

## THE GAME OF LIFE (EXTERIORIZATION AND HAVINGNESS)

A lecture given on  
7 February 1956

Want to talk to you about the highest goal or activity evident at this time in this universe; to wit, games. We look at a great many things, we examine a great many things and we try to read purpose into them. When we try to examine anything as broad, big, deep and thick as this universe appears to us (especially Christians), we come to the conclusion - you'll have to delete that, I mean, you just didn't hear that - we come to the conclusion that, golly, there could be an awful lot of purposes. In fact, there could be a complete confusion of purposes. There could be as many intentions, possibly, as a thetan could invent. And, golly, that's an awful lot of intentions.

And so, if there could be an intention from every separate thetan in this entire universe, for this universe, they would probably all be different intentions. But somewhere there may be a common denominator of what a thetan is doing and where he is going and why.

Now, you ask a lot of chaps - come up to you and they want to know, "What is this thing called Scientology? What is it? It's no good, of course, but what is it?"

And you say, "Well, it's a modus operandi of making people better, more able."

And they say, "Well, I understand it has something to do with God and the universe."

And they - "Oh," you say, "yes, yes, yes."

Always agree with everybody. Agree with them before you call them a liar. At least make the communication line exist before you knock them over with it.

And, they say, "Well, that's all very well, but why?"

And you say, "Why what?"

"Well, why are we all here?"

And you say, "Well, that's fine. Scientology can make people more able and raise IQs and do various things and so on."

"Yes, but why did God do it?"

And we say, "Well, we're not particularly interested in that particular aspect at this time. It's very true that there's a Tone Scale and there's the dynamics, and there's this and that." And you explain it all for a half an hour, an hour.

And then they say, "Yeah, but why?"

A lot of people seem to have this - have this ... A lot of people have thetans; other people have this on the brain. "Why?" Okay.

Well, just as a mean, dirty, nasty trick, I dug up the answer to that. And this answer is, however, only satisfying to those people lucky enough to still be able to look up and see that there might possibly be a game involved. To other people, the answer: "Why?" "It's a game," is not satisfying.

They know that it's serious. They know nobody can have any fun. And they know it's all going to wind up very, very poorly. They don't know anything else, but they know these things.

Now, the actuality is, however, that in its behavior the human race responds nicely and neatly only on this definition. If you wanted to get a great deal of cooperation, activity and enthusiasm, if you wanted to get everybody's energy stretched out to the absolute limit, you would invent a game everybody could play.

And if they really knew they could play this game, if they had any feeling they could really play this game, they would all of a sudden feel fine about the whole thing. It wouldn't matter whether that game was Monopoly or tiddlywinks or shooting policemen or any other kind of a game, if everybody could play this game, it would be a very fine thing.

And so we have war. The response of the human being to war is one of the darnedest things that anybody ever cared to study; but nobody ever studies it. He's involved in the war. But if you were to exteriorize from a war and take a look around, you'd find everybody busy. You'd find them shooting or making things to shoot or ducking people who were shooting, one or another activity. And everybody's interest would be focused upon this thing, and the activity, the amount of energy invested, the things done and to be done rather escape the imagination of a peacetime-involved populace.

Why all this activity? Does that mean man is nuts? No, it means man is capable of playing a game, and as mankind, the closest he can get to it is war.

Now, that's pretty far down. To have to go out and shoot people and so forth just so that you can have a game that's convincing is a little bit lowtoned. In fact, the last time I ducked, I didn't say, "low-toned."

Now, wherever we look in a war we find activity, concern and participation, since in this particular instance, because it is destructive, pervasive and anybody is a target, we have a participation element. People are not disenfranchised in a war. Anybody can come in and play war. Anybody can get killed. Anybody can get shot at. And if we look around, almost anybody can become a general or an admiral. It's a wonderful thing to look at the amount of participation that is permitted in war.

We go into peace right after a war, and participation drops to practically zero. They say, "Now, if you train very carefully for eighteen or nineteen years, why, we will permit you to stand on the bridge of a vessel and watch somebody act like Officer of the Watch. This is if you're a good boy and don't get any black marks."

Look at the difference. In war they say, "Have you ever been to sea?"

The fellow says, "I stood on a dock once."

They say, "Fine. You're CO." Gone.

Difference of participation. If you wanted to get as much activity as there is in a war, going in peacetime, all you would have to do is open the doors to that much participation in the game called life, and you'd have just that much enthusiasm. But how to do this?

We've got an awful lot of people playing "only one." We have a lot of people that are holding all the money there is over here, and a lot of other people holding all the goods over there, and a lot of other people over here holding all the not-haves that want the money and the goods. And when we get through, we have a complete participation of only one thing: "Why?" Now they all want to know why.

In wartime they very seldom ask why - very seldom. I have talked to men during wartime, and they had a lot of things to talk about, but they very - only in a spare moment, such as just before the attack at dawn or something like that say, "I wonder what this universe is all about?"

They have a feeling they may exteriorize, you know. But it's momentary and it's fleeting. It's an unserious thought.

Now, if you wished to restore man's ability in general, all you would have to do is restore his willingness to have people participate in a game. In fact, one day I was reading a long textbook; it was a fellow by the name of Karl Marx, and he was writing some balderdash or another, someplace or another, and he was writing this stuff up. And, by the way, you know, I keep hearing that book quoted, but I can't find anything in the book that's quoted out of the book. This is one of the great miracles of our times. Nobody ever really has given me the right copy, I guess, of *Das Kapital*, because it doesn't have the right quotes in it.

