

## HAVINGNESS

A lecture given on 16 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

This is the eleventh ACC lecture, January 16, 1957, 16<sup>th</sup> ACC.

We have made some considerable strides in the past year on the subject of havingness.

Give you a little background on this: Havingness is a real old idea. We knew about havingness years ago. Taught all about it in early ACCs, but then we forgot about it. First, when it first came out, knew all about it, and then we forgot about it, see?

Wondered why everybody was falling on his face and we weren't really getting the results that we had been getting, and isolated all of the odds and ends that could have been isolated. And the next thing you know, we rediscovered havingness.

All right. So I went along fine and invented a cliché: „*When in doubt, remedy havingness*,“ and told everybody that. And it appears on most of the tapes relative to auditing in any way associated with havingness. And then we just went along fine until the fall of 1955, when we forgot all about havingness again.

The HGCs in the U.S. and England found that they were having to reprocess cases, having to give people extra weeks, do all sorts of interesting things, see, at that time. Three, four months went by, and what do you know? Havingness cropped up once more.

Well, I don't know how often it takes to convince me. I evidently take an awful lot of convincing. But this time I wrote bulletins and instructions and all kinds of things, and sent them to HGCs and sent them to schools. And not too long ago -- six, eight months ago -- made it necessary for Subjective Havingness, Remedy of, and the Trio to be taught at HCA level. This became a standard, routine action.

You'll find Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought doesn't tell anybody very much about how to handle or audit human beings. It does the rather astonishing thing, in a very few thousand words, of covering the entire field of auditing, which is phenomenal. To cover the whole subject of auditing in two PABs was a fantastic thing to have, and of course those two PABs became part of that book. And the only process in there that's punched up at all, that somebody would know how to do if he were auditing just out of the blue (you know, he just picked up a book and read it), would be Trio -- the „*can-can't have*“ version of Trio. That'd be about all that he would learn out of that. But that's plenty. That's plenty.

If a beginning auditor had nothing but the Trio, he'd be in good shape. If he had Trio with games condition added, he would be in better shape.

Now, how do you add games condition to the Trio? Well, the Trio is a very elementary process and an intensely effective process. And that process works this way: You have the person look around and tell you something he could have. You ask him to find something he could have, usually. And he looks around and he does this over and over and over, and the way we add the games condition to that is very interesting: Anything besides himself is run „*can't have*.“ He is run „*can have*“ -- „*Look around and find something you could have*“ -- but anything except himself is „*can't have*.“ That adds the games condition. „*Look around and find something your body cannot have*.“ „*Look around and find something your father cannot have*.“

All right. Here we go. That „*can have-can't have*“ will split valences and it'll do all sorts of things. Relatively slow process, but terribly effective and very stable.

However, it has a limitation. There are some people that cannot have anything to such a degree that the process doesn't bite. You simply get into an argument about what „*have*“ means, or something like that, see? Doesn't bite. There's no boom to the process.

Now, you have to watch this, because when you're running a Havingness Process you get change. And if you're not getting change, and the preclear is doing it very easily, and everything is fine, and there's no change at all... Boy, watch these preclears that do it easily! See? Watch them that just „*Ah, there's nothing to it*“ and there's no change. Boy, I couldn't find anybody in the entire United States of America or the United Kingdom who could actually do Havingness, Trio type, without change -- unless it was an over-reach on the case. They will do it glibly and without any change whatsoever if it is too much for them.

This you must watch. This you must watch. Because this one factor all by itself will upset your evaluation of cases more than anything else.

You look at this person, you say, „*Well, he's in wonderful shape; he can do anything you know? He can look around, he can run the Trio and he can run „can't have“ and he can mock up things, and he can do this and he can do that. And the person's in perfectly good shape and must be in wonderful condition. Bright facsimiles.*“ This is the famous, old wide-open case of Dianetic days. Strictly dynamite.

Everything the person's running is over his head. He is running one thing: obsessive agreement with the auditor. You got to watch that like a hawk, because you can waste more auditing time.

Now you take this case; case exteriorizes. You say, „*Well, be three feet back of your head.*“ They're three feet back of their head. You say, „*Look around the room.*“

„*Oh, that's fine, no problem.*“ They just agree to anything you say! You get the idea?

I mean, maybe they can do some of these things, but if they exteriorize at that level, they exteriorize on this basis: They walk up and they see a broken egg. This frightens them, so they exteriorize. See? They make a slip of the pencil and they exteriorize. In other words, they run away from everything and confront nothing.

This doesn't say that everyone who exteriorizes easily, by a long ways, does this. But we must take this case into consideration. This case could also be a fairly murky case, or something like that. But Havingness is over this person's head.

