

BASIC LECTURE ON HAVINGNESS

A lecture given on
31 January 1956

I'd like to talk to you tonight about havingness. Now it seems that this might be a point we could overstress, you know, and we could have too much to say on this subject. But actually, there's very, very little has been said on the subject. Matter of fact, it doesn't matter how many reams I've written or how often I've talked on the thing, I've probably not scratched the surface of the subject of havingness.

First and foremost, havingness is the postulate that one must communicate versus the postulate that one must communicate to something. Do you at once see that this poses a cross-postulate? I must communicate / I must communicate to.

Now, if there's nothing to communicate to, all he can do is communicate through. And he would have endless, unlimited space with nothing stopping the communication all the way.

Now, I want to call to your attention a little sport that is carried on in one part of the world - it used to be a Greek sport, and it's been transferred over to Spain. And it's also done in Mexico and so forth. They get a bull who was stupid enough to pick up a mock-up in that general neighborhood, and they get him in there and they get him to run at a cape. It's quite interesting. He runs at the cape, and he goes through the cape. And he runs at the cape and goes through the cape. And he runs at the cape and goes through ... You can just watch this bull's morale deteriorate.

Finally - finally they take some old horse that is padded with blankets and so forth (question mark, because the padding is never thick enough Spanish thirst for blood) and they let the bull finally charge and push at the horse. And usually the bull gets the horse and the picador over between the fence and himself. And it's nice and solid. And boy, that bull goes to town. You can just see his morale go up, up, up, up, up, up, up. In fact, he would practically be a well bull if he could find it solid enough.

Well, as gory as this spectacle may or may not be, the point of the matter is that the picador leans on him very heavily into the hump with a big fork and discourages him from pushing that hard against something solid. And by the time they get him out there again charging at this cape - never a man, he never hits a man, he never hits a horse, he never hits a wall, he just hits this red cape and there's nothing there. Nothing there. Nothing there.

The bull, without really being hurt, he's - it's - probably feels kind of sore, but he's lost no blood to amount to anything; he's really not in a bad state, physically. Supposed to be totally physical, this whole bullfight, but it's not physical at all. He just loses his nerve. And he finally stands there in terror and sinks, then, into apathy. And he gets to such a point that a matador can come around and fixate him.

And, a good matador, if he really knew his business - they don't do this at all well. I mean, these guys want to make a big splash and a display and so forth. Once in a blue moon you see a good matador. And this fellow will simply fix the bull into any position - he could probably even stand him up in the air, you know, if he wanted to. Because the bull is now in a state of shock. He is hypnotized into a belief that there is nothing solid anywhere. That no matter how hard he charges, he will hit nothing. And he's gone. He's gone. I imagine if they simply kept him pushing at the red cape just a little bit further, he'd probably fall over dead anyhow; probably has nothing to do with the sword.

The physical aspect of a bullfight and the aspect of a thetan in the physical universe are not too wide apart, since the trick in the physical universe is to get them to charge nothing. Get them to charge nothing and keep them convinced, one way or the other, that there isn't anything they can

charge. Got it? Until at last, they do not believe that they can touch or lean on anything. And not being able to touch or lean upon anything, they then have the feeling that if they did utter a communication they would simply expend what mass they have because their communication would just go on forever. They would not be able to touch anything. Those walls are no longer real.

Very odd. Very odd. Here are these two counter-postulates. If an individual supposes that he should communicate, and if his joy and game and so forth is communication - mind you, it takes that game - postulate there - and if at the same time there is nothing with which he can communicate, no terminal, he has the vista of endless space. His communication itself is making the space. And then there is nothing to stop his communication, so there is no end to it, and it makes him feel very weak indeed. He just shoots the roll, you might say, every time he says anything because it never winds up anyplace.

So, he eventually does this interesting thing: He says something into a mass which he himself puts there. Now, however we want to classify this, whatever conditions or significances we wish to place upon it, nevertheless follows that this aspect of man fighting himself is man merely trying to reassure himself that there will be something to hit with his communication. You see that?

Now, he therefore puts masses up here, he puts pictures and so forth, so in case nothing is receiving his communication he still can reassure himself and say, "There is something there, there is some mass, I can accumulate something that I can go knock, knock, knock on, one way or the other, and my communication just won't go on forever."

He just doesn't like this idea - again, merely a consideration - but he still doesn't like the idea of speaking into a vast nothingness, so he himself accumulates his own terminals. And we get an oddity here of an individual constructing a universe, perforce, because he cannot have the universe in which he finds himself - the physical universe.

Now, a thetan is totally capable of constructing a universe himself, and the cycle is somewhat like this: He builds a universe of one kind or another, himself. Then he, in - by agreement and so forth, finds himself involved in a larger universe. To a marked degree, he simply invests the universe which he himself has created into this larger universe. Sometimes he doesn't like it, but sometimes he does.

And he then finds himself cojoining and existing with and in the physical universe. And now, because the physical universe does not offer him a sufficient number of terminals to receive his communications, he then begins to manufacture his private universe all over again. You got it?