But anyway, he actually figured out a game there. He says, "Labor should be permitted to labor." And look what's happening. You know, that's about all he says: it should be permitted to labor. They shouldn't be excluded from laboring or something of this sort. They should be permitted to work for the military or whatever the tenets are of that particular political ideology.

But he says, "Participation is possible on the part of labor." And look at this thing. I mean, it's about five-sixths of the civilized populace of Earth now is gobbling it up madly. And that's all he's saying.

So, I got wise to this and I says, "Let's see, what will we do here? This looks like a good opportunity."

So, I invented the philosophy called co-operism. Be much more, much more popular than communism. The philosophy would have as its basic modus operandi, "Let the other fellow play too." It'd be terrifically popular. That's actually the meat which keeps communism rolling. All right.

Now, that could be very pervasive, because the common denominator of activity is participation. In the first place, unless you have some agreement, you don't have any universe. And if you have a universe and nobody to do anything in it, you haven't got a universe. And little kids will figure out all kinds of things to do with some of the darnedest old tin cans you ever saw. And so does man figure out what to do with this particular universe.

But the moment he stops figuring out what to do or just carries on with some old plan, the moment he's saying, "All of you guys over here can't play," we get something like the standard American or British sport picture where everybody is in the grandstands watching a bunch of fellows bust each other's collarbones or shins. A very few people there are really playing.

Of course, watching is playing too, to some slight degree. It's better than the fellow who never goes near the stadium. He's kind of sunk. If you talked him over and said, "Is it possible to play a game?" or "How long has it been since you played dominoes with your kids?" you would get an awful comm lag.

Participation is the keynote of games. And where man is participating, where he's in communication, and where he has not, from man to man, forbidden participation, he has a civilization and he's leading a happy life.

Now, on some of these rather cursorily examined tenets, we conclude that there is a common denominator to this universe in terms of purpose, and the purpose is to play a game. The universe as itself could be summated to be a playing field. When an individual is disenfranchised from playing the game entirely, he has an awful lot of trouble finding another body.

Death is simply a disenfranchisement from playing the game. When one loses something, he begins to feel he's losing the game. When one engages in certain definite, positive activities

toward a certain goal, he will be as enthused about them as he feels that he is engaged in a game. Therefore, a game is something we should examine very, very carefully.

And one of the first things that is requisite to playing a game is living beings. It's quite odd, but that's true. It's doubtful if robots would be able to play a game amongst themselves. You could, if you were monitoring them, you could mock up a bunch of robots going through the motions of playing a game - if you were monitoring them. But who would be playing the game? You would.

You could even sort of split yourself on a schizophrenic basis and play one side against the other side and be the only one monitoring the robots. But after a while, you get tired of that and start looking for Joe to come over and give you an argument.

Now, here we have this first condition: it requires living beings. And the next condition that it requires is something on the order of communication. This, at once, gives us space and then we have to have limits to communication, and so we get barriers, such as communication terminals and boundaries of various characters. And then we have the elements necessary to play a game.

This is really all that's necessary, because imagination and what to do to whom will furnish the rest of it.

If we have these things, the first thing that a man thinks - a being who isn't entirely crushed down and disenfranchised from all games - first thing he thinks when he sees a big scope of something or other and a bunch of material and some other guys, he sort of thinks to himself, "I wonder what we could do with all this."

And if you get them all together, they'll talk for a while. They will all agree upon some purpose which might be specious, it might seem very actual to you, but on some purpose or another, they will get busy using all this to do something with this. And they will invent more and more limits and restrictions, and more and more rules, and eventually they have some sort of a game like building houses or they have a game going, like railroad, or they have a game going like army - only that's not much of a game these days.

Now, here's where we see man investing his livingness, his beingness, and the materials and the playing field with certain purposes. But the purposes he invests them with are all junior to this one: game.

What do we mean exactly by a game? It's another thing that's quite interesting. We mean an involvement and consecutiveness of incident participated in by living beings, which contains an element of chance or unknownness. We have satisfied all of our requirements but one: the element of unknownness.

If you know the outcome of a horse race, it is highly doubtful if you will go to see the ponies run. In fact, you couldn't care less. You know that Ginger is going to be second and Rachmaninoff is going to be first, and so forth and so what? No, there must be an element of chance for you to take interest in horses.

In presidential elections and other low-toned sports, you must at any time be prepared to have your expectations overwhelmed and to have your mind changed on the subject. If you didn't feel that your mind was going to be changed sometimes in life, the expectancy of the thing would have insufficient randomness, and as a result we would have no game.

So, knowing how to play the game is very, very interesting. And somebody who is relatively disenfranchised will sit around for a long time wondering what he did wrong in playing the game. The only thing he possibly could have done wrong was not to have played the game.

But what is the game? Well, that's what he agreed was the game. That's an interesting thing. You agree that something is a game. It becomes a game. You play it. That's it. But an individual

requires some knowingness to play a game. He has to know where the limits are, know who the boundaries are, know who Joe is. He's got to know what color the other side is wearing. He has to know usually the weight of the rifle or the pen or whatever he's wielding in this game. And then he has to have some not-knowingness as to the involvement's conclusion. He has to not-know the end of the game. Now, maybe he's very capable of knowing the end of the game, but the oddity is that he won't play it unless he has not-known the end of the game.