Just in passing, what do you run on such a case? „*Look at me. Who am I?*“ See? Oh, you can get some wild ones on that. You take this case that can do anything. Boy, there's one thing he can't do, and that's identify his auditor. Do anything. „*Yes, I know who you are; you're Mother.*“ Sometimes tell you this with great ease. „*Yeah, I know, you're Mother.*“

If you started to search into the case's ability -- personal ability to differentiate -- you'll find out that you were auditing a bundle of machinery which wasn't in very bad condition; but of the preclear, there is no sign.

We don't know what this preclear did when he exteriorized. We don't know what machine went whir-click and put him which. See? We don't know what arms and levers and so forth. We don't know what made all those solid facsimiles; but the funny part of it is, is those facsimiles are very often more solid than real life. All kinds of oddities occur. Don't get fooled. And don't get fooled on this process of Havingness. See?

Havingness can be too high for a case. And when you have a process which is too high for a case, you at all times have a uniform comm lag with no change. Now, that's only confusing to you because when a process is flat you have uniform comm lag with no change. But you found uniform comm lag with no change, but you didn't flatten anything.

„*Oh, but some other auditor audited it. He must have flattened it.*“ You mean living in this cotton-picking universe for the six months that have elapsed since his last auditing session, which was only about ten hours at best, this fellow has not changed any in any direction at all? Oh, yeah?

Processes which are flattened do not necessarily always stay flat, and Havingness is one of them that doesn't. There are day- to-day changes in havingness. Person gets up in the morning and doesn't eat breakfast. You try to run Havingness on them. They can't have anything. You know? You give them a cup of coffee and a doughnut, something like that; they can have something. You get the idea?

The human beast -- excuse me, the human demon -- is too closely connected to food, clothing, shelter, weather, politics, cash, all kinds of things, you see, not to experience life. And if you conceive this person to be experiencing life at a distance, you've got it, see? He must be experiencing life at a vast distance, never to experience any change at all.

Either he's got to be in such terrific shape that he can bulldoze through anything -- the kind of shape that he would be put into with Lord-knows-how-much auditing -- or he is going to experience havingness changes day to day, sometimes hour by hour.

It's very funny, but you can take another process and, running it for a short while, change a person's havingness aspect.

Now, here's the only happy look about it. It isn't something that stays that way forever. This one occurs (this is an interesting little side panel on this): It changes less solidly (by experience), it changes less fixedly between sessions, on sessions in which Havingness is being run, see?

In other words, each time, the fluctuation is easier for the auditor to undo. Auditor gives somebody a two-, three-hour session -- ran him on Havingness, you see -- lets him go for a week. In that two- or three-hour session he had the person up to this consideration: „*Oh, I can have anything around here now.*“ See?

He didn't start on this big generality... Watch this one, too -- the generality case. Oh, that's gorgeous. It's any and all. It's the everything case, you know? „*What can you have around here?*“

„*Oh, I could have everything*“ First question, see?

„*Yeah, well, find something you could have.*“

„*Well, I could have anything. This is rather silly, you know? -- looking around and finding one thing I could have. I could have anything in the place.*“

„*Well, just find one thing that you can have.*“

„*Well, I mean, it's silly. I mean, why should I look around and just find one thing 'cause I can have everything Rrr-rrir-rrh!*“

What the test is, is not could he have everything, but the fact that he will not look around and find one thing! And that's one of these all-and-every cases. Everything. All. You know? In other words, if he has an aberration it becomes a total. Got that?

Now, it's rather easy for a thetan to fixate on any group of subjects and say that he knows that group, or he has that group down pat. But if he's fixated in his own knowingness -- that is to say, he has studied music and he is fixed on music. Now, he's fixed on music, see, because he's studied it, he likes music, and so forth. You say, „*What pieces of music do you like?*“ And your person who is well and easily oriented, you see -- consciously, knowingly oriented -- he'll say, „*Oh, well, Brahms,*“ something... He'll give you a piece.

But this other guy doesn't do that. „*Oh, I love music.*“ (We've run into this person.) „*I love music. Oh, music is just wonderful. You sit down and...*“ They listen to any piece of music that comes along, whether it's Wagner or Brahms or Tchaikovsky, you know, or Hammerstein -- going upscale. They listen to this piece of music, regardless of what it is, and it's always, „*Laaaaaaa wonderful!*“ you know? They're people trying to make music obscene. You say, „*If you get that spinny sort of a something or other every time you hear any piece of music, music must be poisonous in the extreme.*“

Now, you ask that person, „*Which piece of music do you like best?*“

The person'll say, „*All music. I like everything in music.*“

You say, „*Yes, but one piece. You know? One little piece.*“

„*Oh, but there are so many pieces, you know. I just like it all.*“ Get the same thing. You can't get this guy's head off a subject called music, see -- which is a generality -- and get him to select one piece.