Now, that's very important to understand, then, that the (quote) universe (unquote) that people are packing around with them when they come to you as a preclear are usually secondary universes. They have come into being because the individual has found an insufficiency of universe in the physical universe. Well, it's quite interesting that anybody could find an insufficiency of universe in a universe which is so capable of solidity as the physical universe. It's one of the madder things that could happen.

But it's done by disenfranchising the individual. You tell him he cannot address, cannot touch, cannot reach. And we interpret it as "cannot have a terminal." Reach, touch, address, have - whatever you want to call it, that terminal cannot exist for him. That's all it means.

And so, he stops talking to it. He says it doesn't exist. An interesting thing that somebody would get into the opinion that the wall didn't exist, because that happens to be the truth of the matter. It's very easy for him to fall into that one. See, the wall doesn't exist. That's an easy thing for him to fall into, because the wall is a consideration. All right.

Now, as we observe this, we find him forced into truth. And I've said before that the probable aberration, all up and down the track, is that an individual is forced into truth and away from a game.

As long as he can ably create, even as low a level as a lie (a slightly less low level, a problem), he still can have a game. But when he's no longer able to create, no longer able to put anything there, there isn't anything there. He comes upon the truth of the matter, so that all aberration seems to add up to is an enforced truth. This is a very great oddity. An enforced truth.

You are made to admit that what you conceive is there, is what is there in some such a way; and of course, you get an as-isness of the situation. And so you get a destruction of the terminals which you normally would have or utilize or a destruction of the spaces which you would utilize.

Mothers work on this rather hard - fathers, schoolmasters and so forth, "You must tell the truth." And they wonder if there's anything to this fact that a child ceases to be creative and imaginative after he's been around for a while. They must conceive there is something dreadfully, dreadfully destructive in this child's lying.

The person who would conceive the imaginative impulses of a child to be lies is, himself, in the interesting state of conviction that there isn't anything there anyhow, and there had better not be anything there anyway.

Let me call to your attention again a manifestation of a child who comes in and asks you for a sixpence. And he goes through various parts of the Tone

Scale as he slides on down and finally tells you when he hits the bottom of the scale - and even if you hold a sixpence out to him - finally tells you that he doesn't want the sixpence.

Do you know the child could get into a position where he has to make nothing of every sixpence he comes across. A rich father, in denying a child money - actually, it's an interesting thing that the rich man's son is usually the more aberrated child on the subject of money. And it comes about since he's told all the time that he can have everything, you see, and then he - all these things are enforced on him in some fashion. His power of choice as far as money is concerned is overthrown here and there, and finally he comes into the status that there isn't any money anyway, and the old man's fortune falls into his hands and swish! Gone.

You take the rich man's son and audit him, and you will normally discover that he cannot have money. Money is something that if it did come into his vision in any way, he would have to make nothing out of it at once. This is a fascinating thing.

Now, let's just get off of such a - interesting subject of money and a relatively uninteresting subject such as a wall, and we find the same thing applies to the wall.

Now, this child says, "I just shot a giraffe out in the backyard, mama." His mama is in pretty good condition, she says, "Yes, well make sure you bury it."

Mama is very well educated in the subject of havingness, and she knows there's no giraffe in the backyard. And she asserts this fact to the child. "Johnny, you really didn't see a giraffe in the backyard, did you? Now, tell me, Johnny. You realize you'll break my heart with these lies."

This is in the standard happenstance to mock-ups in children. I've had people turn around to me and tell me, from time to time, as a writer, some of the darnedest things about imaginative sequences, you know. They tell me that that really didn't happen, you know, explain to me how that really didn't happen and be very upset by it. Of course it didn't happen. Wasn't a word of truth in the whole sequence. Should have been obvious. But they cannot differentiate quickly and accurately enough between the creative and the truth of the matter.

And so, they are on such an interestingly unbalanced pivot with regard to walls and so forth, that if you started to create a new wall, you see, with a lie or something of the sort, they would know not only that this wall really doesn't exist - it'd be a pretty thin thing to them - but they know also that your wall had better not exist. And you're trying to give them a wall!

Wrote a story one time about "Beyond the Black Nebula." Or Nebula" and, oh I don't know if there's anything on the other side of it. I never looked. But, gee, people got upset about that story.

It posed the fact that there is, in Orion, a tremendous barrier, a black barrier, across this particular galaxy. And I made people look at this fact and then dreamed up some causations behind it and so forth, and probably this barrier as they read the story was threatening to get actual and thick, you know, and they were saying, "B-zzz-zzz-zzz I don't want this barrier. You shouldn't do that to us, Ron." You know, that kind of a reaction.

Well, here's a point. Here's a point: The person who could have a wall didn't care how many black barriers were manufactured. The person who could have something accepted a new manufactured wall in the spirit that it was given - the spirit of a game. But when that person could no longer have, he could no longer accept anything offered to him.

Very interesting thing. I imagine there are a great many girls that, if you walked up to them and gave them a pearl necklace, they would have to assure themselves of the fact that it was a phony or it was something of the sort or that it was worthless. They probably would take it down at once to get it assayed, just assure - and then if they were told it was a real pearl necklace and so forth, they would be quite upset about it. You could probably spin them in: ruin their whole lives by giving them a pearl necklace.

