other officer's wife or something at a party, which had gotten to the ears of the captain who himself would liked to have flirted with the fellow's wife. And so what they did to this new reporting officer, a lieutenant senior grade, was to give him the third division and then transfer out of the third division all of the good men, and then transfer into the third division everybody who had a criminal service record - anybody with bad court-martials and so forth. And calmly - without telling this lieutenant anything about it - calmly handed over to him his division after they'd done this to it. Well, it was all the bums on the ship. Crack division. It became not only the crack division of the battleship but it became the crack division of the navy in terms of gunnery and big guns. Fascinating.

How did this come apart? How did it come about? Well, I'd heard that story when I was a kid and I fortunately had heard it, otherwise I simply would have dragged out my .45 and slid back the slide and put the muzzle of it against the roof of my mouth and pulled the trigger when I reported to Boston in the very early part of the war to take command of a corvette. They had emptied Portsmouth and that was my crew. Anybody who even vaguely could be let off from serving seven years and accessories, which is to say denial of citizenship. Anybody who had any vaguest idea that he might not immediately kill an officer, you know he might wait for a few days, why, they had scraped together and thrown together one corvette crew. Oh, dear.

It was quite amusing. I saw them come aboard and they were dirty and they were ragged and their hammocks were all muddy and, ooh boy, this was a real foul bunch. Well, I looked through their service records. Summary court-martial, court-martial, summary court-martial, general court-martial, general court-martial, summary court-martial and sentence suspended. Sentence suspended in view of the fact that he has volunteered for sea duty.

Well, you'd have thought that'd been the crummiest ship in the navy. Funny part of it was that individually these people were terrible, but collectively they presented a front which could be very dangerous to an environment. You see that? All they had to do was simply look around and recognize in themselves that we had a social group here that might, because of its numerical superiority, have a chance. They had to recognize that. When they recognized that they straightened up and you never saw such a crew in your life.

This crew, by the way, almost starved an officer to death one day. They were going out... we were going out and testing a new weapon, a new weapon against submarines, and this officer reported aboard to observe this new weapon. And I saw him a couple of times briefly and then noticed he wasn't eating in the wardroom and he wasn't eating anyplace, and Lord knows where he'd been bedded down. And I finally said to one of the boys up on the bridge, I said, "What have you done with Mr. So-and-so?" Silence. Well, I finally sent for a bosun and had him chase... had this guy chased down. They'd bedded him down in a chain locker and... Yeah, that's right. They'd said that was the only available stateroom. It was a very wet and miserable place. And they had said, well, corvettes out at sea, didn't... they didn't serve much hot food. They generally served K rations. And the boys had stolen some off the army.

What had this guy done to deserve this horrible fate? He'd walked over the gangway, taken a look at the gangway guard - and at that time of the war it was impossible to find anybody in uniform - and he'd seen the gangway guard standing there in undress blues with a neckerchief and a nicely pipeclayed web belt and so forth. You know, kid looked like somebody who should be on guard.

That was not the characteristic of the navy in those days. He should have been standing there much otherwise. And this fellow had said to him sneeringly, he'd said, "Aw, I thought this was the dungaree navy." And he went up a bridge ladder and he saw that the thing was... rails were done up with Spanish lace, old White Fleet style, you know. That is to say it looked real pretty. "Huh," again he says, "I thought this was the dungaree navy."

He came up on the bridge and he looked at all the things which were supposed to be polished up. They were all polished up except not to reflect so that anybody'd shoot at you, but the bridge was clean, just burnished, see. "Huh, damndest ship I ever saw." That's all he did. Next three days he spent in the chain locker. Nobody in the crew would talk to him. But this was all on their own morale, it was on nobody else's morale. These fellows had resurged as a group. And therefore you find groups quite commonly, quite normally, fusing together a very high-toned society, although the component parts of it are bums.

So let's take a look at that phenomena and realize that it is the numerical strength plus what these fellows feel a third dynamic should be. Now, they've gone around complaining about what the third dynamic should be and they all of a sudden find themselves in possession of the ability to form something on the third dynamic. And as soon as they do this, they put together their best ideals. You know? "This is the way it ought to be." They fuse those together on the third dynamic and rarely has anything to do with the other.

Here it is. Now, you think I've just been on and on here reminiscing about the navy and - "as officers will do" - and the war is all over and so forth. But here's a very interesting point. Look at this: We have no slightest mystery here and we have a point which is so valuable that you can heal a psychotic with it.

