

GE SCIENTOLOGY

A lecture given on
31 January 1956

Want to talk to you now about recent developments gained from the staff reports and my own research and processing and your boo-boos. Now, also, your successes.

Audience: Thank you.

I'm not going to invalidate everybody tonight; no sense in doing that.

Now, as a matter of fact, there are a couple of faces I see here, whose recent auditing I have had very, very fine reports on. Very fine reports. So, we evidently have turned a couple of corners. So, we are evidently getting, as you have gotten, rather consistently good results throughout, but we're starting to get some spectacular results, and that's all I ever settle for. That's right. Nothing but a spectacular result.

Now, the worst part of a spectacular result is this: is when it becomes average, it ceases to be spectacular. You get that?

Audience: Yes.

Now, I can tell you that the last three months preceding this early February 1956 lecture have been months of turmoil in the field of processing and, to a much lesser degree, in the field of organization. They have been months of turmoil. Because all of a sudden under the heavy microscopic eye of Scientometric testing, which is always kept on the results coming up, processing results ceased to demonstrate uniform gain - all of a sudden.

It was about the same time that Not-Knowingness Processes were released into general hands. Now, that is a great oddity. One would look at once to see if it was the lack of success of these Not-Knowingness Processes.

One would look to see whether or not it wasn't some other factor because in looking at Not-Knowingness Processes, and the profiles gained by simply running "not-know" and "don't-know" and "exteriorize" showed gain. So, some other factor had suddenly been introduced. And what this other factor was, lord knew.

But I tried consistently, from the time that these gains stopped showing up, in very remarkable style, until a relatively short time ago, to discover what had been dropped, sort of suddenly, out of auditing. And I eventually found that the Remedy of Havingness had been dropped out of auditing, and although you get early gains on Not-Knowingness or Don't-Know Processes, and early gains on all Separateness Processes, too often - in fact, rather usually - the preclear starts to run out of havingness and auditors had had a Remedy of Havingness so high on the old Six Basic Processes, they had seldom looked at it. They didn't realize it was something that you ate and slept with, you know? They didn't realize it was that germane, that important.

And so, we had to take a complete overhaul of the entire subject of Scientology and reevaluate all of the importances of it. Which wasn't an auditor's fault, or it wasn't the staffs fault, really wasn't my fault; it's just something had gone a little bit awry.

A recent report, in fact today, from the Hubbard Guidance Center of Washington, DC, demonstrates now that a Remedy of Havingness has been put into action (and these reports only reflect its being in action one week there), reflect a gain once more. A good gain. And this leaves us with some preclears that we've got to go back and process, because they didn't get gains.

Now, what an oddity. What an oddity to all of a sudden come along everything's sailing along beautifully, you're getting beautiful gains and then suddenly, wham, no gain. Because at the same time we had come much closer to a very distinct understanding of the human mind, the human beingness. We came close to an understanding of life and human beingness, closer than we'd ever been before, and all of a sudden we didn't get any gain. What happened?

Our processes got too strong. The processes got too powerful, too suddenly, and overwhelmed the havingness because the masses and spaces of life are problems. And we had suddenly, just like that, reached out and solved too many problems simultaneously and weren't holding up the comparable gain in terms of havingness. Don't you see?

Audience: Mm-hm.

The processes all of a sudden started to burn up all the havingness on the track because they solved oh, problems, problems, problems. In other words, we got too good. You could say that.

Now, you can tear up a preclear with such rapidity today, with some of the material which has been developed in the last four or five months, that for the first time I must give you a considerable caution on the use of Scientology. Use it lightly, if you please.

Now, this is an interesting state to be in: To know more about life than we'd ever known before and get no gain, and then to go back and have to pick up something that we've known about for three years and bring it up to the fore solidly, study it all over again, reevaluate it anew and find out brand-new data about it in the light of the additional material we knew.

Well, that really puts us in present time with Scientology. But it also tells us that the materials which we have had to hand have not at any time been lacking in some power.

Three years ago when Creative Processing came out, we had ourselves a very, very weighty tool. But we didn't know just as much as we needed to know about the exact internal anatomy of existence, you see? And therefore we used

Creative Processes to shave off the edges of the preclear, you know, instead of just take an auger and bore the center out. You get the idea? All right.

Now, today, although we have abandoned no information, we have a much better understanding of the Remedy of Havingness. Now, I call your attention to SOP 8; good old SOP 8, which appears in Scientology 8-8008. What was called Step IV of that process is very interesting. It is called Expanded GITA - means give and take, wasn't an Indian word; it's just a short name, give and take.

So that you had the individual take some havingness and throw away some havingness. And the way you did this was get him to waste, accept, desire, and be curious about various items. And there was a tremendously long list, tremendous list in that old SOP 8.

Now, that step is very workable today, there's nothing wrong with that step, but you could certainly narrow the living daylights out of that list, you see. Just what factors do you use?

Well, we find out oddly enough that it really doesn't matter what factor we use in the list. The havingness is the thing. Havingness is the thing. It isn't the significant havingness. The significance isn't as important as the actual mass involved.

