

## **AUDITING TECHNIQUES: ORDER OF PROCESSES**

A lecture given on 22 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

This is January 22nd, 1957, fourteenth lecture of the 16th ACC.

This continues the lecture series on processes which was begun with the last lecture.

I'm talking to you about processes.

Now, we know that this ACC is working in exactly this direction: communication, control and havingness.

Now, each one of those is a process.

What do you think about this fellow who goes running down the road, goes by a stop sign and has an accident? What do you think about that man?

Female voice: No control.

First, he's out of communication. Second, he's out of control. And third...

Audience voices: He's low on havingness.

That's right. And that is the way the MEST universe goes -- one- two-three. What is this thing called havingness? Well, this thing called havingness is our word for a rather vast panorama of phenomena, all of which has to do with possession of objects, particles and spaces, and any form thereof, in that consecutive order.

The first category with which you will collide is an object. The next thing that is run into is a particle. And the next thing that is run into is a space. And then we have combinations, by which we mean forms and scenery, significances. You add these things together.

It is very interesting to note, extremely interesting to note, that the world of (huh!) psychology today thinks that Scientology is doing something very, very strange, peculiar and unheard of, something that should be at once condemned. Scientology is dealing with the component parts of the physical universe, and psychology has actually, on a couple of occasions, held this up to scorn.

What's this tell you? Not only that they don't know their business, but that they cannot confront, even vaguely, objects, particles, spaces, and the forms and scenery which result as a combination thereof. It tells you they can't confront them -- which tells you at once that they are not aware!

Awareness always contains, regardless of the emotional response, some small ability to confront. To be aware of something, one must be able to confront it. Must be some small idea of confronting it there.

If a man is terrified of grizzly bears, there is, to some slight degree, an ability to confront a grizzly bear. Do you see that? So a person who is simply terrified of something is not in very bad condition. The person is not in a critical state at all. The person is terrified of something. Fine! They're aware of it! Three cheers!

Now, when we go a little bit further than that, they tell you they're apathetic about grizzly bears. Fine! Good heavens! They're still aware that grizzly bears exist! But how about the fellow who, while one is chomping off his head, says, „*What grizzly bear?*“ What about that fellow? Now, you're looking at any and all cases to be found in this universe which are still susceptible of being processed, or which should be, to obtain any optimum function or operation. And what I am talking about applies to any such or all such cases: They're here, you can talk to them, they exist, they're in this universe, you yourself can be to some degree aware of them: then what I am telling you applies to those cases. Now, that should establish at once the breadth of this situation.

Now, this phenomenon of awareness and ability to confront carries throughout this matter of havingness. These are side panels to havingness. When we say „*have*,“ we are actually on the lower level of confront. But is there anything above confront? Yes, there is. Yes, there is. Almost the same order of magnitude, one little step up, is „*contribute to*.“

Now, the fellow who can contribute to grizzly bears certainly can control them. He certainly is in communication with them. Confrontingness says communication, doesn't it? It's the factor of communication.

But what is this havingness? Well, it's below confronting, which is simple possession. A man can have a body, who can't confront a body. It's an undercut confrontingness. And really, in final analysis, what are we doing but examining communication? He can be in it and be it and use it to confront something. There we would say he has it.

Now, because there are so many things that people cannot confront that they don't even know they cannot confront, Havingness is then a very usable process, because it knocks out a tremendous number of identifications.

*„Look around the room and find something you could have.“* The fellow says, *„Oh, I could have that settle over there. I could have that mantle. I could have that light switch.“* He didn't say he could confront any of them. All he said, really, was he could be in the position of that and look at the rest of the room. That's really all he said. And if you keep up Havingness long enough, you run into spaces.

See, at first it runs from objects into spaces. And it is a scale of confrontingness that is taking place all the time you are running it, which undercuts confrontingness; so therefore, havingness is quite important. So we say *„havingness,“* although it's a scale of communication confrontingness. You get the idea? The key to it is havingness.

Don't think that it works this way -- doesn't work this way: That fellow is very bad off because he can only have. No, that would be true of anybody in this universe. There's always a certain category -- until he's totally cleared -- which he could only have. It's the place to look from. When he can have space, he could probably exteriorize.