So, not-knowingness is one of the barriers and limitations of a game. And we find out it is very necessary in processing. Well, as we look at this universe and we see man struggling, and we see beasts and beings dying and living in agony and poverty, and we see the pain and turmoil and confusion, concern, and all of these various things, we say, "Good heavens. No game could be this way. This couldn't possibly be the game."

That's because we have become pantywaists on the subjects of how tough a game should be. Now, that's a good thing for you to know. If there wasn't this much penalty, you wouldn't get that much game. You see that? Do you see all the misery and suffering as just-well, just rack it up and say those are the penalties. You miss here, and you fail to win there, and that's you there. Other people are very convinced. They see you lying there and they say, "Well, you know, I just better play this game just a little bit harder over in this direction."

What happens to a society then, when it really starts going to pieces? Well, let's look over history and find those societies that have gone to pieces are those societies which have no longer had stresses, no longer had contests, which no longer had anything in doubt, where everything was known and predictable and nice.

If you really want to put a people on the rocks, just give them plenty to eat and lots of leisure and nothing to do. And then insist that they conduct their lives that way. Add into it enough discipline so that they're totally protected from anything that might menace them. That would become a psychotic society.

It's an interesting thing that during the war in London it is reported that nobody went psychotic while the bombs were falling. But as soon as the war was over, everybody seems to have racked up a nice record in the mental homes. Interesting, isn't it? Why shouldn't people go crazy under that much stress and strain?

And the answer is, is people don't go crazy under stress and strain. People go crazy in the absence of stress and strain. And they get to a point of where they have so little stress and strain that somebody comes along and drops a straw on their big toe and the big toe breaks. That, they will have to consider as a penalty. They've been expecting some penalties, there's - must be a game going on somehow; they can see Bill and Joe walking around, and so they take anything as a penalty.

It's quite interesting. They're trying to say, "There is a game here. We are doing something," when they know very well that they are not. So, a conviction that something is going on and that - a conviction that we are participating is absolutely necessary to the game.

Now, moving a person out of a game and driving a person mad is practically the same thing. If you just exaggerate a disenfranchisement from the game sufficiently, you will bring about a condition of neurosis or psychosis. You'll find, if you really want to take the E-Meter and find the big jolts and shocks in a person's life, it's when he no longer could play the game, or he was not permitted to play the game. All right.

We'll find, for instance, he's stuck all along the track on deaths; even the death of an ally will be sufficient to more or less stick him on the track. A lot of people come up and they got a big, black field and they got huge, black energy. Did you ever - probably you've never heard of one of these guys. They don't see mock-ups, they see blackness. You ever heard of one of these people?

Audience: (various responses)

Yeah, I thought you might have.

Anyhow, these people are in this interesting state of being partially disfranchised from the game. They lost a piece or they lost the maker of the game, like Grandma. Maybe Grandma was the maker of the game. Grandma dies, where are they? Well, they're still playing the game that Grandma played. There might have been a bunch of other games presented themselves in the interim, but they didn't notice. And so they lose their primary game; therefore, they're disenfranchised.

And, on the death of an ally, we get the most remarkable upsets on the part of people. When an individual is processed, you discover these various things. Whenever you discover that he's having a hard time or had a hard time during a certain period, you can boil all the things, no matter how significant they seem, down to this one thing: You can say this person, at that moment, was disenfranchised to some degree from the game and his actions after that were consequent to that point, and he went along rather badly until he found another game.

Now, a person doesn't just go crazier and crazier as he gets older and older. This is a natural conclusion one should make, but a person would go crazier and crazier to the degree that he had less and less game. And if it got to be less game and then less game, and if it was always less game than it had been, yes, this would be true that a person would get crazier and crazier the older he got.

But that doesn't happen to be the case. The state of game varies. In fact, this Earth was in a wilder turmoil within all of our easy memories than it's ever before been, perhaps, since the days when the volcanoes were blowing their stacks. It was an interesting mess, World War II. You talk about chaos and a game involvement.

Well, what's very funny is, World War II, of course, produced an enormous amount of insanity in the armed forces. It must have because there are a lot of people in hospitals. The first time I ever suspected this fact was the first time I ever confronted that fact: that there was some coordination between being disenfranchised from a game and going mad. Found that out. It was quite interesting.

I was flown in from the South Pacific as the first casualty to be shipped out of the South Pacific war back to the States. The war had been started in Pearl Harbor, and I'd been down in the South Pacific and - a lot of things happened down there. And the outfits down there were pretty well wiped out, as you can remember before the US and Great Britain started to fight and go back in. All right.

Most of the guys that were shipped out of there who had been wounded, were shipped out by slow boat. And I didn't, I wasn't that seriously done in. I hooked a ride on the Secretary of Navy's plane; produced the right set of orders (I hope nobody ever kept them on file) and got flown home. And when I got home, they turned me in to the hospital.

And I thought, "That's an interesting place to get turned in to, and - but it's nice. Fine as far as I'm concerned."