You can go into a sanitarium where somebody's utterly raving, who is locked up in a padded cell, who has to be kept naked because he'd strangle himself with his shirt; how can we make him well if we know this. What keeps anybody in the run? Responsibility. I refer you to the Handbook for Preclears. There is an article in there on responsibility, but it's about all there is about responsibility. Well, we're interested only in this fragment, and this fragment is this: An individual stays in there pitching because of other people's troubles. You, being quite able actually, being unable to exteriorize perhaps, are doing what? You're bogging down with other people's problems, but actually you're quite able. Really you all by yourself could exteriorize. You all by yourself could jettison your mother's or your father's universe, the physical universe - anything and everything - and go on your way except for one thing. You're only interested in and only have one kind of problem: other people's problems.

You can try in vain to run the concept on a preclear, "My problems." This is interesting. You can take any form of concept processing which has been developed and run this in an effort to

get some action or change on the preclear. You get just this little tiny change, little shift, it doesn't matter to anything, you know, doesn't matter much. And here's this little tiny change, "my problem." Why, look, this individual came into your office talking about his problems. "Oh, I have this and I have that and I'm bogged down here and I'm bogged down there and I'm so unhappy and I lie awake all night worrying." And if you were to say to him, "All right, now just mock up this, the unbearable weight of your personal problems or the unbearable weight of your problems. Now, just mock that up and duplicate it and duplicate it and duplicate it and duplicate it and duplicate it." Why, it should produce some action. It doesn't. The case will go right on, on, on, on. He'll do all the processing on his personal problem that you could imagine.

Now, let's run the other one. Let's have him mock up and then duplicate many times this concept: "other people's problems." I'm not giving you an office technique; this would be a very crude and vicious thing to do to the guy. This is experimental. It's just demonstrational. You give him this concept, "other people's problems," and, so help me, you'll get automaticity the like of which you never saw in most of the cases you'd apply this to. Other people's problems - zing, zing, zing, zing, zing. That's all there are, are other people's problems. No preclear really has any problems of his own. Every problem he has is somebody else's problem. If there's something wrong with his body, it's somebody else's problem, isn't it? It's his body's problem that he has interested himself in.

If there is something wrong with his mother, he has interested himself in this problem. If there's something wrong with his father, he has interested himself in this problem. We get this rather interesting interwoven scheme in existence, everybody being interested in everybody else's difficulties and nobody, individually, with any slightest difficulty.

Now, we take somebody and we tell him he's a bad boy, we tell him he's no good, we tell him he can't have anything, we back him up against the wall. What are we telling him? "You can't have other people's problems because we're pushing you down to a point where you can't take care of; help or assist other people." We're saying that to him continually. See, "You can't have... you can't have anything to solve or help problems. You can't have anything, you can't do anything, and here you are and we just backed you up into a corner and we're not going to let you in on this at all. You can't have other people's problems." And he just gets sick as a pup. He gets real sick.

Now, let's take that same fellow, sick as he is, and turn him loose with fifty guys much like himself. All of them have been denied any interest in anybody else's problems. Only, individually, boy, they have plenty of problems evidently. As this composite they evidently have plenty of problems. Oh, they've been knocked around by life and they've had tremendous losses. Well, you'd think that they would simply go in and key in at the Tone Scale level of which they're the component parts.

We'd say immediately, "Well, you've got all... All these boys are in grief and... They're in apathy and grief and fear. And therefore if we added this up and divided numerically, we would find the average was somewhere between apathy and fear, and therefore they would form a third dynamic which would be between apathy and fear." They don't. They're just as likely to form a third dynamic which has 4.0.

All of a sudden, boy, do they have a lot of havingness in terms of people they can help. Boy, can they help people. Everybody on every hand obviously needs help. Everybody needs help. They have just been pushed into a locale where the greatest abundance there is, is complete problemification on the part of everyone. And so they simply pitch in and start to heal up each other's problems, and they make a going group the like of which you never saw.

It is a wicked and terrible thing that man would insist - if he's going to permit life to go on at all, which of course is a question: Is man going to let life go on at all? Not necessarily "Is man going to let life go on at all?" but "Are those in charge of man at this time going to let life go on at all?" You know, you throw enough H bombs around you've got no air cover; let's not kid