So, going back and coming up to present time on the whole subject, we now prepare Six Levels of Processing, Issue 8. And dedicate it to old SOP 8. And we devote the entirety of Level One of SLP Issue 8, 1956, to the Remedy of Havingness - the entirety of Level One.

And in actuality, this is all we do with a preclear to start out with. We get him to sit still, to find the auditor, find himself in the auditing room. Find out if he has a present time problem and at once begin to use a Havingness Process. At once. No slightest break.

Now, this Havingness Process is not as good a Havingness Process as many of them. But very often it's as easy as the preclear can be handled, you see, it's just - he wouldn't go for anything more than this.

His present time problem is, if it is there, a pressing thing. And to take his attention off of his present time problem is, to be very, very, very technical, a boo-boo of the first water. To yank his attention off of a present time problem is to cave the present time problem in on him. All right.

Now, I suppose I can be allowed a few mistakes, I suppose. I make a practice of being right at least 2 percent of the time. And in an early Operational Bulletin (if you ever see a file of them), you will find me saying that if I were running a case and just running them all out, I would simply handle everything as a present time problem and ask the person repetitively what he could do about it.

Well, do you know you can get away with this with a person who is having no difficulty with havingness. But as nearly every preclear you're going to lay your hands on has difficulty with havingness, you just better throw that out the window and say, "This we will put in solid brass to demonstrate Ron can be wrong."

Don't ever solve it.

For heaven's sakes, never solve the present time problem for the preclear. It may be the last one he's got!

Now, let me show you how far this can go. It can go as far as when Mr.

Jones calls up on the phone - you've put an ad in the paper that said, "I will talk to anyone for you about anything," or something like this. You've done and he calls up and he says, "I have a problem, Mr. Auditor. I have a problem, a very terrible problem. My wife has hiccups and has driven away her boyfriend," or whatever it is. "I'm now having to support her," you know? Something like this. He has this horrible problem. All right, fine.

Do you know that you as an auditor could sit right there on the other end of the telephone and defeat one, your ad; two, the preclear's case; and three, all of your group ambitions and future basic course plans, by simply saying, "Well, that's fine. What could you do about it?" And you ask him this four or five times, and he feels fine about that problem for the moment and says goodbye and hangs up, and an hour or so later, really feels like the devil. It was the last one he had. It's very valuable.

You are really talking, to the people who call you there, to a very high level of the society. These are people who can at least have a problem and know it. And that's a fairly high level of the society. You think you're going to talk to nothing but nuts on such an ad. No, you're just going to take the cream right off the top. When that ad doesn't work anymore, there won't be any wheels moving out here.

You get the idea? Because it's really a high-level activity to know you have a problem and to want to communicate with somebody and to make things a little bit better. That's a pretty good notion for somebody to get. All right.

Now, you could defeat the whole thing simply by solving it for him. No, the thing to do is to tell him that that is a gee-whizzer. That is the darnedest problem you ever heard. You don't see how he can live with this problem. And undertake at once, on an emergency basis, to complete his communication with grave fears that it will do no good. He'll feel wonderful. Furthermore, he'll

come around and see you. Furthermore, he'll probably join your group. That's the way it'll go, you see? But don't solve it.

Well now, similarly with this individual preclear who sits down there in your auditing room, for heaven's sakes don't start out by solving anything for him. The solution is a straight line. It has no mass; it's very, very unentangled. The top solution to everything, you understand, is for nothing to be here at all. Do you see that? There'd be no universe, no planets, no bodies, no governments - nothing, you see; it'd just all be solved. No game.

So, the ad infinitum at which we are looking is not attainable, at once, with a preclear. What you have to do - what you have to do is give him enough mass to counterbalance taking problems away from him. You can actually substitute nonsignificant mass and space for actual significant problems. Because problems are a lower inversion on mass. We got it? See?

You do a substitution. You give him some havingness, and he will surrender some problems, and then he'll get better. Otherwise, he'll hang fire.

All right. We ran into a strata of processes, then, a few months ago that simply started wiping out the whole track and every problem on it. And naturally, we weren't giving them enough havingness to substitute for it, and the net result was they were not showing many gains on graphs there for a while. And that was a disastrous thing as far as I was concerned. How can we possibly be this expert and get results this lousy? That was a question I was having to answer for a long time. All right.

But we answered it. And apparently, well, we're well out of the woods on this. But in the process of answering this, the darnedest amount of data turned up, and some of the data reaches into odd places that I am actually quite ashamed of. I'm ashamed that some of this data is around. But I'm going to give it to you anyhow. You want it?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, first and foremost, the datum which stands here in the world concerning atomic fission has a great deal of chance of being used against man. Up to a very short time ago I said, "There's some chance that man will never use this bomb against his fellow man."

In researching havingness, in researching this problem which we were confronted with here, I found out quite the contrary. There isn't every chance that it's going to be used, it's a dead certainty it's going to be used. And why?