And I was lying very comfortably in my bunk about eight o'clock in the morning when there was a funny looking joker with glasses about a foot thick standing down at the bottom of my bed. And he looked at me very piercingly and he said, "How many fingers am I holding up?"

Well, I did a double take, and I was all of a sudden going to give him a facetious reply in . . . and - because my morale wasn't very bad; his was, though. And I remembered a friend of mine had been thrown into Bellevue Hospital for ten days one time when he was drunk, simply because he had answered silly answers to these obvious absurdities. So, I said carefully, "One.

And he looked at me very piercingly and he prowled around the side of the bed and he grabbed ahold of the clock that was sitting there and he pulled it around and he says, "What time is it?"

So, I told him. He looked very disappointed. He asked me for my name, rank and serial number and I gave them to him. He left.

All day long there was a parade of people walking in and saying strange things to me. At the end of that day, the whole hospital had deserted me except, of course, one very good-looking nurse. But anyhow, the point was they had lost interest and they were very confused.

Everybody knew, up to that time, that no man could stand the stress of modern war. They knew that a Stuka bomber, in diving, drove men mad. They knew that the terrific, unexpected attacks and heroic forces being employed were such as to plow you in. Your psyche would get unpsyched in a hurry if you were shot at enough.

And yet here, a fellow, a young officer, had the utter brass to come along and throw aside this theory. They didn't like me anymore. In fact, they simply reported to Washington, DC that I was in good condition - I was, by the way, walking with a cane. I was in good condition. I couldn't see. I had dark glasses on, but I, you know, I was doing all right in a kind of a dumb sort of way, and they sent me to sea in the North Atlantic the following week. That shows you what happens to people that disprove people's theories.

But during the remainder of that week, I became very curious at their tremendous and absorbing interest in neurosis, not in me, but in this fact, because their psychoneurotic wards were full - jammed from door to door with members of the armed services.

From where? There were no casualties home yet - till I established this very interesting fact: they had all gone nuts in navy yards. Of course, I can imagine somebody going crazy in a navy yard. But not with this wild abandon. And as the war progressed, I discovered consistently and consecutively that the people who were going into these places were the people who were not being permitted to fight the war.

Interesting, isn't it? During the armed - the amphibious forces, I had a vessel that was carrying attack cargo during the last few months I was at sea in the war, and that vessel, for a long time was getting - because it was pretty upset and there were a lot of people aboard it - it was getting a couple of psychos a week. It was not a combat ship.

There was a story made about that vessel, by the way. It was called Mister Roberts. You may have seen this picture or read the book. Now, the boys were going crazy on that ship. Inactivity. They would very often be permitted to see a beachhead being blown up, and take no part in it at all. They were beautifully protected. They always slept in warm bunks, and it was too much for them, and they were going mad.

So, if we look at madness, we had better also examine not-doingness. We had better also examine where did this fellow get disenfranchised? Where was this fellow not permitted to play the game? That is actually more important than any other single factor in the case.

Well, let's get more factual than that. Let's look up here very, very carefully and get off memoirs of the old soldier. You know, the old sailors and soldiers have a horrible habit of discussing their memoirs all the time. Yeah, I'd better write mine in a hurry though, because the next war's going to be a lot more interesting.

Anyhow, where we have a game, we have at the same time ideas, actions and barriers. If we have barriers of one kind or another, an individual then can measure the amount of action and doingness in which he is involved.

And let's be very plain and break this right down to processing, just snap. Processing becomes the improvement of the ability to play a game. It is not, definitely not, freeing a thetan. That is not its goal. The goal of processing is to improve the ability to play the game.

What's the matter with the criminal? He can't play the game called society; he's got to play some stupid game called cops and robbers. As if any cop can play a game. And we get this interesting thing, that the man is involved in some game we know not what of and that is not real in his day and time, really. He's not playing the game that the citizen in general is playing. He can't participate.

In order to keep him from descending lower into criminality, or to raise him, actually, out of criminality, we have to restore his ability to play the game.

Now, here's something very, very funny: that this works. And what I'm talking to you about now, after this lapse of three years, is based upon empirical data of such startling content that we really cannot overlook it. The matter is very well proven at this time because we use these tenets I'm giving you right now, and we arrive with excellent results. We restore this criminal's ability to play the game - no matter how we do it - and we discover that we have an honest man on our hands. That's an oddity, isn't it?

Now, supposing we merely ran out J. Edgar Hoover's idea of a criminal. J. Edgar Hoover thinks ... Did you ever hear of J. Edgar Hoover? He's an interesting chap. He's a criminal uh-uh-uh investigator in the United

States. And he tells you, at once, that the criminal has a criminal mind and that is why he is a criminal, and that's all there is to it. And this sage observation has, to date, led to no cures of criminals: "His mind is different than other people's."

Mind works just the same as everybody else's, with this exception: He is less able to play the game called "citizen." In fact, he's less able to play all games, oddly enough, so he has to get that hectic in peacetime in order to convince himself there's any game going on.

Well now, as we look over the situation, then, and we apply this to preclears, we find out if we simply restore the elements of the game, we push him into a position of where he'll play the game.

How do you restore the elements of a game? Well, the elements of a game consist of separatenesses and barriers, and in auditing terms that would be exteriorization and havingness. Exteriorization versus havingness. A chap can be as able as he is capable of leaving a game and coming back to it, by the way, and that's an exteriorization.