In other words, his ability to select one thing or two things or three things; in other words, his ability to differentiate (see Book One: Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health) is shot!

Similarly, you run into this manifestation in Havingness. „*I could have everything*“ he said. Yes, this would be an optimum condition. But it's the lower, spinny harmonic on the condition you're trying to get the fellow into.

It's as though insanity, aberration, inability, and that sort of thing, was invented to shame actual abilities. It's just as though somebody came along and invented these things so as to disgrace a sane reaction. See that?

You can think of an insane person that way. He is making us all ashamed of being able to have two separate personalities. Each of us in a sane level is totally capable of many personalities. If I only had two personalities I'd consider myself poor indeed. But you certainly can have that personality which addresses the milkman when you haven't paid your bill, and the government department (another personality) that you have just found in tremendous error. They're two different personalities entirely.

And if you think that's you operating on a gradient scale, then you aren't differentiating either. You, a thetan, can have a tremendous number of identities. So what do we have psychiatry pounding in the head as being the prime function of very dangerous types of psychosis? What are these? „*Well, schizophrenia. Multiple personalities. Ooooooh, that's very bad. Ghrrrr...*“

Is it?

I guess if he thinks this is very bad, to have more than one personality, a psychiatrist really gets fixed in psychiatrizing, doesn't he? Tzzzzzha! Huh! Wouldn't you like to be dedicated to electric shocking people for the rest of your life? That'd be pretty grim.

All right. Now, let's look over this and we see, then, that some of the conditions which you're trying to put a preclear into, we very often find a very bad-off preclear in. We didn't understand this in the early days of Dianetics and Scientology, so we'd

be fooled every once in a while. Somebody'd go around saying, „*I'm a Clear, I'm a Clear.*“ He should have spelled it with a Q.

Here was something that was quite interesting. Just exactly what was this all about? Well, similarly, in Havingness we very often run into somebody who has got some manifestation -- just original, virginal manifestation -- of just being in perfect condition on havingness, see?

Watch it. I said I don't know a human being unaudited in two great nations who is perfect in terms of havingness. You know how I know? Because you could shoot any of them down with an atomic pistol.

I went back and looked up some of the records on the track -- I hate to bring up things like this, because it's para- Scientological -- but I found out that there was a coordination between being able to tolerate space and invisible particles, and being knocked over easily by ray guns. Very scientific research.

In other words, a person has to be allergic to something before it can hurt him. He has to have developed certain mental attitudes toward a thing before it can harm him. And I don't care whether you apply that to the body or the psyche or anything else. See, he has to have certain attitudes toward something before it can behave toward him in a certain way.

Give you an idea, somebody sailed in here one day; he was a fellow who had been through an HCA course, and he hadn't had much auditing. He'd done quite a bit of auditing in a rather unbalanced condition himself at the beginning. He had then done much more auditing than he had audited, and he'd unbalanced himself rather thoroughly. And he'd gotten into a criminal valence. He was thinking of himself as a criminal. Stepped into Union Station down here in Washington and, by golly, the cops picked him up and questioned him for murder till two o'clock in the morning. And he had an auditing session to run this out right afterwards, and this was the only thing he'd run -- of course, you could say he was in a state of shock -- but he all of a sudden cognited that he'd been in this for about a month.

A checkover of this particular individual showed that he'd been in contact with and trouble with the police for a very long period of time -- most of his life. The auditor audited this, and up till now the person has not been actively arrested. He is simply engaging in somewhat antisocial activities. But it has no connection with the police. Somebody cleaned police out of this case without cleaning the police up. Got the idea? In other words, we altered his consideration, his resistance to, his allergy concerning cops. Cops leave him alone.

Now this, you could say, was magic. But it's not magic when you understand that a person is part, by agreement, of all dynamics. You actually have to influence some other dynamic to have it influence the first dynamic. See, you have to actually influence the actions which are undertaken against you. You really do. And it's not very magical.

The fellow who goes around worrying about getting drowned usually gets drowned. If only on the basis that when he sees water, or a place where he could drown, he gets

nervous. This makes him less secure in the handling of boats, ropes, walking in gangways, bridges. See? So he gets nervous, and at the right moment he slips and he gets drowned.

People create their fates. Somebody who believes that one has accumulated an enormous amount of karma up and down the track, and so on, is believing that nobody creates his fates.

Now all you have to do with somebody who's worried about karma is get him to create a few fates, and his karma has a tendency to go poof! The way to solve karma is just to have somebody create some fates and consequences.