Well, we have to go back to an old friend of ours called the GE, the genetic entity. Now, as you know the parts of man, and if you've ever observed these things while auditing people, you will know that the awareness of awareness unit is the personality of the being. This awareness of awareness unit is something that observes other things. The masses are not the personality. They are simply adjuncts or masses appended to a personality.

The body is quite something else than the individual, and the individual is not his body. But something is running this body, and this something we call the GE. And falling in line with our own researches, and incidentally, agreeing with the ancient Greek, we discover that this seems to be located in the center of the body or in the vicinity of the stomach.

Now, the GE is a fascinating brute. I have had to study the Scientology of the GE, of recent weeks, and have discovered it to be distinctly different than the Scientology of the awareness of awareness unit, or the thetan. They are distinctly different.

And so we are auditing a thetan, an awareness of awareness unit, over the desire for dead bodies of the GE. And we have actually been balked, as we know, in handling the thought patterns of the individual, by some countercurrent in the person. There was something there arguing him

into a worse life and a more upset circumstance. There was something there. And we were at war with this somethingness, and we didn't quite know what it was.

It is contained in the Scientology of the GE, and this is distinct from the Scientology of the thetan. It's distinct in this way: The overt act-motivator sequence is not operative on or trained into a GE. There is, then, no restraint.

Now, we know what the overt act-motivator sequence is, you go over and hit Joe and your own nose starts hurting. You know that phenomena. Some people get so bad off that they think a hostile thought, an hostile thought to some organization, and immediately thereafter figure the organization is about ready to do them in. This is a quite ordinary sequence, but it has its own values in restraint. It is quite a game in itself. This thing we call conscience, this thing we call "moral lack of temerity, moral timidity." We, in other words, are restrained by our own reactions to a very marked degree. Well, oddly enough, these restraints are contained in the reactive mind. They are. Hadn't anything to do with the GE.

There are many men around who are "Operating GEs," not Operating Thetans. And this whole matter of the GE becomes excessively important to us when we discover that the GE can be affected by a thetan but ordinarily is not, and that the reactive mind is operative upon the motor controls and other parts of the anatomy, but not upon its thinkingness. And there is a separate thinkingness in the body which has very little to do with this reactive mind. It has nothing to do with a thetan. But boy, can it influence the body. And that is the GE.

Now, the GE is going on down the genetic line. And we first hear of the GE, in something on this Earth called the lee Cube. He sort of tells us that he got dumped in the sea, you know? And we've gone all over this, you find it in the History of Man which was researched by an E-Meter. All of this material was relatively para-Scientological. We weren't at all unhappy about it or happy with it, it's just material which was consistently and continually reported to us. All right.

We put this material together and we find out that the GE has been coming along this line from some time. He has a history of being a plankton and a clam and so forth. As a matter of fact, you can get your best friend to have his teeth pulled out simply by telling him all about the worries and woes of a clam. And you come on up the line and you follow the genetic blueprint. Now, what we're looking at is the genetic blueprint, which is on excellent enough authority - even Darwin, the monkey man, whose hindsight only went back to apesight, and who could have looked a lot further - even Darwin admitted that there must be some kind of a blueprint for existence.

Well, this blueprint for existence we found in Scientology: we know its anatomy, how it's put together, and how long it's been on the way. But this is not the thetan or the awareness of awareness unit. He hasn't been on the track like this. This isn't the way he operates. This isn't where he came from. This isn't what he does. He handles and monitors these bodies that are put together on this genetic blueprint. And he skips off the genetic line and comes back onto the genetic line again. All right. So much for that.

When the GE dies, it sails off like a thetan and makes another mock-up on the same, more or less, genetic line. You see? The thetan just sails off. He leaves that genetic line and, really, enters some other genetic line most ordinarily. You see? So, there are two different livingnesses in the body, and they go at death in two different directions. And one of them carries with it the entirety of the life pattern of the last life or lives, and the thetan doesn't bother. He just not-knows the whole thing and skips it. All right.

Now, here's a great oddity. These two things, they're sitting there together and responding in a coordinated fashion while you're auditing the preclear. And one of them we haven't been paying very much attention to.

Once upon a time, a fellow by the name of Freud talked about the horrible ravaging beast that underlies all of our motives. Most of the time I have considered Freud was pulling, at least a

longbow. I knew I didn't have any horrible, ravaging beast. I've turned around suddenly and I've sometimes found a mock-up of a lion or a snake in back of me, but never any real, horrible, ravaging beast that was giving me advice and monitoring my directions. But obviously if there is dramatization in reactive thought, there is some kind of a reaction that takes place that the individual doesn't seem to have any cognizance of.

Well now, it is not true that a thetan has a horrible, ravaging beast and a terrible conscience and a censor and fully equipped with an ad-libido something. It's not true that he had all this bric-a-brac. But it is true that a thetan is in somebody's skull that has a lot of bric-a-brac and is a beast. Get the - bit of a difference here.

The GE's Scientology does not include an underlying, ravaging beast which springs forth unbeknownst to it. It is a ravaging beast. Get the difference? It has no suspicions whatsoever concerning its own character. It knows it's terrible and it loves it!