And he's as capable of having a game as he is certain there are barriers wherein to play this game. Those are the two elements of auditing; all the mind changes you get evolve from those two elements. So, we at once get the two key processes of Scientology, and that's quite important to us to have the two key processes.

Number one, are they key processes? Well, their omission in auditing produces minimal gain in psychometric tests, if any. If you just drop exteriorization and havingness out of auditing and use anything you find there left, you get no tone rise in the profiles, you get no increase of IQ, no changes in ability or personality.

It's fun. You sit in the chair and he sits in his chair and you chew up energy, but it doesn't change any preclears. That's fascinating. We introduce havingness just all by itself and all of a sudden we get a change of game level, because the individual has to be reassured that he can have a barrier, and as soon as he gets certain that he actually can have a barrier, and he's certain there is a barrier there ... Remember old-time Certainty? Well, that applies very definitely right with havingness. You have to have a certain element of certainty, and "Can he have?" before he really benefits from any of his havingness.



He finally discovers there's a barrier, and as he discovers there is a barrier, he then says, "Well, there are some limits, you know? Maybe I can rack around a little bit, maybe I can move in a couple of small circles, maybe I don't have to sit here and hold on tight. Maybe there is a wall over there, you know?"

There are limits. Therefore he gets to thinking, "Let's see what we can do with these limitations. This freedom within these limitations."

The next thing you know, he's in the same frame of mind as a fellow, walks out, sees a big field, a lot of material and he gets a figure-figure, "What are we going to do about it?"

All right. You as an auditor know better than to tell him what to do about his new-found case level. You know that doesn't work, so it's up to him, actually, to reenter the game. And you get him to reenter the game, you could, just on this one basis only, simply remedy his havingness until he is sure that there are limitations.

Sounds funny, doesn't it. Your preclear will tell you, "I don't want this body. I don't like this body."

He will tell you, "I don't want that wall."

He will tell you, "This is the most horrible universe anybody invented. I don't want anything to do with it. I don't want that floor, I don't want that ground. Get it away from me."

He will give you eighteen different varieties of things that are too terrible to look at. He will quote you papal bulls to tell you there are some things in life which must not be confronted or confused, or you will go someplace where you won't like the barriers.

Now, he will give you all sorts of arguments. And if you are a very, very foolish auditor, you will listen to him and you will say, "All right. He doesn't want his body. He doesn't like bodies. Well, we'll just help him out, and we will take his body away from him."

And he gets so unhappy. Now, he says he doesn't want his body. All right, let's as-is it. Let's chew it up. Let's keep on running significances, significances, significances until he's eaten his head hollow. Let's get him so he chews himself and is in clear space right down to his neck. And he sits there getting less and less head, and less and less body, and he's getting less and less happy. And as you exhaust this energy, these masses and these barriers for this preclear, he will eventually jump up and tell you, you are doing him in.

He'll find that out, usually, quite late, but he'll still tell you. Well, you were helping him out. You were trying to take his body away from him. You were being a nice guy. He wanted it lost and you were trying to lose it for him and he still objects. Shows you how ungrateful some preclears are.

Now, that, we can demonstrate empirically is the wrong way to go about it. What, then, is the right way to go about it? Well, there are several tricks and dodges. You could get him to waste bodies until he could have one; we know that works. Or you could simply ask him what kind of a body he'd like to have, and then have him mock up bodies like that and ask him what he could have of the body he just mocked up. You know, we could run on all kinds of gradient scales and do all sorts of interesting things with mock-ups, until he suddenly says, "You know, well, I could probably have a goat's body."

You know, he's all set. Now he can have a goat's body. He'll feel better about that thing. He doesn't want this old thing, he'll tell you, that he's sitting in. He'd like that goat's body. That's fine. He can mock it up and remedy havingness ...

We go on running bodies, making him mock up more bodies or black bodies. A person who sees only blackness can still mock up black bodies. And he goes on working with more and more bodies, and more and more bodies, and more and more bodies, and more and more ... And all of a sudden you say, "Well, now how do you feel about it?"

And he says, "You know, this body I've got is not so bad; I - I - I don't - I don't have to stay with it, but, you know, it's not so bad."

Very funny part of it is, its chronic somatics were his expression that he didn't want it. An interesting thing. They cure up. You gave him enough bodies. Then, the direction he was actually going was toward more bodies, saying the while that he wanted less.

So, we find these fellows that say they don't want anything to do with the universe, we find they don't want anything to do with the universe because they don't have it. He didn't want anything to do with his body because he doesn't own it. He doesn't have it, actually. He doesn't have anything to do with, and he objects to, all the problems he has because he can't have a problem.

And if you improve his ability to have any one of these things, you then improve his ability to play the game because, of course, you have added the factor that he can have some barriers. And as soon as you give him some barriers, he gets real happy with it.

Well, as I say, we could solve the whole thing in this category of havingness, very interestingly solve it. There is one series of commands which are fascinating, and one of those commands is "Look around here and tell me what you could have."

First thing he's liable to say is, "Anything, everything, I could have everything around here -uh-da-duh."

Shoot him. He's no good to himself or anybody unless you finish the auditing session. That's a fact. He finally picks up a grain of dust or something like that, and he says he can have this, and he improves his consideration until he can actually have many things in the room.