Now, here we have - here we have a case of nonactuality. This girl knows that jewels can't exist. See? It's simple; jewels don't exist. And what she keeps on saying is not what she is saying at all. She's saying the rest of the way, "Jewels don't exist. Jewels don't exist." You see? "Is it real? Is it not real?" You take to mean "Is it there or isn't it there." This isn't what she's saying. She's saying, "Honest, it doesn't exist." See? "Really, it doesn't exist."

Now, one of the more interesting ways that people make nothing out of things is to misintend them. So, that you could come back the next week maybe and find she'd used this necklace to decorate a cake or something or other. You know - anything.

You find this amongst savage tribes, particularly. I have had numerous experiences of handing out knickknacks and things like that to the kids or the elders of the village, and so on. And things that obviously should be used for one purpose or another, you know? Good can opener. They still get canned meat filtering into the country every once in a while. Come around, fellow's wearing it as a locket. It's almost impossible to guess, how wide of the intention they can throw something. Well, that's kind of, you know, to get rid of it.

Now, on a high-toned basis they would simply be trying to make it persist. On a low-toned basis they'd be saying it doesn't exist. So, you get the two manifestations meaning two different things in comparison to where the person is in relationship to havingness. All right.

This whole thing of havingness then comes down to communication and terminals. And there's a great oddity about the whole thing. And anytime that you have difficulty with the problem of havingness with the preclear or have any difficulty with the problem, that's because you've departed from this rather strange maxim. It's hardly a law, but it's a recognizable thing. There can't be enough havingness, you see? You never get a superabundance of terminals.

I saw Helen of Troy the other day - movie. And, here are the Trojans outside the walls. Now, you'd say, "Now they would be resenting those walls badly." In other words, they were trying to not have those walls, so they could have the spoils of Troy. All right. Fine. Fine.

There's a certain greed there that is interesting, isn't it? They want the spoils inside the walls. They can't have those - the walls say they can't have those, so you get the interplay there.

But the funny part of it is, is the reason they couldn't have them, is because they couldn't have the walls. You can develop almost any situation in life and resolve it on that basis.

You're trying to get over a barrier to gain something else. Well, it's a cinch that you can't have the barrier. If you can come into possession of the barrier, you become into possession of the rest of it. It's very amazing.

The only reason a person can get trapped is because he can't have traps. You see? And the only reason he goes out and gets himself trapped is because he can't be trapped. It's really quite, quite interesting.

But the systems which we have to own and have - "own" and "have" are really two little different things. You start owning something properly and it doesn't exist anymore. So "have" is maybe a misownership.

If you really have all the walls and barriers of the physical universe, they pose no problem to you. You have to select some of them out as unhaveable. And then you can have a problem in connection with some other havingness.

If you do not have methods of acquisition, there really is no acquisition possible. There would then be a total acquisition. And if you had a total acquisition, you would, own everything there is. And the way to own everything there is, is simply to own everything there is without any system of owning everything there is. And then make sure that you misown it so it'll continue to exist.

You get the oddities of problems which enter at once when we counterpose these two postulates: communicate to something. See, I must communicate and there must be a barrier to communicate to, but of course a barrier is antipathetic to a communication. No, a barrier is necessary to a communication. No, a barrier is antipathetic to a communication. No, a barrier is necessary to a communication because your communication must stop somewhere.

Well therefore, life well played would be a game of commenting in the proper direction toward the right barriers and not trying to go through the wrong ones. But you could get into some interesting problems if you tried to leave this room through that wall and take your body with you. See, that would be an interesting problem.

It's liable to throw somebody into apathy, but the funny part of it is - funny part of it is, it wouldn't throw him into apathy anywhere near as fast as simply being able to leave this room with his body through the wall. That would upset him. I guarantee you, that would upset him. No barriers. Nothing stops anything anywhere. All right.

Now, let's look at Remedy of Havingness in the light of stops. In *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, there are a great many command phrases. I seriously doubt if anybody in England has really taken a look at the behavior of engrams.

These are some of the wilder things. Person gets into a prenatal engram, something like that. These things are unheard of. They don't exist - or didn't. They are now written up in medical journals. But, they didn't exist.

The funny part of it is, you can take anybody and with a few magic phrases: "The somatic strip will now go to (in a certain moment in time), and when I snap my fingers the first phrase will occur to you." And the fellow will roll up in a ball. He can't help himself. He's never heard of *Dianetics*, never studied it. That's the way it goes.

You can run somebody through birth, and if an obstetrician were standing there, why, he could tell you exactly what type of birth this fellow had. Exactly what method of delivery was practiced in this particular case and so forth. Because the fellow quite ordinarily goes into contortions over the thing.

You run him through a sperm sequence - these are all very doubtful things, you understand, they only exist on complete evidence. And he goes through a sperm sequence, and it's impossible for a human being to lie on his back and then wiggle his feet from side to side in an S-curve; and yet, people run through the sperm sequence do that.