Look at this, now, because it becomes very important in this field of havingness. Now, I'm discussing havingness. And I'm discussing it from this angle for this one reason: these considerations which I have just given you, being unknown at the time, kept us to some degree from appreciating havingness itself. Because we'd find somebody who was practically spinning, who could have everything. We could find somebody who was not in too bad a condition who couldn't have very much. But that was our consideration, prior consideration, that the individual was able to have. Was he able to have?

And further research along the line has demonstrated that havingness is a direct index of the state of case -- direct index of the state of case.

But! But, has to be real; has to be conscious havingness. It has to be something where a person can look at something with perfect clarity and freedom and say he can have it or not have it at will. Do you understand that?

The thetan has to be able to have or not have, not a bunch of machinery. And boy, machinery is lying stuff. You look at this machinery and you ask it what it could have, and boy, it's liable to tell you anything. You got the idea?

So havingness was obscured by this fact that individuals on lower Tone Scales react like people on upper Tone Scales. But it's not a very hard thing to observe. It's about as difficult to observe as the Washington Monument to a low-flying pilot in the bright sunlight. See, it's right there.

This is where we merged into the sunlight: obnosis. A person could have everything, mock up anything. What shape is this person in? We went right straight back to the original Tone Scale. This fellow has endocrine failure, cross-up in all directions, body is in terrible condition, he's all fouled up like a fire drill -- and he can mock things up and push them in?

Now, you maybe don't see quite yet how this fooled us. But where we were fooled was on Subjective Havingness. You'll get out of this that preclears can fool you. As they go downscale they get fixed on harmonics of upper-scale phenomena. See, they get into these „*onlys*.“ See? They're not able to do a breadth of things; they do one. See?

All right, how could this fool us? Because a Subjective Remedy of Havingness -- the earliest form that Havingness had; that is the earliest form -- very often runs an individual downscale! So how could we evaluate this with tremendous importance?

Then, of course, I would say, „*Havingness is a variable to some degree. Therefore, it isn't a direct answer. Therefore, it isn't the thing*“ And this curve permitted me to miss a proper sight of the subject.

Now, how can an individual run Subjective Havingness and go downscale? Well, the truth of the matter is, he really can't -- if he himself is mocking up the masses he is shoving into the body. But every lower-scale case lets some object somewhere occur and then shoves it into the body, maybe. In other words, he didn't mock it up. It's not created. All he's doing is finding old pieces of the bank and shoving them into the body. Got that? That's what fooled us.

Now, very recently we found ways and means of overcoming this vagary so Subjective Havingness at once worked on everybody. I found this only a few weeks ago, actually. One of these simple answers that's almost too simple, you know?

If you have any question in your mind, or if you wish to play it safe on every preclear -- see, it wouldn't be needed on every preclear because a lot of your preclears could mock something up; but if there's any question in your mind, do it on every preclear - - when you have him mock something up, follow it with this command: „*Now make it a little more solid.*“ And that does it.

Just today in the HGC, all morning Dr. Brand was busily working on „*Mock up a female body. Mock up a female body. Mock up a female body,*“ and all of a sudden the preclear started on downscale. Now look, just mocking up a female body and adding female bodies to the bank of a female body is not going to shove that person downscale. That's not going to happen.

But he had the answer to this, see? We'd already talked about this a couple of weeks ago. So this afternoon he rolled up his sleeves on the subject and he said, „*All right,*“ he said, „*Mock up a female body. Now make it a little more solid.*“ And up the scale came the preclear, and started walking right through the top toward a nice, clean exteriorization.

I'm not talking about this this evening because that happened today, but it was rather interesting that at Auditor's Conference this thing had actually been proven once more after several such proofs.

This person was obviously doing a Havingness-type process. Just mocking something up, whether one shoves it into the body or not, is Havingness. But „*Mock it up, mock it up, mock it up, mock it up, mock it up,*“ didn't work. See?

I thought he was going to tell me at first, when he was reporting, that „*Mock it up*“ and „*Unmock it*“ was being successful. And that would be twice as bad on havingness. But he was merely straightening up his notes on the thing. The notes were that he was running „*Make it a little more solid.*“

In other words, mocking up something was not being obeyed by the preclear. Outside of that, the process was running beautifully. „*Mock up a female body.*“ Preclear, auto-



matically, tick-tick-tick- tick-tick over here, magic arm goes thunk! and puts a female body in front of the preclear, see? Preclear says, „*Yes, I did that.*“ Auditor says, „*Mock up a female body.*“ The bank hears him. Little arm out here goes tick-tick-tick-tick-tick-tick-tick-tick, thunk! A female body. Preclear says, „*I did that.*“

What do you think's happening here? The existing mass of the bank continues to be the existing mass of the bank, minus energy lost by heat transference. And the exact loss of havingness is the energy lost in stirring it up, see.