Now, havingness is a sort of an undercut exteriorization phenomenon. It's the reverse. *„It isn't absolutely necessary,“* he cognites, *„that I be in this position, possessing this body, in order to view any other part of the room.“* This sort of little phenomenon takes place. It's an underlying thought. You know? *„I could have that“* -- in other words, occupy it, be it, possess it. You get the idea? But all of that is mechanically unintelligible. It cannot be at once translated into positions, placements, locations, and so forth. It doesn't solve beingness in any way. What he really means is he has a slight tendency to comprehend that he could occupy that mass and view from it other masses. He could have it. That is why people like to have cars, why they like to have pretty possessions, why they like to have a pretty house, why they like to have clothes. You get all of these things. Hm?

And people actually go so far as to have glasses. People always think that glasses are something you look through at something. No, a glass is something to view from. And somebody who's been wearing glasses for a long time has no space between himself and the glasses. And when you, as an auditor, take these glasses off of him suddenly... He's been looking from the glass. See? He doesn't look through glasses; he looks from glasses. He can have glasses; that is something he can have. He might not be able to have eyes, but he can have glasses. You get the idea? And you take them off of him suddenly and he has nothing from which to look.

Now you say, *„This is very strange. The solution to glasses, of course, would be handling eyeballs and glass panes and...“* Listen, I've been through all of this. I've done all this on a research basis. And I know that nothing solves glasses, short of straight Havingness. Just straight Havingness solves glasses.

But glasses are rather difficultly solved because they are the total confront of the pre-clear. They are that havingness with which the pre-clear confronts everything he ever looks at. See? Boy, is that a substitute! You see? That is really an interesting substitute!

You'll find perceptive assists all fall under this category -- such things as hearing aids, other things. A person hears from the hearing aid, if you get the idea. The hearing aid really just gives him something to hear from. You got that? It doesn't much change if you try to change his level of being able to hear.

You say to somebody who's wearing a hearing aid, „*Now, the best thing you could do is to just get over the idea that there are dangerous sounds. See? So we'll get you over dangerous sounds. And we'll get you over these dangerous sounds in this fashion: Now, let's walk around town here and find some sounds that it would be all right for you to listen to.*“ See? Doesn't that sound theoretically wonderful? See? I mean, it's theoretically perfect. As a matter of fact, it has some small workability -- oh, down around witch -- doctor level. See, I mean, it's not good. It has some small workability -- 22 percent.

No, you've got to have a mass that supplants a hearing aid. Look, this individual can't have an ear, but he can have a mass called a hearing aid. Do you see this? See, as long as he has that, there is something from which one can view/confront sound; an ear isn't good enough. The trouble with him is he hasn't got an ear; he's got a hearing aid. You see this slight difference here?

On perceptive assists, then, you should not be very critical of people who wear glasses as they're coming up the line; you really shouldn't be. Because it is a terrifically high-level confronting mechanism. See that? A very high level. And what gets the pre-clear over this is almost a total Remedy of Havingness. The last thing they get rid of is glasses -- I know; it's fascinating. It's fascinating, because it's a havingness. It's a clear mass, and one can perceive from it.

Now, you can get all sorts of significant rationales in there. You can say, „*Well, it protects his eyes, and that's why he wears them.*“ And I've had all of these. I've thought all of these up. You can think up probably more than I thought up, but they all dead-end. They're simply significances and rationales, no more than that.

Now, above havingness is this thing, confront. See? A person doesn't have to be in the spot in order to have an awareness of it. In other words, this mass, he no longer has to be in the middle of to have. See? He can also have it if it's sitting out there four or five feet away. In other words, he can confront it and still have it.

In other words, he has to admit some of his co-ownership of the universe in anything he confronts. To some tiny degree, he has to be willing to accept the responsibility for having mocked up all these horrible grizzly bears before he can want to look at one. You get it? No matter how much of a tiny shadow it is, his responsibility for having created it or having had something to do with it gives him his ability to perceive it.

All right, we look at this grizzly bear. The fellow who will contribute to grizzly bears is above the person who will simply confront grizzly bears. To confront a grizzly bear means sort of a fight, but to contribute to grizzly bears means to raise them, feed them.

Now, some people go on a lower inversion of this and hand them the body every time they show up. It's not necessary to go to that extremity just to contribute to a grizzly bear.