Now, it's perfectly all right to malign this GE because all it can do is give you a headache, kick your teeth in, tear your head off, and cause you to murder or sell your grandmother.

But here is a certain thing that is interesting: This thing has not been educated into a thorough belief that when it does something to somebody, something will happen to it. That's the thetan's idea. That's a thetan's idea; not the GE's idea. The GE doesn't run that way at all. The GE runs on unlimited, continual overt acts by it to others with compound interest and no liability. And that's a fascinating view to take, because it says that it is unrestrained.

The test of it is, is can you run - worse, can you run a GE? Yes. Yes. The thetan, by doing mock-ups and remedying havingness and straightening up certain other things, puts the GE under control. It's quite interesting. So, Remedy of Havingness showed us up, suddenly, this Scientology of the GE. All right.

Now, will a GE run on receiving motivators? Well, the oddity is the thetan runs on receiving motivators. The GE doesn't run on receiving motivators. Do you get the idea?

If you try to get the GE to believe, by mock-up or otherwise, that he can be destroyed, he just gets unhappy. He isn't pleased at all. Now, you get the difference of beingnesses here we're operating with.

To unconfuse these two is the act of exteriorization. When an auditor gets these two things unconfused in a preclear, the preclear is better able to handle his life and beingness.

There was something that looked, then, like a subconscious or an unconscious mind. Only it wasn't a subconscious and unconscious mind. It was the livingness which is a resident in and composes the stomach and structure of the body - acting, thinking, and reacting.

The GE dines upon death. That's all a GE wants. The basic philosophy of the GE is not survive. There is not much question about survival. The basic premise, the dynamic principle of the GE happens to be this: "If there is any other life form anywhere alive, I cannot be happy or live."

Wow. The "only one" ne plus ultra. "If there's anything anywhere alive," it says, "I can't live." Wow. How does it respond to this? How could you possibly find this out? How could you test this?

Well, part of the processes which I had to sort out, put together, in the line of havingness, consisted of sacrifices: Were dead bodies more acceptable than live bodies? and so forth. Not only were they more acceptable, they were the only things that were really acceptable to the GE.

Now, the thetan could receive motivators. I've lectured to you about motivators, remember, body motivators. The thetan, evidently, is the one who receives these body motivators, not the GE. So, we're not putting the ravaging beast any more under control by running motivators.

What we must do as a process is to have the preclear mock up things out in front of the body which are then sacrificed to the body. Now, I use the word sacrifice, very advisedly, very advisedly, because you can go so far as to have the "holy knife" and the altar and you can have anything mocked up you want, as long as it's a known sacrifice.

Now, in order to keep from tearing up the fellow's track and to make sure that he's putting new ones there instead of old ones he's picking out of the GE's bank, you have different things occur. You have modern dress. You have "occur tomorrow." You have green bulls and polka-dot doves, you know? Anything that really differentiates it, so that we just don't drain the bank down. And thousands and thousands of things being sacrificed are much better, providing he's certain that they are and have been - the GE is certain they are and have been sacrificed to his livingness.

Now, this is a frightening thing to look at and examine. It tells us at once why many of our preclears go off the rails in auditing. We have a double direction here: the direction of auditing the thetan and direction of auditing the GE.

Now, listen, if a GE has nothing in mind but the obliteration of all life, what do you think his ambitions are in relationship to a thetan? Same thing. Same thing. All right.

Now, we take a GE and examine him as to this: What is the relationships of the GE ... You understand he actually is resident in the stomach; he's right there in the middle of the body. What is his relationship to, let's say, the legs? Well, there haven't been enough legs sacrificed to him. He's got a scarcity of leg sacrifice. And he starts to sacrifice the body's legs. And we get cripples.

He starts to sacrifice the body's head, back, ridges. We get hunchback material and so forth. It's quite interesting material, because it tells us the source of deformity in the body and gives us at once its solution, which is just having anything with that condition sacrificed; but never letting the GE be sacrificed, you see. It won't run that way. It'll run on the thetan, but not the GE. So, we just go on with sacrifices.

Now, this works out to an idiocy of complexity if you want it to. Fellow walks in and he's - his shoulder is hurting. So, you say, "That's fine. Now, mock up a fellow with a bum shoulder and have him sacrificed to the body," and he does. And does that a few times, the shoulder lets up.

What happened? Well, there was just enough death, of all things, enough death. And that is the motto of the GE. If he can have enough death, he's happy.

It evidently is less important that mass occurs than that the mass be good and dead and preferably that it be sacrificed. Now, you take somebody who can't eat bacon, he can't eat eggs, he can't eat this and that. He has to eat coconuts and drink swizzle tea and he's very, very careful of his diet somehow or another. And you'll find there's only one thing wrong with his diet: He didn't see it die.

And it's fabulous. You have small rabbits and chickens and things like that, you know. Have him mock those up being dragged in and then have them executed, you know, and have the soul go off to heaven (they all do this, by the way, they let the soul go off to heaven, you know), and wham, right into the GE goes the body of the rabbit or the chicken, and so on. It's the fastest operation you ever saw in your life. It just goes in slurp.