It might or might not be safe at that time to change the auditing command to "What wouldn't you mind remaining right where it is?"

And he tells you finally there's a lot of things that just - he just as soon they remain where they are.

And you say then, "What things could you dispense with?" And you are then running the exteriorization part of havingness.

You might also ask him at the same time, "What are you separate from in this room?" You'd get the same result. All right.

So, you run this very simple gradient scale, and you could run it in sequence, and then again in sequence, "What could you have around here? Would it be all right if it remained?"

And you could run it and run it and run it until you had included the entirety of the universe in that scope. And at that moment, he could have or not have the universe at will, and you would have exteriorized him from the universe as long as you ran that third step. That third step: "What are you separate from around here?"

You could express it, "What are you separate around here . or "What could you dispense with around here?" Now, that's the exteriorization part of havingness.

A remedy of havingness, then, to some degree, is a misnomer. It's a remedy of havingness so that one can have or not-have. It's a little bit of a misnomer. That's not quite right. What it is, is

he is put in a condition where he can have or exteriorize. And that would be a better statement of what we are doing.

If one can leave the game under his own determinism he, then, isn't kicked out of the game, is he? Well, that's a nice, neat, mental dodge for a person to make. But on that dodge depends his sanity. Is he choosing to enter or leave the game? Or is the game choosing whether or not he leaves or enters? And when it's the game that's choosing, watch out! And when he still has a power of choice on the game, he'll be all right. Therefore, we have exteriorization versus havingness as the two elements.

Now, let's look over here and take a look at exteriorization. And here's something very interesting. Could you use this totally? Could you totally put a preclear way upscale by only using exteriorization processes and never touching any havingness or barriers? Not with ninety-nine and forty-four one hundredths percent of the preclears you will handle. Why? Is they can't have what they're exteriorizing from. What they're exteriorizing from is so unreal that they would not be able to leave it. You see that? It's a very simple thing. You disenfranchise them by exteriorizing them.

Do you know that there is an interesting process, though, that attempts to do this? And I'll tell you about this process and this is new to you - most of this material is not. Very interesting process. You'll find your preclear gets very nervous the second his havingness runs down just a little bit - oh, very nervous. Or he dopes off almost at once.

You - for instance, there's an ashtray sitting there, and you move the ashtray from the arm of his chair over onto the side table while you're auditing him and he boils off. You know, you just reduced his havingness one ashtray and that's too much for him, you know. All right.

Now, we take this critical preclear, we take this highly critical level preclear, and we find that he is worried about exteriorization. Now we, as an auditor, come along and say, "Well, now if you just get an intensive I'll exteriorize you." Uh-uh. No, you could sell him an intensive quicker by saying, "I'll interiorize you so you'll never come out again."

No, he won't like that. He won't like too much. Or he's obsessively fond of it. He'll say, "I've got to get out. Yes that's what I want you to do. I want you to exteriorize me."

The second you say, "Be three feet back of your head," he says, "What are you doing to me? You are killing me." You've had this sort of thing happen, I'm sure. All right.

Now, is there a process which would blow him out? Yes, but unfortunately, you'd have to remedy his havingness the while. But maybe if you did it very delicately, you could almost get away with doing it. You would just ask him for something which unfortunately remedies havingness off the track. So, you're not quite escaping from havingness. You would ask him for a time when he wasn't exteriorized. Very fascinating process: A time when he wasn't exteriorized. You've asked him for a time when he hadn't been told to leave the game a time when he wasn't exteriorized.

"That's fine," he says, "this morning."

You say, "A time you're not exteriorized."

"Well, I don't know, I was in an automobile accident once and pinned inside. I certainly wasn't exteriorized on that car."

You say, "That's fine."

Of course, you realize if he's picking things up off the track like this, you would, in the ordinary course of events have to remedy his havingness in one fashion or another, otherwise he would start to boil off. So it's not practical to assume that you could just exteriorize him without

reassuring him of the barrier. But you keep on asking him this question: "A time when you weren't exteriorized. A time when you weren't exteriorized."

And this is what becomes fascinating. And this would become very, very fascinating to anybody researching man, because they would discover past deaths at once.

Most of the preclears that are having a great deal of trouble one way or the other have disenfranchised from the game too often. They have been pushed out of a game and they've been convinced they can't have a game. That's the one thing they can't have. They've been shoved out and shoved out and shoved out. They don't like it. They get the idea after a while that "Oh, there's a game going on, I'd better leave." This sort of a reaction is an immediate reaction.

But you ask them (this type of preclear) for times when they weren't exteriorized from something or weren't separate from something, and they will almost invariably pick up an operation or accident which is totally buried and forgotten about on their part in which they did exteriorize from the body in this lifetime and did experience the phenomenon of death and have since covered it up absolutely.

Interesting observation that I have made with regard to it. There's a hidden this life exteriorization.

Fellow's in a tonsillectomy and all of a sudden, bang; and he went out and he said, "Oh, no, here I am with no body." And he came back in woosh! (sigh) "Well, they didn't kick me out this time. The body will still wiggle when I wiggle."

"All right. That's better," he'll say. And then he will forget about it or he'll try to tell somebody about it and they'll say, "Oh, no, that didn't happen."