You can throw them into the conception engram - moment of conception and you will see, in lots of them, this odd foot-switch and shoulder-switch wiggle. They are assuming S-curves, in the wriggles on the way, which are not possible for a human body to assume.

Another thing, you can run a person through an inoculation of some sort or another. You can sit there and if you really know your Dianetics and you know how to run an engram right bang, you can watch the flesh sink in as the needle touches the flesh. It's quite interesting, because there are no muscles to do it.

The evidence of the engram, completely aside from the electronic deposit and so forth, is quite abundant. But the whole subject of the engram is a subject of can't have. If the individual couldn't have the environment and couldn't have the circumstances he was undergoing at the time, it's a cinch he'll have an engram.

See how that would be? Because he resists the environment to such a degree and considers it so foreign, so solid, and so dangerous, that he actually makes a sort of an energy plaster cast of the thing, and so makes a facsimile. Quite intriguing.

He really resists. You can ask somebody to stand here and resist with energy this window, and then let him go on for another ten minutes and ask him, "Can you remember resisting the window?"

And the fellow says, "Oh, sure."

And you ask him to remember it a little bit better and just slide him back in time to the moment he was resisting the window. And he will have, usually, a backwards picture of the window. You tell him to turn it around and he'll have a print of the window. Quite amusing. All right.

So, that tells us, then, something very important. That the visible engrams were those of loss. Those things the individual resisted - those things he couldn't have in the environment, he resisted - they are backwards. They usually are black-backed. Just like you had the pictures on the wall turned face into the wall, you see. You get a backwards print. And the back of the picture is black. All right. That's a lot of people's blackness, and that's why blackness succeeds lots of pictures. A person has lots of pictures and then finally blackness. He's gone down the role of being able to have, and then has said, "I must not lose."

Now, let's see what that is. There is a thing called a tensor beam. A thetan can do something that a physicist hasn't yet learned to make energy do here on this planet. But elsewhere physicists can do this. That is to say, they make a beam grab something - tractor.

You put a beam on the chair and pull it towards you. You can get the idea of doing that. If you can get the idea of doing that, energy will perform it. That's all there is to it. Now, if the chair, of course, were steel and you had a huge magnet in your hand, you could see how the chair would come to you.

But a thetan can do this without the thing being of steel. He can do a tensor manifestation. And he can put - actually put a beam around the back of somebody's head and stand him there. Have you been talked to lately by somebody who didn't have much to say? Huh? It's very stupid of

any lecturer, you know, to restimulate boringness engrams. But the fellow actually feels - it seems sometimes as though he has a beam around the back of your neck, and he's holding you there and you can't leave.

The electronic structure of a pretty girl who has just walked down the street is a very interesting thing to observe. Every guy she's passed has put a tensor beam on her, you know, tsk, tsk. Well, that's "Mustn't let the terminal go any further away." That's the motto of that beam, see.

So, the individual can have, and then he'd - can lose. He decides he can lose; and if he feels he's going to lose any part of the environment, he will hook a beam over it. Do you see how this is? And he'll hold it there in front of him.

And if you take a facsimile apart very carefully (aside from simply mocked-up or copied facsimiles, that's very possible, too) you will see that it is - if the preclear is looking at it - is cross-sectionalized as a tractor beam. He's trying to hold something from leaving him.

Now, he tells you, "Oh, I don't like these pictures, and they bother me, and all of this, and they're very, very upsetting to me." Take a few away from him. He'll start to crab at you. He is actually unable to retain to him the actual object, and so, he gets a picture of the object which he can look at straight.

Now, below that level he goes into blackness, and this blackness is simply pressing on things. He pushes things. See, things mustn't come any closer. Well, that fellow has already gotten himself into some frame of mind with regard to something. Anybody has got some blackness on his track. It isn't true that cases are black and other cases aren't black. Anybody has got some blackness on his track. Sometimes you start to run a wide-open case that will just run along fine, and all of a sudden it all goes black.

You could take almost any preclear today and start to remedy his havingness and all of a sudden blackness will show up. Well, you better know enough to say, "Mock up some blackness and shove it in."

So, we get the engrams of resistance. And the engrams of resistance are black. And we get the engrams of "Mustn't go away," and they are pictures. And an individual who can't have the physical universe, can't have anything leaving him because he can't have anything else, you see, he at least retains a picture and there is how he builds up this secondary universe. Now, that really isn't his universe. It's pictures of the physical universe which he has in lieu of

Now, an individual only gets into a frantic frame of mind about things leaving him if he can't have anything else. He's talking to a friend, and this friend and he have been very good friends for a long time, and this friend says 'Well, I'm going up to Galway, now, and, I'll be up there for a couple of years.' And the fellow goes zzzuh, you know. Trying to persuade him to stay, you know.

If you ask anybody who did that, he would not be able to tolerate the amount of distance between himself and Galway, number one. He would not feel that he had any other friend anyplace. See, he's already on a big scarcity of friends.