Now, the odd part of it is, is the thetan has a conscience. And he believes that certain things should happen to him. He believes in reciprocity. He believes he's alive, other people are alive,

you see. And if he does things to other livingness, then things should happen to him. GE doesn't subscribe to this at all.

So, body motivators run just fine on the thetan, but foul up the GE. And this was where I first discovered this. I discovered something was fouling up running body motivators, and I had to isolate it and find out what it was and where it was, and all of a sudden, I found myself looking down the long microscope at the genetic entity as a separate thinkingness and beingness. It's what keeps the body moving and rolling and its philosophy is "So that I can live, all things must die."

Now, there's a cure for this. It goes on this gradient scale: You get things sacrificed to the GE by mock-ups, you see. Things sacrificed, sacrificed, sacrificed, more and more; and you'll find, shortly, that things are going into the genetic entity, although they still have a little life left in them. You know, the soul is gone but some of the cells are still alive, and it's still acceptable to the GE.

And so, it builds up on this gradient scale very nicely until the GE is satisfied with something alive and is no longer pulling this liveness - this live object forcefully into the body. Two things happen: one, first the GE can accept only death; we improve that consideration until the GE can also accept lifeliving beings. They go in, and then living beings that don't have to go in, and then living beings that he can let remain or go where they please or operate on their own determinism, don't you see? And then living beings he can throw away. You got the idea?

In other words, we can civilize the GE with a considerable betterment to the digestion, to say nothing of the arms, legs, and the rest of it. Got it?

Now, that is a rather fantastic discovery to make because it's a very basic discovery in the problem of what is man doing and where is he going. All a person has to live is a somewhat hungry youth, and all he has to do as a thetan is to finally get beaten down to a point of where he's in total agreement with all the ambitions of the body ... Who have we got? We've got a conqueror.

I understand somebody spent two million pounds - I think it was Howard Hughes spent two million pounds to make a picture called The Conqueror. John Wayne, of all people, starring in it, and an old pal of mine, a very good friend of mine by the way, Susan Hayward, starring in this thing. Huh! Two million pounds this Conqueror is worth. I wonder why this is the most expensive motion picture ever made?

Did you ever hear of Genghis Khan's pyramids of skulls? Brother, you talk about an "Operating GE" . . . no conscience of any kind. Total, unlimited slaughter. They used to flatten, the Mongols did, cities - opulent cities and their populaces - so flat that their ponies wouldn't stumble when ridden across them at a hard gallop. That was their brag. Pyramids of skulls. Death, death, death, death, death, death. Somebody comes along and spends two million pounds making a picture about this jerk. You talk about the deification of the gastric origin, that's it.

So, you wonder why the populace at large can be appealed to by things and creatures that make nothing out of everything and why they neglect creative efforts. The GE has no idea of creation. The GE can only consume, he cannot create. It must be that people are to some degree running on their stomachs; must be quite prevalent.

And when you look at the thirst and rapacity on the parts of many governments for taxes and sacrifices, from their electric chairs and hangman's nooses and so forth, we sort of get the idea there must be some operating GEs working in there, too.

But it would give such people nothing but supreme pleasure to have an entire city sacrificed to them with atomic fission. Nothing but pleasure. The moral restraint will not be present. A hideous thing to have to face.

It tells us, if we wish to make the experiment with a few preclears, that even those chaps that we process - we find out there is an operating mechanism like there - and then the cases that won't run at all, run exclusively on this. We discover at once that we had certainly better take something into our computation and reality. Just come off the maybe about it because there's no maybe there. That's what it tells me.

It says within the next five years somebody's going to clobber somebody. Why? So that somebody's stomach can be titillated. That's a horrible thing to have to look at.

Naturally, you'd expect action of this character to come from countries which are very genetic-entirely, you know? They're very MESTy, very materialistic, very sold on the idea that food is all, you know? And we have such countries. And they have atomic fission.

So, not to just ... Be cheerful about it. I mean, there's nothing to it; if we know that we can probably do something about it. We can probably razz them off of their penchant.

But the point is that, organizationally, why, we'd better figure out a few things. We better figure out - write ourselves a book, called "Radioactive Burns, Their Treatment - Their Care and Treatment," or something like that, and a basic textbook on handling radioactive contamination, so forth, with Scientology and otherwise. And give it an emergency address someplace or another that isn't likely to be in an immediate bomb area, you know and spread it around, and put it in the bookstores. Do a few things about this sort of thing and just stop regarding it as "Well, it's very silly for somebody to even figure that somebody'd do . . ."

People who think it won't happen are the people who think. And they are sizing up everybody by themselves; and they themselves would not do such a thing to their fellow man. But there have been such people who thought and created and were restrained in their own actions in the periods of such people as Genghis Khan, the great stomach.