But „*Mock it up,*“ he would say; a little arm would go tick-tick- tick-tick-tick, you know. And the preclear would say, „*Yes, done that.*“ And he would say, „*Now make it a little more solid.*“ So the preclear would say, „*I wonder how you'd go about that? Make it a little more solid...*“ Finally say, „*Yes, I've done that, I guess.*“

Just that little bit of mass added to that mock-up is within the range of every preclear I've tested to date. They argue about it sometimes, but it is within their ability to add a tiny little bit to the mock-up. And if you want to be safe, you always ask them to add something to it, like solidity. See? If you always want to be safe, do that.

Now for the first time, Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health becomes a completely, utterly workable subject on all cases. Just like that, bang. Awful simplicity. Fantastic simplicity. „*Mock it up. Make it a little more solid. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid.*“ And there you go.

A person isn't sure whether he's mocking it up or not, you don't have to badger him about it. Just make it a little more solid.

And now we discover (after I found this out a few weeks ago) that Subjective Havingness always works, providing the person mocks up or makes more solid any image which he has consented to have in front of him. He can do one or the other now.

If you said, „*Mock it up,*“ and a machine put it there, you don't care. „*Make it a little more solid.*“ He did do something. Now we could say, „*Push it into your body,*“ and we could do anything with it. And we find if this takes place, the preclear always gets a gain. And that's that.

Now, why does this make Dianetics workable? Well, Creative Processing always had the power somehow, in most cases -- „*that's in most cases*“ was what we kept stumbling over -- to solve any difficulties with engrams or forms. See, you could take Creative Processes and you could handle engrams with Creative Processes, and it didn't take you 8,662 hours to audit out somebody's bank. See? You added to the bank. You supplanted certain things in the bank. You did a substitution. You did other things with the bank and you caused him to be able to handle his bank. And the moment that you could do that, of course, the form of engram running itself became obsolescent.

Now, running an engram contains in itself this ingredient: Once you run it through, then you run it through again, then you run it through again, then you run it through again, you're duplicating. You're going into better communication with it. But where it

severely injured somebody's havingness, the techniques of Dianetics didn't function successfully -- if something was wrong with the havingness factor. And that is the only trouble anybody ever had with Dianetics.

All the cases I audited, audited very well. I wrote a book and a bunch of bad cases showed up. A bunch of bad auditing here and there, and the next thing you know, we had to look for a better answer.

There are numerous reasons why this took place. It follows exactly the same curve as the amount of atomic waste in the atmosphere, which does things to energy. It depresses people's tone. I don't know what happened. I wouldn't venture to tell you that that is the reason why. But it may have an influence upon it.

All I know is, all of a sudden about the middle of 1950, boy, was I faced with some cases! I'd even audited insane people up to that time, and run engrams on them with great success.

Well, a better answer was needed and I went looking for better answers. And I got better answers all over the place. And boy, we certainly found out there was a lot of unknown material in the field of the mind. And we're just coming up on this to such a degree that, well, I'm afraid my own confidence along the line is insufferable now. It was always annoying, but now it's insufferable.

Somebody walks in, and he's in bad shape, and so on, and somebody says, *„Do we dare audit this case?“* -- somebody who has been around and hasn't changed too much from the last two, three years, you know -- *„Do we dare audit this case?“*

And I've been practicing -- I've been practicing how to look bored so I can properly answer these questions today, you see? The trick is to look bored enough so that it carries through with it a little criticism too, you know? It's just exactly the right note of boredom: *„Audit that case? Sure. I don't care whether they're spinning standing on their heads. Where'd you get him? Haul him out of a city sewer system or something? I mean, where'd you get the case?“*

*„Oh, the case is real bad off. Been eighteen years and two days in institutions, and they cut all of the neurons in the body in order to make the case walk better or something you know.“*

I say, *„Well, what's the matter? Whatcha talking to me for? Go ahead and audit the case.“*

*„Yeah, but the case is liable to blow.“*

*„Ohhh, no, it's not! Ha-ha! Not today.“*

Just this one -- *„Look at me. Who am I?“* -- cracks up the bulk of these cases. Mimicry -- you mimic anything they do -- probably reaches about as far south as anybody could go and recover. You show them they are creating an effect. How do you do that? By mimicking everything they do, see?

You show them *„I'm creating an effect, I'm creating an effect.“* They will obsessively start changing the things they do. They will get into a mad complexity. You'll really never understand how complex actions can be until you have inspected the very insane. Then you will understand how complex actions, motives, reactions, motions, can be.