All right, you've got lots of friends and one of them says, "I'm going to Galway." You say, "Okay, fine. I'll be up and see you someday." You let him go, you get the idea? That says you can tolerate that distance, and he doesn't, to that degree, reduce your havingness. Person would be in good shape, you see? He'd also be very easy to get along with. All right.

Now, as we look over the general situation on the subject of havingness then, we find out that it is a decline from having one's own universe exclusively, to a matter of cooperating with the universe, which is the physical universe; and then we run out of havingness of the physical universe, and we get into a point of a little anxiety - we might lose parts of it. And from that we pass into "We're liable to acquire some of it." And we get a flip. And therefore, we must resist

parts of the physical universe, and from there we go on to total not-have. That is a disenfranchisement - total disenfranchisement of the individual.

Now, I'll tell you a little game. You ever find yourself flinching a bit from a pc? Pc is sitting there running something quite restimulative one way or the other, and you find yourself flinching a trifle. You find yourself sitting back. If you were to look at your own physiological anatomy, you would find out that your space has collapsed to about here, right about to the end of your nose, and he's got the rest of the space in the room. That's you being uncomfortable.

What happens? You can't have him, so you put a barrier up there that you can have and talk to anyhow. To that degree, you go out of communication with the preclear.

Tell you a little stunt, horrible stunt: Sometimes a very sensitive preclear will know you are doing this, and they get - dzzuh. You look over the preclear. You find out you're kind of backing off, you know? The preclear's life is private. The preclear's case is the preclear's case. You really don't have any business, you know. You feel, "Well, I'll let him talk," and you kind of find yourself backed up into no space and he's occupying all of the space. You just find out what part of the preclear you can have. Because that's what's happened. You've run out of havingness of preclear. That's all that's happened.

Do you know that this can happen to you, and you lose the preclear; you really go out of session as an auditor. And do you know that if you have too few preclears that you begin to believe that there aren't any. And you don't reach for anybody or process anybody, because they don't exist.

Well, that's the beginning of it. One preclear is rattling on at a drooling rate of horror, horror, horrible fates and so forth, and you kind of start backing up, you know? It's all for the preclear, and your space finally gets to about here, see.

Well, you've run out of the havingness of one preclear. And then you're liable to lose another one, and then you're liable to lose another, and then it'll get to be a habit.

And then pretty soon you'll be saying, "Well, I haven't audited anybody for weeks. They don't exist. I mean, it's very hard to get preclears. It's very difficult to get preclears." This is just a case of havingness.

But the same law applies. If there's anything wrong with the subject of havingness or the subject of terminals it is, there are not enough. There cannot be a superabundance of terminals.

Honest to Pete, this street could not be stacked full enough full of preclears, see, really, to satisfy your idea of preclears if you were really rolling. Oh, you'd say, "It's wonderful. I got eight thousand preclears to audit between now and next month."

You probably - if you really had that and you could have them all and so forth, boy, you'd be a happy guy. Eight thousand preclears - you mean you're going to audit twenty-eight hours a day, huh? All right. But that would be the frame of mind you'd be in at the same time.

So what? You know? I work thirty-nine hours a day, it's all right with me. Audit one on the phone, one in front of me. A couple of preclears that were in the waiting room, we'd put them in an antechamber and have them co-audit. I've done that, by the way. Anyhow ... Don't like to have people wait.

Now, there is a cycle of it. And it's quite interesting if you look over the preclear that is doing this to you. You know, you're running out of space, you just look him over and find out what he's got you can have, you will find out that your level of havingness of the preclear has dropped a hell of a long way. And you can build it back up again. As you're auditing him you just quietly and privately pick it up. Sometimes the preclear gets aware of the fact that he's all of a sudden surrounded. It's quite interesting.

But he only gets upset about it if he can't have his body. What little tenuous grip he's got on what little body he has left is so light that the idea of any other influence around him drives him half mad. And if he's in that kind of a condition and you suddenly start adding up: (Let's see, what can I have about this guy?) "Yeah, that's fine. That's very good. Now, tell me something else you could consider dead ... That's fine." (Now, let's see, what can I have about this guy?) You see, and (I could probably have the dirt in his socks or something like that.)

And if he's in fair condition, he will actually feel better about it. But if he's in very bad condition, he's liable to get very jumpy.

But there's an oddity. And after you've done that to a preclear or two or six - you know, just do it once in a while, look it over - when you get in a frame of mind where you can have preclears, you're actually running on "What body could you have?" you see?

And what you're doing is a gradient scale; instead of reaching out of the bin of your life and selecting a body that you can have, you just pick out what you can have about a body, you see? You run the gradient scale approach and build it up, and you'll find out oddly enough that you can have this preclear. And the moment you can have him, you can really make that guy well. You're liable to get tired of seeing him sit there running considerations and computations and that sort of thing, and say, "Oh, hell," and as-is the condition of his leg and mock up another one and shake him by the hand and tell him, "Goodbye."

You think I'm joking. But if you were in a terrific state of havingness with regard to preclears in general, why, your ability to handle them would be rather fantastic. You would only minimumly account on sorting out the right combination. You would keep their havingness remedied. You'd keep them exercised one way or the other and so forth, and you'd straighten them out. All right.