Now, where we get in this deep in research, we are into something sufficiently significant that we can start predicting what the behavior of a certain organism is, and predict it with certainty, why, we're of course on a more positive course ourselves. We're leaving just that much less to chance and that much more to control. And chance is all right for a gambler or a fellow who doesn't have much game, but when there's a lot of game anyhow, why, you can start cutting into the chanciness of existence and make it a little more positive. And so we can do that now and we intend to.

Well, that's just one of the things that I wanted to tell you about this evening, and there are several more that are equally - not quite so dramatically startling, but they mean quite a bit to us, particularly since it's rather necessary that we get a better grip on this thing called processing.

Radioactive burns have, at this date, no cure. They're cumulative. It can be rather easily discovered, however, that the bank is just saturated with radioactive engrams. You can always throw radioaction into restimulation if you want to. All right.

The reason radioactive burns are restimulative and cumulative, which is the important part of them - you know, fellow gets five minutes' worth of burn today, five minutes tomorrow, five minutes the next day, and the next thing you know he's got fifteen minutes' worth of burn - it doesn't wear off the way other burns do. All right.

Why is this? It's because it throws the engram bank into restimulation so easily and keeps it into higher and higher restimulation, and there he is.

Now, you can take a rather serious burn and on this basic law which is it sounds incredible sometimes in the field of havingness, but on the basic law in havingness - that one never gets enough of anything. You see, there aren't things around which you can have too much of. That's what throws havingness off. And that gets you to resisting and doing all sorts of things

There aren't things around that you can have too much of in spite of a thetan's belief that this is so. See, he makes a game of this. There are things around he can have too much of as far as he's concerned, but that's his game. Factually, there aren't any things around that he can have too much of. You see, he can always have a scarcity. And anything wrong with his havingness is on the score of scarcity.

Individual has terrible gastric pains. And you say, "Oh, my, we must get rid of those." Oh yeah? No, no, no. That's the wrong philosophy. The right philosophy is "Let's see how we can get enough of those." Got the idea?

He's got some problems. Well, the philosophy is "Let's not figure out how to get rid of these problems, let's figure out how to supermultiply them," you see, though that's the other factor. And anywhere we look in havingness it's this rationale that kicks us along.

It is the same thing in radioaction. If your sidewalks and streets and the sidewalks and streets of the world were all radioactive, you wouldn't care two pins for any atom fizzle. See, you wouldn't just care two pins for it. It wouldn't be anything to you. Bomb would go off - flash! And you'd say, "Somebody's being careless today," and go on drinking tea with somebody. Get the idea? It's its scarcity.

An individual has quite a few radioactive engrams. They are thrown easily into restimulation, so he's already abundantly aware of radioaction. Abundantly aware of this. And now, all of a sudden there's a chance to get some more. A bomb explodes over there two miles and only blows his bloody head off, you know? He'll go, "Gee, I didn't blow my stomach out either, you know? I mean, that's bad. I've been cheated."

Well, on an injury basis, he looks up at the radioactive flash and he says, "Oh, that's terrible, I must get away from it." Wrong computation for auditing. See, that's his - that's the way he thinks about it and that's the way he reacts and that's what he does.

But an auditor, looking at the case, has to think another way in order to do something about the radioaction. He says, "Gee, that guy was scarce on radioaction. Look at him - stone-blind. Boy, he really had a hunger for that stuff."

And, so, what do you do? You just have him mock up more radioactive stuff, and you make the walls radioactive and the ceiling radioactive and the floor radioactive, on a creative basis. Or make the radioactivity more radioactive.

You'll have a little bit of difficulty doing this sometimes. You'll occasionally have to have somebody waste radioactivity for a little while before he can start to mock it up easily. And boy, when he has, to his satisfaction, the walls glowing a bright green, you know, all of a sudden his own radioactive burns will turn off. I've had considerable experience with this already.

The US government loves to use up its taxation money by blowing up bombs and, in any given twenty-four hours, probably uses up twelve to fifteen million dollars' worth of uranium or something; particularly since it's irreplaceable, you know.

And, they use the deserts out in Arizona and Nevada and anyplace that somebody might have a good time, you see. And, they keep blowing this stuff off. And then great clouds of radioaction blow across the country and burn holes in the newspapers in Chicago and everything. And the newspaper says in glaring headlines, "Scientists Claim Radioactivity Did Not Affect Any Other Area Than Salt Flats." You know? "Radioactivity, As a Result of the Fallout, As Reported Increased in Wyoming, Actually Is Only Up 200 Percent from Normal," you know. Just utterly psychotic, the reports on this radioactivity.

They evidently can't have enough of it, can't have it, must have it; and if they do get it, they've got to lie about it. You get the confusion that goes on there? It must be a problem, it can't be a

problem. For instance, they blow up typical American homes and things like that. They never blow up any Russian homes. It's really wild. All right.

People can see these flashes occasionally. Somebody will be riding down the road or out in the front yard or something like this, and there'll be a terrific flash off on the horizon someplace or another and he happens to be looking at it, see. And by morning his face will be nicely bloated and his eyes will be in very terrible condition.