I'm surprised that psychiatry never discovered this, because they're the people who own the insane. I'm surprised that they have never really delineated this peculiar characteristic. It's all incomprehensible to psychiatry, that is only answered by an incomprehensible explanation. Truth of the matter is, these people are all comprehensible if you want to get that complicated.

You say, „*Just why do you have that stool sitting upside down on the window ledge of your cell?*“ They're not sure you'll listen. But if you'll wait through the various comm lags, they'll answer the question. Maybe it's on your next visit, but they'll answer the question. And it will be something so involved that you yourself would feel that anybody would be a genius to figure out all of those concatenative reasons. How did anybody figure out that many associations which don't exist? Of course, they're not associations, they're identifications. And you ask a person to make an explanation along this line or tell you why it is necessary to have that stool sitting on that window ledge upside down, and it has to do, you'll probably find out, with the meteorological records which are kept in ancient Mu.

You'll find out that stools are actually the symbol for hunger. And if you invert them, this has a great deal to do with Greek mythology. Greece must have been a pretty good game in its day; so many people get stuck there -- all these classic scholars, and so forth.

But they are not following through any particular pattern which is sensible to anybody who can differentiate. They are identifying. But they are identifying in such a way, with such a complexity, that the pattern almost seems logical. It just doesn't quite break down anyplace on long inspection. But, man, is it complicated! Wow! See, terrific complications involved in this thing.

Well now, you ask somebody to mock something up; if you ask him to mock up something simple, you'll almost kill him. And this again was one of the ways we failed to recognize the quality and reasons and value of havingness. Ask him to mock up something simple. Ask him to mock up a girl sitting still. Oh, my. That girl turned into a dog and the chair jumped up against the ceiling; „*The girl is sitting still all right now, but it's all right, isn't it, if she's sitting up on the chimney?*“ Complications, complications.

In other words, you strike a case which has not much control over the bank and you get these tremendous complications in reaction, in terms of the bank, every time you try to make them put up anything simple. Therefore, Self Analysis is a better book than a straight process -- you see, it's a better book than it would be if it were written into a bunch of simplicities. It asks for almost impossible complexities in the bank, which makes a person quite satisfied. You do that much complexity, he works at it for a while, and he figures, and he can get interested at that level. Self Analysis again, however, would fail if a person were simply draining the bank.

So this is the liability with which an auditor lives -- that he runs down the havingness of a preclear. And if a technique isn't working, I'll tell you exactly why it's not working. It is exhausting, running down or depleting the havingness of the preclear.

If sitting there talking to the preclear, sitting there looking at him is knocking the preclear downscale, then you can be fairly sure that it's shooting his havingness to pieces.

How? Don't bother to inquire. That's why I've been talking about insanity. Because the person has ridges of some kind or another which, no matter how sane he is, have a very identified and insane behavior. He identifies you with Father, who always took everything away from him. Now, that's the logical explanation, and one which you would buy. But his explanations are not that logical. They're as complicated as the fellow who is carrying the stool or has the stool upside down on the window ledge. See, they're complicated.

So complicated that there isn't any reason to inquire. Just look at it basically and factually this way: The preclear is not succeeding with the process equals -- there's an identification for you, but that is the identification of the preclear -- equals havingness reduced.

Therefore, we find all sorts of interesting things. We find that two-way communication reduces havingness. Why does it do that? Well, it's by the consideration of the preclear. Is it really true that communication reduces havingness? No, it isn't really true. It basically is not so at all!

But sound has so often accompanied blasts in which that preclear has been blown up on the whole track, that he thinks that sound all by itself is destructive! And there are scientists all over the place who are trying to work with sound, trying to get it to disintegrate matter. Sound will never disintegrate matter, don't you see? But disintegration of matter has always been accompanied by sound. The only place on the whole track that there is sound is in an electronic explosion.

The person is out in space, you see -- a thetan out in space. There isn't even any air to conduit sound. Sound is an unknown experience to him, you see. In this cycle of action that he is engaged in, he doesn't remember sound. It's something that would be quite foreign and new to him. And all of a sudden, he finds himself in the middle of a lightning bolt. Well, the lightning bolt itself conducts sound to him. So his only association with sound is that of violence. Sound means violence. And he says, „*Two-way communication containing sound*,“ he says, „*this reduces havingness*.“ This reduces his havingness.

This shouldn't reduce his havingness. This shouldn't reduce his havingness. And the two-way communication isn't reducing his havingness, but it is utilizing sound, which always accompanied a destructive action which reduced his havingness. So he identifies loss of bodies, mock-ups, universes, with the electricity or energy which vanished them, which was accompanied by sound, which he now identifies with communication in an air-atmosphere planet. And then this follows through this way: It means that two-way communication is destructive to havingness.

Well, why argue with it. We can understand it. Too much two-way comm with the usual run-of-the-mill preclear does result in a reduction of havingness. Got that?