That is primarily a very practical application of these principles - talking to you about. There actually can't be enough of them. If you can't have a preclear or if a preclear were to make you nervous or upset in some fashion, it's just a not-having and the answer is there aren't enough of them.

That's an oddity, but this just works out. It's one of those outrageous things. This shouldn't be. It should be that there should be considerations which said, "There are enough, there are too many, there are too few." And you should be able just to have these considerations bang, bang, bang, just like that. Not as long as you're hanging around a body in this universe. The consideration which works out is, is "there can't be enough."

Funny part of it is, the moment that you get into a consideration that there are quite a few, you run out of greed. You just pass right on out of greed on the basis. You pass from greed into abundance. Greed only comes about in the face of a scarcity.

Government down here says, "Prices are going to go up in August." That's an envisioned scarcity. Well, they'll create the scarcity. "Prices are going to go up." Everybody who's got a plugged - penny will be down at the stores buying the commodities off the shelves at the lower price in anticipation of a rise. So, there'll be a scarcity so the prices will go up in August. And then everybody's got it in the back closet moldering. So, we get into the symptom of waste. So, greed leads to waste.

Now, as an individual looks out across the face of this particular universe, he is prone to believe that there's an awful lot of space there with darn little matter in it. And he gets planet-happy. A lot of people get planet-happy. Sometimes it takes very extreme forms. Sometimes some people are being good simply because they can't have anything; even if they stole it, they couldn't have it. You get the idea? That's a kind of an apathetic being good, you know? That's the sort of being good that a lot of agencies of one kind or another think is the only sort of being good there is.

These people are just unfathomably bad to have around. You said it. They're down on a make-nothing-out-of-it death ratio. If the government or somebody starts to go, they are the first ones covertly to be around the corner and pitch that cobblestone. Get the idea?

They are the food for any revolutionary. They are the troops. Because they have no responsibility for anything. And any change they compute then, loses them nothing. And having no vested interest, they thereby compose a revolutionary area in a country. You want to look at the poverty-stricken people who have nothing, but more important, amongst those, those that can't have anything, either.

Just because a person doesn't own a lot of money doesn't mean he can't have a lot of money. There are a lot of fellows who have a lot of money who can't have a dime; they're very dangerous people. They're at a level of no responsibility on the subject of money. And they will do the most confoundedly stupid things.

There's some fellow by the name of Jackalson, I think, that owns a lot of stores, in Jackalson. He's an interesting fellow. He just has zillions and millions and millions of pounds. And he can't have one threepence. If you were to walk up to him and hand him a threepence, he would probably say, "What's that?"

He really can't have money. And so he goes on accumulating money, accumulating - but it isn't real! He'd just as soon do in every life form there is. He would hang, draw and quarter people to get another tenpence out of them. And here he is, he owns everything everywhere, getting in everybody's hair, and organizations are stumbling all over him, they don't know which end they're going - it's a fantastic picture.

This is somebody who can't have money who has to have money. You got the idea? Well, the truth of the matter is, he is a poverty case. He's a not-have case. And, boy, that fellow can cause people an awful lot of trouble. It could cause a government trouble, if you were to go up to one of these chaps and offer them a couple of quick pounds, they probably would sell out to any other government that came along. I mean, they have no responsibility. Their vested interest is - doesn't exist, you see? That's what's very, very poor. These people are not regulatable in any way. They can't have anything. All right.

Now, let's take the opposite to that: a fellow who has everything and doesn't have to have anything. He's also uncontrollable. He isn't hungry. You can't appeal to this man because he's got what you are trying to offer him. He's got the very pound that you have in your hand.

You're trying to say, "Now here's this pound and I want you to run down to the corner."

And he says, "Why should I run down to the corner?"

"Well, here's this pound, I want you to run down to the corner."

"Well, why should I take the pound? I've got the pound."

"No, you haven't got the pound, I have the pound."

You'd say, "Oh, ha-ha-ha. It's in your hand, but it's my pound."

"You mean, for the privilege of putting this in my pocket, I am to walk down to the corner. My pockets are full." You'd get into a very nonsensical sort of argument.

The fellow, in other words, would be above the level of game of "have" if he were doing this. And the other fellow's below the level of game of "have," and both conditions can produce a randomness in an area, more than somebody can handle.

If all the workers in the British Isles were suddenly to have no use for any pay, goods or commodities, there would be that game. That would be a gone game, see? At once.

Nobody pretends that anybody would get up to that level of game. The funny part of it is, they get up toward that level of game and they go back into action on the game. Only they play the game now efficiently and they play it as a game. Not as a dead, serious, horror that they have to face somehow. That's the difference. All right.

You can ask this question, "Are you enjoying life?" In other words, "Is life a game to you?" You would ask at the same time, "By any chance, are you in the band of havingness below owning everything there is, and above owning nothing and having to make nothing out of everything there is? Are you by any chance in that band?" Or, "Are you enjoying life?" These are the same questions - identical questions. No real difference.