Actually, if his havingness is in good shape - look at these two things - you can expend a solution, you see. You can solve it. You can say, "Where did you see it? Where are you now? Good. Where did you see it? Where are you now? Where did you see it? Where are you now? Where did you see it? Where are you now?" And all of a sudden the swelling goes down and his eyes get all right.

But you see the danger of that? If he had a very serious burn such as gained by somebody working in a laboratory, you'd say, "Where did you get it? And where are you now?" His radioactive conviction is now high, and you're going to have to run other engrams and do other things. Don't run the engrams. Add to them.

The safe process then, or any Havingness Process, the safe process is to add to the condition. Got it? Make more of it. Not less of it. Increase it; don't decrease it.

So he's got pain. All right. So he has pain. That's fine. Why does he have pain and why is he holding on to pain? Because it's valuable.

There's an interesting old test in SOP 8, Expanded GITA Step IV. You have an individual waste pain. And he discovers something uniformly - I don't care who you take, whether it's a butcher or a cabinet minister, you do the same thing with him, you get the same result. You have this individual waste pain, and he really gets so he can waste it real good, and he always comes up with this cognition: "You know, well, that's good stuff, pain. That's nice. I like that. I know I shouldn't be saying that, but it's kind of nice." See, that's the oddity that enters in there. So, what do you do?

Fellow is in great pain. It isn't that he doesn't hurt enough, it's that pain is too scarce, so he is feeling it. If he had a little more pain he wouldn't feel it. Now, that sounds odd, but it doesn't sound odd. You don't push more pins in him. That's an Indian method, they understood this too, you know. A fellow hurt like mad in the stomach, so they beat his feet; that got his attention off of it real good.

You start the individual putting pain in the walls, and have him make the curtains hurt and the chair hurt and put pain out here and pain there and create pain - two things occur: At once he takes over the automaticity of hurting, and he adds to the scarcity and makes it an abundance.

You must always be prepared, in havingness, to waste. The individual says, "Oh, I couldn't possibly make any pain out of the thing." He can always waste it. Well, similarly, the GE is wasting life because it can't have it. So, that's where you find it on the Havingness Scale. See?

In radioaction and its treatment you have to add to it. And this is certainly something for you to know and certainly something for you to remember, because the least that will happen to any country in the Northern Hemisphere is it'll get fallout, the like of which you'll have to go down the street wearing an umbrella, you know? And that is, don't permit yourself to get so spooked about radiation that you don't run "Add to It" as a process. See, that would be the only danger.

You, right now, could be run on radiation sufficiently, putting it into the walls, to completely remedy your and your body's havingness of radiation. Nobody's tried this, but I'm sure from earlier tests and other things, that you could probably put your hand up in front of a stream of gamma rays that would ordinarily fry somebody, that it'd feel pleasantly warm. I think you

could do this. That's not a tested thing. But there are many solutions in that particular line. All right.

Now, in havingness in general, we have, in havingness, discovered something three years ago which we now drag out and add to: the Waste, Accept, Desire scale. The DEI Scale we call it: Desire, Enforce, Inhibit.

Now, let's take a look at this old scale and let's get what will probably be the basic anatomy of running Havingness on Level One. Of course, we solve that present time problem by getting him to create problems of comparable magnitude and create other problems of comparable magnitude and more problems of comparable magnitude. And if he can't create, we make him lie about the problem, you see? Lying is the lower echelon of creation. And, we go at this rather easily so as not to knock out his havingness. That's important we no longer give an inventory. Got that? We no longer give one. Why?

Because it as-ises too much energy and we may just run the fellow down enough in energy that he can't function in sessions to solve that present time problem, and then we're really - we've really had it, you see?

Sometimes it's unprofitable to process somebody who is undergoing an emotional strain if you know the emotional strain will be at end in a few days. The best time to process him is when the strain is at end. Otherwise you just spend all the time working with a present time problem. Don't ever leave a present time problem half-solved, by the way, and say, "Well, that's good enough and we'll get on with it now."

No, if this person's really under pressure with a present time problem, you know he'll go on the next twenty-five hours of auditing under the pressure of the remaining pressure of the present time problem. His attention then is being yanked off it. He's picking up somatics, and he's behaving strangely in session. And he shouldn't behave this way in session. It's just because you didn't thoroughly solve the present time problem, or another one arose during auditing which is too much for him to handle. And you handle it by getting him to invent problems of comparable magnitude, always standing by to remedy his havingness any crude way you can the moment he goes anaten or starts to jiggle. Something a little bit nervous, you know? He starts to go like this, you know, and says, "I don't - sure would like to have a cigarette, you know? Haven't we been at this long enough?" Well, listen, if he goes that far before you noticed it, you ought to be shot. No kidding.