But why does a person ever permit himself to be eaten? It's simply the last manifestation -- eating is just the last manifestation of „*contribute to.*“ It is an expression of the willingness to contribute to. The „*joy of being eaten*“ is quite a fabulous bit of phenomena. It's quite fabulous. You find it on the whole track.

You can run this on preclears. It doesn't do them any good. This won't do anything for the case. It merely demonstrates a sensation, and some preclears go for this. You say, „*All right*“ (this is a girl you're processing), you say, „*Mock up, now, a man and have him eat up a girl, You know? Mock up a man, mock up a girl. Now have him eat up the girl.*“ And the actual sexual stimuli which results is something that about knocks your pre-clear's head off. It's quite fabulous; it's very intense. That is definitely an indicator that sex is a substitute for this „*contribute to.*“ Don't you see?

Eating lies just above sex, and when eating is forbidden (which is a havingness) then sex gets indulged in, You could rationalize it that way if you wanted to. It's not necessarily a clear-cut line of logic, however, because it also contains creativeness. Although, just exactly how eating is creative, I'm not quite sure; but I'm sure that if you wrote a book called „*Creative Eating*“ it would sell like hot cakes.

Now, as we go upscale on this havingness thing, above „*contribute to*“ we run into just plain old, routine, ordinary create. Now, that's fascinating -- that it's way up there.

Now, authorship of the universe is something which has been in question for many years. People have been arguing about this for a long time. Even in ancient times the Christian argument with the conservative, status quo religion of Rome involved the creation of the universe. Who created the universe? In the early days of Greece, you found the various factions fighting over this fact of the actual creator of the universe. People have a tendency to run it backwards and try to find an earlier creator or a master creator, or this and that.

What are they looking for? They're looking for you! You're hunted! To that degree, you're hunted. Fascinating.

All right. On this scale (this Havingness Scale, we call it, since havingness is so much a clue to it) we have two points which lie under havingness. And one of those is Waste and one of them is Substitute. And I don't much care whether it goes Waste, Substitute, Have, or whether it goes Substitute, Waste, Have. I don't much care, because it's so mixed up at the bottom, a preclear run on these things goes into Waste and goes into Substitute at different intervals, one from another. In other words, not all pre-clears start at Substitute, not all preclears start at Waste, but all preclears will run either on some subjects.

Now, whether it's advantageous ever to process a person on Waste, or on Substitute or Substitution... I'll give you a case history. A girl was unable to drink milk. When she drank a glass of milk she would break out wildly with hives.

She was run on Creative Processes to this degree: She was made to waste milk in various ways with Creative Processes, rather imaginatively. It was the last cup of milk in the whole world, and the house was full of children who were dying for want of milk, and there was no other milk in the whole world: „*All right, now you've got that glass of milk mocked up there. That's fine. Now pour it down the sink in the mock-up.*“ With what speed could this person get rid of milk! No matter what the conditions set up were, this person could waste milk.

And this person wasted milk and wasted milk and wasted milk and wasted milk, and after a while the speed of wasting slowed down. It wasn't quite so frantic. And this was built up, just on wasting, only until the person could have milk. And there the process was stopped.

And then it was tested on this basis: This was the last pint of milk in the world, and the whole house was full of starving babies, and what could the preclear do with the milk? Drink it.

Now, from that time forward, the milk allergy has never reappeared. There's never been a recurrence of this milk allergy. How long did that process take? The process actually occupied about twelve minutes.

Now, that's how valuable Waste is in relationship to Have. And anybody that's run DEI Scale very much can tell you that.

But when do you stop wasting and start having? When do you do that? Well, sometimes Substitute comes up in there and interposes between the two, but usually Substitute is found to lie below Waste. So if a person couldn't even waste something, he could undoubtedly substitute for it.

*„Look around the room and find a substitute for Mother.“* The room is here, but Mother isn't. So we find a substitute for Mother. We do various things. We can come upscale with that for a while and we find out that the preclear could waste Mother. And after a while the preclear could have Mother. And then the person could confront Mother. And then the person could contribute to Mother. And after a while, the person could create Mother.

Now, just exactly at what point they start in actually, physically creating Mother, I have not established. Here is an oddity, and we're dealing with the never-never land of *„I won't do it because I'll spoil the game.“*

But no single level of this scale is of any value to you whatsoever unless you can control a preclear. And if you're going to engage in the controlling of a preclear, you had certainly better learn to establish and continue and monitor excellently your communication with that preclear.