Except one fellow wouldn't be in the universe. He wouldn't be there to ask. So, hypothetically it's an incorrect statement. But the guy who can't have anything and is resisting it, boy, is he there. He's there. He's stuck. He's stuck, thud. Right there.

Now, let's look at this thing called "stop." The old engram used to have "stop," "holders," and so forth. Now, these are embryonic barriers. These are barriers aborning, you might say; the statement or postulate "to stop." And an individual who gets an anxiety about havingness begins to accumulate out of his manufactured bank all of the stops and begins to hold them near him so that he will have barriers that can receive something, and he won't get into this condition of the bull.

See how he does it? He selects all the stops out of the bank, almost knowingly, and puts them there, and he will then have a barrier. There will be something there to resist; something there with which a game can be played. And thereby and therefore, he forms a false wall in a secondary universe. The primary universe is the physical universe, as far as he's concerned, in the state that he's in.

Now, there's an earlier universe which is his universe. And that had barriers and walls, too. But, you'll find that the preclear will thrash around for a while - he'll eventually discover this home universe.

But for our processing purposes, we are talking about this primary universe, the physical universe. And we're talking as - the reactive mind, the facsimiles, engrams, energy, pictures in it, as a secondary universe which is formed by reason of not being able to have the physical universe. And that's how the reactive mind gets born, that's where it comes from.

Now, you very often have to get a preclear over the humps on the subject of havingness on his reactive mind. We do that on Creative Processes, and so forth. But these extend at once to a higher echelon - the physical universe. And then if you remedy his havingness totally on the physical universe and got him to have everything in the physical - no longer with mock-ups - you just have him look at things and find out what he could have, and you had him totally remedied on this subject, he would then be able to and be in a position to create a home universe or universe of his own. See how the graduated scale goes here. It goes from reactive to physical to home universe.

Somebody could separate out of this universe simply on havingness alone. First he'd have to be able to have his reactive bank. Then he'd have to be able to have the physical universe. And then he'd have to know that he could create something else. You see how that would be? All right.

This game of havingness is absolutely necessary to auditing. Apparently, havingness to many people means barriers. And barriers means lack of freedom. But to you, an auditor, a barrier should mean a game. And an absence of barriers is the trouble with the preclear. He hasn't enough barriers.

Now, you can say this about anything. Preclear is exhausted. He hasn't got enough exhaustion. Preclear has got a cold. He hasn't got enough cold. Preclear has migraine headaches. Hasn't got enough migraine headaches.

See? Anything it is, it's just, at once, it's on this: Something has gotten scarce and the next step after getting scarce is for it to get valuable. Now, the mechanism of something getting valuable is, first, it must get scarce. And after that it becomes very, very, very valuable; and then it becomes so valuable it's rare, and when it becomes rare ... How many women have you seen with Kohinoor diamonds walking down the street in the last few minutes? None.

Well, you might even wonder if a Kohinoor diamond existed. And I'm sure there is many a girl who is very good looking who has reached this point of havingness about Kohinoor diamonds. I'm sure she kind of doubts that they exist. They're probably all cut glass. If you were to ask her suddenly about it, she'd probably answer in that wise there, "Oh, I - I don't see what's so good about them, you know, if they do exist." She's in an apathy on the subject.

And that's a very dangerous state for women to get into. If they got this way about diamonds, fur coats, Rolls-Royces, ten-pound notes - holy cats! Think of what would happen. The whole game of the society would just be gone. All right.

Now, as we look over, then, the subject of havingness, we must not ourselves, in trying to do something with the preclear, fall across this one. Just intellectually, if processing didn't measure up to it on ourselves, we would have to say, "All right. Well, we just kind of take this on face value and so forth: Barriers are not necessarily bad. Barriers are necessary and what's really happened to the preclear is, is he's run out of barriers and thus has run out of games, so he is now detesting barriers. And therefore, we will simply figure out some way to give him some more barriers."

Tell you an interesting process that comes along in this line. Just have the preclear start mocking up walls flat against his nose. I don't care what kind of walls - black walls or anything else, just have him mock up walls flat against his nose.

This is one of these processes that can just go on and on and on with continuing cognition and so forth; the walls will get better, and better walls, and better walls, and he will be amazed because he will start protesting at once about these walls. He'll say, "Oh, I don't know. Up against my nose, isn't that awfully close for a wall?"

So, we just get walls, walls, walls, walls, and more walls; and do we do anything with them? Nope. Nope. Just - the wall is there, just let it evaporate or stay there or do anything else. They don't care what you do with them. And just keep mocking up walls. Now, if we wanted to get a little fancier, we would have him waste walls for a while. This is what he's doing anyhow. He's wasting barriers, see?

Now, a wall, actually, is a highly special kind of barrier. But anybody recognizes - a preclear very often won't recognize a person as a communication terminal or something which will act as a backstop. You don't get a backstop, you see, in a communication terminal. He's fogged up about this; he thinks his communications go through them, he can't conceive it. But he knows more or less that if he did run against a wall and hit his head on it, that the wall would be there and his head would be there; there'd be an impact. He knows this, so you have him mock up walls and you capitalize on this amount of information.