He'll sort of know about it all the time and have it all covered up. And he's liable to tell you about this if you start asking him this question, "A time when you weren't separate from things," or "A time when you weren't exteriorized." Either way, you get the same response. To a Scientologist you say, "Times when you weren't exteriorized."

To a person who didn't understand anything about it at all, you could run it and sneak up on him and practically ruin him because he wouldn't know what was happening: "A time when you weren't separate."

He'll tell you about these times if there are hidden times in this lifetime when he did get blown out of his head. Maybe he was a little boy riding down a hill on a bicycle and the bicycle hit a stone, and he went appetite over tin cup and hit his skull, and he went out, and he came back in. And that's the deadliest engram you'll find on the track.

What is the deadliest engram? That one. It's a disenfranchisement from the game. He made it back, but ever since, he's been a little anxious and a little worried. And somebody comes along to him and says, "You can't play marbles" and he'll go into a fit. This one particularly, he'll go into a fit about it. All right.

If you kept on asking him the question, any preclear, this question, and remedying his havingness the while, he would suddenly say, "Just a moment. What am I doing in Brighton? That's funny, I seem to be ... I got a picture of being up above Brighton. Hmm, that's very funny. I have the funniest recollection. You know, I think I lived once before."

And you could say, "Oh, no, course not," and skip it over and keep on asking the question.

He'd get awfully upset with you. He'd say, "I did. My name was Harvey Doakes. I lived at 862 Plum Street, Brighton and that's that. (sniff) It was a good game, too." And he's liable to blow a grief charge on his own death. You ever wonder why people blow grief charges on death?

Now, there is a process which, even run by a psychologist, would produce the same phenomenon. That's a lot of latitude, I know.

Now, you would have to know how to remedy havingness though, to keep it run. To keep it running, you'd have to remedy his havingness because he'd get nervous, agitated and start to flick out, one way or the other, because you're as-ising-there are a bunch of these as-ising processes which are killers. Anything with importance in it becomes a fascinating process because it apparently adds to the person's havingness on the whole track, you see?

You say, "Now tell me a time when pictures seemed important to you." He'll get another one, another one, another one, another one and his apparently his havingness will be good. And it'll stay just fine until that night when he collapses.

Why is this? Because you've picked up the energy masses off the track and you've actually left a hole in the bank that nothing fills up. And he gets a temporary burn-up of energy. And it's just like you take, well, did you ever of course you never have done this - but did you ever take a couple of good, quick drinks that made you feel fine and walk out and practically fall flat on your face?

The only thing that happened there is you burned up a great deal of B1 and energy out of the body at one fell swoop, you see? And that kept you going just fine, you know. And then the next day you're going like this ...

That's because the havingness is reduced, that's all.

Well, similarly, you can beef up a pre-clear in this fashion by pulling stuff in off the track. You ask him this auditing question without directing his attention to present time. "What could you have?"

Oooh. Why, he'll just feel fine. For the first session, he'll just feel wonderful. He'll think that's the greatest process he ever heard of until next day and he's going like this ...

What did he do? He picks the stuff up off the track, you see. He caves his bank in on himself to give himself havingness. His reassurance for barriers comes off the body's track or off of his track. And that's what occurs. All right.

As long as we keep his havingness repaired, we could exteriorize him. The person who doesn't exteriorize is actually actively worried about exteriorization. And he is worried not about some odd phenomena connected with exteriorization, he is worried about exteriorization. That's it. He is worried about going three feet back of his head.

Why, I knew a chap one time that was so worried about exteriorization that he kept worrying about the fact that he wasn't exteriorized, but he knew that he - kind of fashionable in Scientology to be exteriorized, and he wasn't, and he - it upset him. And finally he got an auditor to audit him and he - they exteriorized him and he got about three feet back of his body, complete with a theta body and everything, you know. He got about three feet back of his body and started to shove off for the between-lives area, you know, the callback. You know, "You're supposed to report back here before you pick up another body and . . ." "you know. And he started to shove off just because an auditor said, "Be three feet back of your head."

He almost went back. Scared him half to death. Nobody's been able to pry him out with a crowbar for - or nobody was - for a couple of years.

If we were to run this process on him now, "A time when you weren't exteriorized," if he'd forgotten this, this one would turn up. But this one would turn up on another one in this lifetime, not just a past life, and that would turn up on top of perhaps another one and then all of a sudden he would hand you some kind of a past death

And if this is antipathetic to those people who sell hell for a bit, that this sort of thing can be plowed up and presented on a silver platter of this character, and found in anybody, why, I'm sorry for it. But I won't refund what they lose in the collection plates. I refuse to do that.

Now, the main thing about it is, the fellow's concern about exteriorization or his concern about havingness is all you really audit. Life and its activities are based on postulates, considerations - postulates, considerations. One considers there is a wall, so there is a wall. The wall is actually an animated order. It stands there and says, "I am a wall, look at me, here I am, you are seeing me," whatever you want to phrase it up as. And if you go over and hit it and boy, it's nice and solid and you say, "Boy have we got a game going here. That's good. That's good. That's fine."

But if you can't accept an order, it gets thin. It gets thinner and thinner and thinner. And pretty soon you go around wearing specs; directly coordinated with "can't receive orders."

You start running, "What order would you be willing to receive?" Or "What kind of order . . . " on those that are very nervous about it. Or "What idea could you receive?" for those who are very touchy and delicate. Or "What kind of idea. . . " on the average preclear.