You don't even have to know what is reducing his havingness. You just know it's going down. And if you notice havingness going down, the thing to do is to put it up again. It's one of these idiotic solutions.

How do you put it up again? Well, I know so many ways to raise somebody's havingness by now, on any scale having even this Havingness Scale, that it would be pretty grim just having to sit down and list them all. I mean, it'd be one of these long, arduous jobs. And I have many more important things to do, such as answer memos and okay checks and straighten out advertisements, and lots of important things to do, you know. I wouldn't be able to do this other one.

Anyway, tremendous numbers of them. I'll just give you an example: „*Look around and find something. Make it more solid.*“ I mean, that's all by itself. Now, almost anybody can do that. Crazy ones can't because you can't get them in session. But almost anybody else can. Havingness goes down? Well, this is one of the most elementary of processes, which works at almost any level. Look, if it works on the bank, it'll work objectively. Who's making all this stuff solid around here?

Someday, in running Havingness, you will suddenly find out what the actual status of this physical universe is. Almost take your thetan head off. I mean, it's too idiotic.

Actually, there's not too much difference between the solidity of this universe and simply a person stuck on the track. The phenomenon of this universe is repeated almost exactly in somebody stuck on the track.

You have people make things a little more solid in the bank, and all of a sudden they will come up with some stuck-universe phenomenon which is as solid to them, if only momentarily sometimes, as this universe is solid right here.

The author of this universe is not in question; the author of its solidity is. And when you have anybody make anything a little more solid, it'll add to their havingness.

If you can have somebody mock something up and make it a little more solid (even though he didn't mock it up, it increases his havingness), of course, you can do that right in the room.

So just remember that one. I ask you to remember that one and don't bother to tell you to remember the rest of it, because the rest of it's complicated enough to elicit your interest and so that you remember it. But this is not a very romantic, interesting, complicated statement.

A person's havingness is going down, or your havingness is going down, look around and make something a little more solid. You know? You don't have to make it much more solid, just make it a little more solid.

How do you do that? Well, here again, how do you audit? You audit! You do it.

If you can conceive the isness of existence, if you can conceive an is not further associated, you have conceived, actually, the one step necessary to finally conceive mind essence, which is the total goal of Buddhism. Just conceive an isness not further con-

nected. And it's a wild experience, by the way. No further connection; a disconnected isness. It just is. It has no significance. Nothing else.

Somebody walks along and he sees a stone. Right away he says, „*Who made it?*“ Look, what does that have to do with the existence of a stone? Let me ask you factually, exactly what is this about? Somebody says, „*Who made the stone?*“ All right, I'm sure that this is another subject. But I am not at all sure that it is pertinent to the existence of a stone -- the identity of the person who made it. And yet every thetan is totally sold on the idea that you can't get rid of the stone unless you find out who made it.

I imagine somewhere on the track people were going around running Gallup polls on a house that they were trying to get rid of, or something of this sort, to find out who built it in the first place so they could then find out; and then they could turn around and say „*It isn't.*“ You see?

They felt they couldn't ever say „*It isn't*“ unless they had its authorship pegged down. We're not interested in its authorship. Not that stone. The stone is a stone; that's what it is. Now, that it was made is something new. Who made it is twice removed.

Havingness, in other words, is havingness. And that's what's very difficult to conceive about havingness, which is why I kept missing it. Too simple for me.

A thetan is in the peculiar state at all times of being unable to completely duplicate a solid or a space and being miserable if he doesn't have either -- which is basic game, of course. Got that? All right. As we look around the universe, we discover it's composed of particles (visible and invisible), spaces and solids. It's an awfully elementary universe. I imagine you'd get bored if you contemplated nothing but that, so we add to it vast significances. We get combinations of these elements (particles, solids and spaces). We get combinations of these elements and recombine them and combine them with new significance, new significance, new significances; and we go on with more new significances which add up to other old significances and that commingles with and compounds with existing significances. And we identify a couple of things and then skip a lifetime and forget what we have done, but still have it reactively effective upon us.

How far do you have to go to have a game, for heaven sakes? I thought you needed just a football and a playing field, but evidently you need the maker of the football. I can just see these two football teams out there, unable to play ball until they found out whether it was a Spalding or a Baldwin. See?

Therefore, the conceiving of an isness is a necessary thing. Your preclear graduates upstairs to being able to conceive an isness in Havingness, but he begins, unfortunately, in a lot of significances. The first significances that a human being encounters are those having to do with bodies in the immediate environment, which is worrying him.