It might be said that control and communication are counter- opposed. When you start to control, you tend to go out of communication. When you start to communicate, you tend to go out of control. Exactly what their relationships are, I can only tell you in terms of the behavior of Homo sap. You control a person too hard and too arduously, and you'll stop talking to him after a while. He will only become a machine. You see that?

All right, you get a preclear down to that point and you have defeated your purposes. So some way or another, you've got to rescue the dwindling spiral of control and get it back upscale with a communicate. You see that? You communicate with a preclear too much and your control of the preclear goes by the boards.

What is the judgment point? Well, that's yours, and something that you will learn by experience, but you certainly will be able to observe that there is a judgment point to

be learned. Try complete control of a preclear with practically no communication to the preclear and see how far you get. Now, try complete communication with the preclear with no control whatsoever of the preclear and see how far you get. In both cases, you'll get nowhere.

Now, control doesn't necessarily chop up havingness -- not necessarily -- but communication cuts it to ribbons! Why does communication cut it to ribbons in a preclear? Communication doesn't really chop havingness at all. But every preclear has the consideration that communication is sound (here on this planet at this time) -- communication is sound. And if communication is sound obviously it is destructive. Communication, of course, is not sound. Communication is an interchange of ideas.

The only experience he's ever had with sound, before he reached an air-atmosphere area, was with electronic particles. You can't hear sound in a vacuum unless it is conducted by electronic or electrical particles. So an explosion sounded, but nothing else ever did. You got that? Explosion made noise, but nothing else ever made noise. Communication was done on a thought-interchange basis in other fashions.

But what was this? What was this background? It meant sound equals destruction because an electronic blast was a blast. And you'll find out the loudest noises he has heard in this lifetime have been destructive. The gas tank blew up, see? Sound accompanied destruction. The gas works blew up; that was a little more so. Sound accompanied destruction. A gun goes off. Sound accompanies destruction. See? And he has sound married to destroy. And you are speaking to him with sound. So he may have this basic consideration so thoroughly that his havingness goes to pieces when you talk to him.

That is a real curve. By the way, someone under processing recovers this and gets over it after a while -- he can tolerate sound. But at first he cannot.

So what's that say? This says, then, that the optimum process that you would run would have the exact amount of communication necessary to keep up ARC, with the exact amount of control necessary to keep the preclear in session, with the exact amount of havingness to keep the communication and control from chopping him to ribbons. And that would be a session. And that would be an optimum session. And his tone would go straight on up.

And this is demonstrable, by the way, in the tremendous number of tests which have been made. And if there's anything in this subject that has been tested, it's havingness. Because we've forgotten it two or three times, and we've had to rediscover it all over again. And every time that we have discovered it, we have discovered again that there was one sure method of bringing a preclear upscale: Get him into some reality of being able to have something, and carry him up with good control and good communication, and your preclear's personality curve and intelligence increased and improved consistently and continually. And that was the answer to the situation.

Now, it isn't the total answer by a long ways. It isn't the final end product. But, you would have to do this before you could process anybody. That's an awfully broad statement for anybody to make.

To some degree, no matter when you were processing who, from what fast reading of what Dianetic or Scientology text.. . And all of us have had (me included) the stage of being a „bookie“ You know? Fumbling along, trying to make some gains: „*What was the.. what.. what's the directions now?*“

Amusingly enough, I have had an auditor read to me the canceller out of Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health. It sounded just like a tape being played back at me. You know? Fumbling along. And yet, that confounded auditor actually did run out a rather arduous period in which I became very tired, and he actually did run the engram of that period out. It's quite interesting. Did succeed. See? It did do something in spite of all this.

So there must have been some impulse toward communication. There must have been some impatience in all of us with regard to bad control. See? There must have been some impatience with a preclear out of control. You know? We get edgy and a little bit tense when the guy insisted on jumping up and smoking a cigar or leaving the auditing room, or something of this sort.

If our control only manifested itself in „*Damn you, sit still!*“ see, if that was the only control we did, we still were doing some control. And we tried to be reasonable with him, and this was communication. And we were feeding him engrams he never saw before, so of course, this was havingness; so we could win. Just as simple as this. So we've been doing all this for years.