And he'll go on downscale and all of a sudden he'll tell you this alarming fact. He'll say, "You know, that wall is an order." And it'll go sort of wham to him.

You say, "I better leave this alone."

Had a chap who was an ex-chiropractor and naturopath and he came down just to learn how to make people well, and he didn't have any reality on the subject or anything of this sort, and he was being audited by another chiropractor in one of the clinics. It was quite interesting because both of them were arguing madly with each other about what, basically, one did to spines in order to bring about all this phenomena. And we were having a fine time, and all of a sudden one says, "Uh-oh."

"What's the matter?" the other one says.

"Well, I don't know, but something funny happened to that wall as you had me answer that."

And they were running "What around here is an effect?" See. It's a leadpipe cinch that this will produce some sort of phenomena. And they ran it two or three more auditing commands, and another hole appeared in the wall. And the fellow was looking through the wall. This worried him considerably. He went around very thoughtful for a couple of days before he finally fessed up that he was scared stiff of being audited anymore on anything. He wanted to leave.

We repaired his havingness and he finally got so he could look through the wall or not look through the wall as the case may be and he was happy about it.

So, these things are basically a consideration. We change the preclear's considerations. We do it by demonstrating to him his capabilities in making postulates and creating things and in making things disappear. And when we can show him that he can have a wall or not have a wall, and that it is a good, thick, solid wall, he is then perfectly free to have or not have the wall, and at that time he's changed his mind about havingness.

Havingness is not a quantitative thing. You don't remedy a fellow's havingness ten pounds' worth. You remedy his havingness a consideration worth that he can have that particular item or not have it at will.

Similarly, with exteriorization. Exteriorization is merely a consideration. I am out or I am in. It's still a consideration. But when one is in, afraid that he will go out, the tremendous number of considerations associated with are liable to worry him.

Now, those that are in and know they should be out can worry about it simultaneously and certainly. And yet we exteriorize some preclears and they tell you, "I'd just as soon be exteriorized, and I know it's the fashion, but every time I get back of my head I feel so sad." Why is that? It's the grief charge on his own death. That's all there is to it.

You know these chaps that we could never run the death of the ally off of occasionally when we used to be auditing engrams and things - grief charge. We just never could clean this fellow's allies up. We never turned on any visio with him, so on.

The allies, the people he had lost, were simply locks on his own demise a life or two ago. If you run that out, they'll change the other way to, and the allies will blow as secondary situations.

But all of these things are changes of consideration. That one must cry, that one must laugh, that one must have a game even, are considerations. But that one, strangely enough, is something I've never been able to get a fellow to change his mind on, except in one direction.

We lose more preclears this way. I know preclears that were the finest cases you ever saw and I ruined them. Just ruined them, flatly. The finest cases you ever laid your eyes on. I mean, they were all involved and mixed up and confused, and I started auditing them and audit them and audit them and audit them and say, "Now you need just about one more session, and you'll become an Operating Thetan, go soaring around the universe and everything is fine."

And you come back and never see him again.

You find out what he's doing. He's gone out and he's got a better job, he's working harder, he's having more fun over there, he's something of this sort, and you say, "Hey, how about finishing up this project?"

"Oh yes," he said. "Well, that's fine. Sometime. I'm awfully busy now."

They go up to game level and they're gone. You do this in your own groups. You audit people in the group: group sessions, group sessions, group sessions. All of a sudden they're all busy doing something else and they don't come back to the group anymore. And you feel very sad about the whole thing. Your havingness has been reduced.

The thing to do is teach them Scientology. Don't keep auditing them in these groups. And they will then know enough about the game called Scientology so that they don't immediately blow the whole thing the second that they themselves feel compelled or interested in the game at large. That's the answer back of it.

Now, we could be very exact, we could give you an awful lot of material concerning the exact anatomies of the barriers, and so forth, that make up the game. Well, we could add this up; we could be so Germanic about this thing we could have texts that thick as to what is a game.

But you know what a game is. I know what is a game. And all we really have to know about is the preclear wants to play a game, and you want to regain for him his ability to play the game, and the game is a game of exteriorization versus havingness, one way or the other. You jockey these two things together and his imagination will enter in and he will start playing the game of life. And when he does that, you're through with him. He's no longer a preclear.

Where man is failing is where man no longer feels he is able to play any kind of a game. And he's failed, then; he's in a mental institution.

I hope that look at the situation, as you look it over, I hope that look at the situation will clarify some of your own ideas. I want you to take a good look at this; I want you to take a good look at this in preclears. I know in advance you'll find out I'm right, but use your determinism on it.

This isn't a game I'm laying in your lap and telling you, you must play. Look it over, see how it looks to you. And I think you will find out that your preclear is being as well audited as he is being returned to an ability to play a game; not as well audited as he is getting free.

Freedom can become a horrible thing. Very horrible thing. Talk to some fellow right after he's been discharged from the army. He doesn't know what he's doing.

Now, where man fails is where man disenfranchises man. He kicks men out of the game and then he wonders why he has trouble with criminals, why he has trouble with the insane, and kicks out some more people out of the game just to make sure that he'll have more trouble. His game is trouble. Our game isn't trouble. Our game is solving it. I wish you a lot of luck with these ideas.

Thank you.