Auditor was running somebody the other day on spotting walls, a good auditor, and he was running a guy on spotting walls. And the fellow spotted a wall and a wall and a wall and all of a sudden the auditor was aware of the havingness cut-away. The fellow's hand as he pointed was beginning to shake a little bit. Just this much, you know? So, he ran it a couple of more commands just to make sure, and the fellow really started to get jittery then. In other words, he had looked and he had found the entering threshold of a reduction of havingness. He'd actually noticed it, and he could have remedied it easily if he'd remedied it right then. You understand? He could have remedied it easily. If he goes on to a point of where the fellow is twitching all over the place, the guy is practically out of control. It's very hard to remedy havingness when you get them that far.

Now, let's distinguish here, at once, between a repair and remedy of havingness. A repair of havingness is having him mock up and push it in. Push it into the body, push it into himself, we don't care what. It's "push in" repair.

Remedy of Havingness you run a mock-up and push it in, and mock up and throw it away until he can throw one away and be convinced that he has really thrown one away. Now, we say we've remedied havingness on that object. That's the difference between a repair and a remedy of havingness.

Quite important because if you keep pushing in, you'll restimulate the thetan's motivators - not the GE, he doesn't have any - the thetan's motivators. The thetan will get the feeling after a while like he's done something or he's guilty. That's just because things are being pushed in on him. See? So, you have to throw one away every once in a while; it makes him feel good. All right.

Now, we enter into a scale - reaching way back there and picking up the old scale and remodeling it - right with the present time problem, preparing to remedy havingness at any time, with this scale. And we find for the remainder of Route One that this scale applies; and it's an interesting scale. And it starts with "possibly motivators." That's for the thetan, you see, "possibly motivators." That would be such a thing as ". . . a problem it could be to you," or something like that. But it's a shove-in proposition, or it starts with - you see, with anywith a different individual it could start with different things. But he's somewhere on this scale, and you're going to go up the scale, and then the scale itself has harmonics; it repeats itself. So, we don't care, we'll just give you the full scale, and you'll find him going through the various upper echelons of thisrepeating it, in other words.

Motivators. That's an inflow of some kind or another. You have him mock up things with the intention to kill him, or do something of this character. That's not absolutely necessary; we'll find that on the run somewhere. We'll find that condition.

The next one up is Waste which we call today "sacrifice." We convert the whole idea of waste into sacrifice, see? All right.

And the next one up the line on this is "possession of live havingness," again, an inflow. And the next one is quite interesting. It's one that we've never looked at before, but it's obviously there. And that's "What wouldn't you mind letting remain where it is?"

And that is the stop between the inflow and the outflow. And that is a terrifically effective auditing question. A fabulous auditing question that was sitting right there, very observable in the action of inflow and outflow on havingness, but we just never used it. I just never noticed it.

"What wouldn't you mind having remain right where it is?" You know? Or just have him mock things up right where they are, and just let them stand right where they are. They don't go in, they don't go away; just mock them up. See, there's that interim step. And then the next is, "reject." "What could you dispense with?" And of course, the whole cycle can go all the way over again. Now, that's not smoothly stated nor smoothly worked out.

But this is smoothly worked out. And this is a process on havingness that you can't do without today: The way out is the way through. The way to be at liberty in this life is to be able to have or not have this life at will. To be able to have or not have bodies, space, environment, planets, mock-ups, anything. You get the idea?

Once you could have all these things or not have them at your own discretions you would be free, and so would your preclear be free. And this is a basic road to Clear. And it's simply this: "Look around this room and tell me what you could have." The individual spots those things he could have.

When he has a lot of these or has - actually sure - you don't keep nagging him and unstabilizing him by saying, "You sure you could have that thing?" and so forth - but he's actually sure he could have most of the things in the room, you ask him what things he wouldn't mind having remain right where they are. And we can let everything sit that way. You next ask him what he could dispense with in the room. What he didn't have to have.

Now, you could run that cycle and those three auditing questions over and over and over in sequence, you see? You flatten each one, flatten the next one, flatten the next one; then you can start with the next one - with the first one again and flatten it anew and flatten the second one anew and flatten the third one anew. But you will be going out into the outer universe.

Now, I'll tell you how to keep from getting restimulated. I told you the other evening, I'm going to tell you again because this is the hottest thing that's ever happened as far as an auditor is concerned. He's a little bit leery of his preclear; that's because he can't have his preclear. If he finds himself getting restimulated by a preclear, all he has to do is look at that preclear and little by little on a gradient scale find out what part of that preclear he could have. What part of that preclear he could have remain the way it is, and what part of that preclear he could throw away.

And the odd part of it is, when he's done this drill, all he has to do is change his mind sometimes and the preclear suddenly gets well. So, that's not just the road to Clear, that's the road to being Christ.

Well, anyhow, you get this - the essence of the steps I've been giving you on Level One. That a person must be willing to have, to let remain, to throw away; and if he can do these things, why, he's going to have an awful easy time of it.

Your preclears are obsessively pulling in, obsessively flowing away, or they're obsessively stuck. So, we solve all these things with various drills and other commands which we'll write down in due course; but you solve all these problems of havingness in Level One. If you've got anything left to audit, then you go ahead with the remaining steps of SLP.

Okay?

Audience: Yes. Got it.

All right.

Thank you very much.