He is in a body. That's obvious. The body talks and walks, and when we talk to it, it reacts. That tells you, then, that he is most intimately connected with that body. That tells you, then, it must worry him. Why does it worry him? Well, he's stuck in it! -- unless he can do this one thing: drop it or pick it up at will. If he can drop it and pick

it up at will, of course, it's not troubling him. But who can do this? Only somebody that's had the living daylights audited out of him.

This, about the year 800, was very easy. But later on it became a little more difficult. People figured out some new significances.

You mean you can take your body right where it is, and then without going to sleep or discommoding your awareness at all, just disconnect totally and then connect again totally? Just nothing to it. Pick it up, walk it around, drop it in a corner and let it sit Raggedy Ann fashion for a while? That's asking a bit, isn't it? Well, if he's not doing that, then he's stuck in it. So we know at once that his havingness on bodies is his lowest havingness.

Now, he uses a body to the degree that he considers it valuable. He considers it valuable to the degree that he has lots of them or they are available. And as bodies become less available they become more valuable, and then eventually become so non-existent, they aren't. And he's still stuck in them.

So, the story is that havingness really begins with a body. Closest to home, a person is stuck in a body. He's pushing one around, isn't he? He's talking through one, isn't he? So then, to some degree, this person has some scarcity of bodies.

Now, if you put him in good condition and he still continued to push around a body, we would say then he has a scarcity of exterior games. Like me. See? Obvious: I must have a scarcity of exterior games to this planet. And that's true. They haven't got any running.

All right. What do we do then? Calls for a Remedy of Havingness, that's what it calls for. Doesn't call for anything more complicated than that. We don't care whether that remedy was subjective or objective. It's a Remedy of Havingness of bodies. This is the significance which he will buy. This is the isness which he will buy.

Well, if he can't mock them up, he can make them a little more solid when they appear. But what if they're black? What if they occur only in blackness? All right, so he thinks bodies are best off in blackness. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid. That is the answer. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid. Mock it up... What? A body. What sex?

Well, if you wanted to be brutal, you would take the same sex as the preclear. Because obviously, a woman... To a woman there are less female bodies than male bodies. A woman believes there are more male bodies than female bodies -- by her behavior, not by her computation, you see -- because she is using a female body, you see? Therefore, it's more valuable. Most any gal will tell you this, that female bodies are more valuable than male bodies. It's true.

They nevertheless find less scarcity, usually on the opposite sex. So if you started it out easily, you would have them mock up the opposite sex for a while. That's just to give them experience in mocking something up. Hasn't anything much to do with their state of case.

Now, you curl the ends of your long, waxed moustache, and you have them mock up bodies of the same sex. The fun begins. All kinds of things are liable to occur if you just did that. But you will get stable gains of one kind or another. This person is mocking up a body of the same sex, and you're being sure by having him make it a little more solid. Case gains occur and are stable. Whether you mock one up of the opposite sex or whether you mock up one of the same sex, there is a stable case gain.

Awfully simple. They didn't do anything with it, did they? They wanted to know what to do with it; you told them to do as they pleased. They didn't do anything with this. You weren't playing a game with it, you were mocking one up. You were creating one and you were adding mass and havingness. You got that? Well, that's about the score.

Now, of course, if you've got them all straightened out on body of the opposite sex, then a body of the same sex, and they were all straightened out and boy, were they getting solid mock-ups that they were putting there, and they had good depth around them and -- ohhh! you know, and everything -- and you want to kick the whole apple-cart all over again, just have him mock up a couple; a male and female together.

Now, if the bank all goes to hell doing any one of these three things, if it caves in, if it upsets, if somatics turn on and off, if blackness comes on to a case that's never experienced any and goes off again, if the mock-ups become invisible, too thin, if they start double-ending and dogs start wheeling through the room on monocycles, you simply do the process. It's that the process is too simple for the preclear and greater randomness is occurring than the process. This is all that is happening.

Now, there are many things that you can do with this process to make it a little more complicated, and sometimes to do something a little more effective a little faster. One of the wildest things you ever did with a preclear was have him mock up Mother and say then that she's bad. You have him mock up Mother and make her a little more solid, say she's bad. Mock up Mother, a little more solid and say she's bad. The DED-DEDEX situation: Mama told him he was bad. He never did tell Mama she was bad.

You see how you could work out valences with this and exert, also, the power of evil that I talked to you about yesterday? This does all sorts of wild things. You can do wild things with any of these things as long as you basically know that havingness is; that a preclear gets as well as his havingness goes up, and he gets as bad as his havingness goes down.

If his Havingness, Remedy of, is well executed, he eventually is able to have space. And when he is able to have space, he will also be able to have invisible particles. And I'm afraid that at that point only, will he become capable of living in this universe at this time. So this is a rather worthwhile subject I'm talking to you about, isn't it?

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]