Well, you could have him waste them for a while if he couldn't even do that; and after a while, after you've asked him for ways to waste walls, you finally have him mock them up, he would be able to get them.

Now, a little bit fancier on the thing: You'd have him go over and feel the wall. But the funny part of it is, is they are very often so far downscale on the subject of the wall, that although they feel the wall, they are not sure of the wall. The moment they stop feeling the wall, they're merely

looking at the wall, they say, “Ah, well, it’s - like that; it’s obviously a wall. If I walked over and ran into it, I guess I’d bump my head, I suppose, I don’t know.” You know, certainty.

Now there, as we go up the line, we would eventually have him get into the idea of terminals. And we would start having him waste and make communication terminals - one of the upper steps of SLP 7 - just mock up terminals. Mock up terminals. Mock up terminals.

If you had a preclear who was in terrible shape and you just ask him to mock up walls flat against his nose, why, he would get someplace. This is a certainty.

Now, you want to know what those funny ridges he’s got - what are these funny ridges he’s got? He’s got a ridge here, he’s got another ridge here, and he has terrible pressures against his ears, and he complains about these things. What a nut. He complains about them. He’s complaining about them, about having them, when as a matter of fact, he can’t have them! Do you get the idea?

Now, that’s what he’s doing. And so therefore you say, “Put some more walls there.” And when he first starts this he gets the basic impulse of the preclear. The preclear is in real bad shape, going to come in there and he knows just exactly what he’s doing - he’s going to make nothing out of everything. Nothing out of this and nothing out of that and nothing out of something else and nothing out of that and make nothing out of you, and he goes away and he makes nothing out of your bill. And if you just let him get away with this, he’s going to stay in processing forever. But in view of the fact that he makes nothing out of your bill, too, what’s the point?

So, pc’s got a ridge. Conclusion: He hasn’t got enough ridges. Pc’s got a cold. He hasn’t got enough colds. Pc’s got a bum leg. He hasn’t got enough bum legs. Pc’s got some bad lungs. He hasn’t got enough bad lungs.

Now, when we were first studying havingness three years ago, I rather supposed that it was an interchange of energy which ran out the bad and left the good. Don’t you see? This was a matched terminal affair. We had the preclear mock up a person with a cold out in front of him, you know? And we had him do this several times, and we considered that the cold discharged.

That was not the action. I always stated that kind of cautiously to myself that it just didn’t seem quite right because it was not quite workable, because the havingness reduced if we did that too much. If we put two people with colds facing each other, yes, the preclear’s cold would get better, but his havingness would go down in some fashion or another. It was kind of mysterious.

Well, the mystery of the thing has to do with just this one thing: We didn’t have him mock up enough colds, and they weren’t bad enough colds. We didn’t have the cold really running and dripping, you know? No sonic in it: slurp!

And if we actually have him mock up colds and shove them in on himself, and mock up colds and throw them away, and mock them up and shove them in, he’ll eventually - if you have him throw away things and push them in and waste them, do anything with them at all, but mock them up and do something with them - he’ll eventually get the idea, you know, “There are more colds in the world than this one. What do you know? Uh-huh.” And he’ll let go of it. It becomes less valuable.

Now, therefore, in the treatment of chronic somatics and psychosomatic illness, you’ve got an answer. It’s a fantastic answer. The use of it is a lower echelon. “What problem could a cold be to you? Invent a problem a cold could be to you.” Lower echelon. And to get a complete recession and cessation of it, you’d have to follow through with a Remedy of Havingness of colds. He hasn’t got enough colds. Now, if you can do this, you can handle chronic somatics.

Now, the reason a guy is stuck in a body, obviously, is because he hasn't got enough bodies. He's not running eight or nine, he's only running one. And he gets the idea very easily that he doesn't have enough bodies. Obviously, the answer is, "What body could you have?"

Remedy his havingness with it. Ask him again, "What body could you have?" And he tells you, "Well, I don't know, a duck's body maybe." Remedy his havingness with it. You don't care what it is. And remember that the end of a Remedy of Havingness is being able to throw one away. He throws one away and knows it, why, that's the end of the Remedy of Havingness. All right.

Therefore, as we look over this general situation, we discover that we must bring our preclear into a possession of a great deal more of the physical universe than he has. So regardless of the subjective remedies, we've got to get him into a physical universe remedy, too. And the way we do that, we ask him, "Look around here. What could you have?"

We don't let him do it subjectively. You make him do it with his eyes wide-open, "Look around here, what will you have?" And you, if you're retreating from him, look at the preclear and find out what you can have about him.

This is, in essence, auditing - where she is going and how she is done.

I hope these principles about havingness can assist you a great deal. There are too many preclears around still making nothing out of everything. It's easy to get them over this - just boot them up so they can have something.

If they make nothing out of everything, they can't have anything. Those two remarks go together. If they've got something and are holding on to it, they haven't got enough of it. If they haven't got anything at all, they haven't got enough of that either. Abundance of terminal is the answer.

Thank you very much.

Thank you very much.