Those branches of mental exercising which have failed and gone into the past and have been forgotten... There are many of them, by the way. The Aesculapian school. The more or less dead-ended line of Tibetan Lamaism today -- the Lama throne now being occupied by a communist -- that's practically gone. I suppose there are a few temples they haven't discovered yet in some of the side valleys in order to shoot them up, and I imagine these are still functioning somewhat. But it's pretty well forgotten, its forward impetus across the world halted.

Even Buddhism today is a dwindling mental activity. It never was a religion the way the Western world understands religion. It was a series of mental activities of one kind or another. It was a series of studies, of observations of the real life.

And you take, oh, the very, very minor ones which never made any spark at all, such as psychology, the ones which have been totally discredited, such as psychoanalysis... There isn't an analyst today, I don't think, who practices analysis. He practices something else. God knows what he's practicing.

You go in and ask an analyst and say, „*What do you practice?*“ And he says, „*I'm a Horney man.*“ And you say, „*Oh, I see. You ever read a book by Horney?*“ And he says, „*No.*“ And you're off to a good, logical conversation. I mean, I've actually had this exact conversation with them.

And these schools were not successful, none of them. If they had been successful, then people would not be throwing pills down the throats of insane people. You wouldn't have people going insane in the first place; you'd have a society monitored in such a way that people would understand there's something you could do for it. And a

fellow is getting a little bit tired and edgy, and so forth, and they would do something for him. Don't you see? They wouldn't let him go all the way out the bottom the way they do now, and cut his brains out with a dull butcher knife or an ice pick or something. This shows a franticness, an unsolved situation.

Now, why? Now, you just think I'm giving you a little propaganda. You possibly think, occasionally, that I draw a long bow. You think possibly that I exaggerate with regard to these practices and the past in mental healing. But that's only because you yourself have not closely and intimately studied it. You understand? I mean, I'm telling you that straight from the shoulder. I am not exaggerating.

I am telling you that any group of people bound to heal, have healed. You understand? It will occur. I don't care what their title or practice or anything else is, they're going to achieve some success. Do you see that? But it's not going to be a predictable success.

Therefore, any group of people getting together, saying, „*Let's heal people*,“ would achieve some success. Don't you see? I can tell you the exact percentage is 22. That's right!

I imagine that these conflicts in the field of healing never should have occurred. Never. There should never have been a school of Galen versus Harvey on the subject of whether or not the heart pumped. Or there never should have been a fight between orthodox neurology and Freudian psychoanalysis. There just shouldn't have been any fights, because they didn't have anything to fight about. They were all agreed on this basis that men of goodwill banded together and, addressing patients, do accomplish a certain percentage of results.

And personality has a lot to do with it too. Personality has a considerable amount to do with it. You give somebody a good nurse and he pulls through, and you give somebody a bad nurse and he kicks the bucket. I mean, she wasn't even administering anything to him, she was just making the pillow more comfortable. It's quite interesting. It's an amazing thing. So that some chap who is engaging in psychoanalysis -- he's a good fellow, a nice fellow, he's personable, he can meet people, and so forth -- a certain number of people come in to him, get well. See, it wouldn't matter what he was using. A witch doctor down in the Belgian Congo is a good boy and he thinks the tribe ought to keep rolling, and it doesn't matter what herb he burns under what coconut shell, his patients do well. See?

Next boy right down the line has got hell and mayhem in his heart, and nobody ever gets well under his hands. You see, the personal element is a very interesting one.

We had a writer many years ago -- he wrote *Ruggles of Red Gap* and many other... One of his stories was *Oh, Doctor!* and the first few paragraphs of *Oh, Doctor!* are quite amusing. The person is ill and the night shift comes on, and *Midnight Mary* takes over (or whatever her name was in the book). And she takes the thermometer out of his mouth, which was left by the departing nurse, reads it and finds that it's normal. Immediately, with great disapproval, punches it into a glass, takes out her

own thermometer and takes his temperature. „Ah! It's up three points! That's better!“ she says. A very amusing skit.

In other words, the intention of the person, the personability of the practitioner -- these have always been factors and these always will be factors. But until somebody could take almost any kind of a practitioner, functioning with almost any kind of a sour intention, and produce results come hell or high water, no matter what he did, nobody had a right to fight. They were all totally agreed.

The magic combo is communication, control and havingness. And you can take a stinking auditor -- just terrible, you know? -- somebody that you reformed out of medical school. See? He'd flopped medical school even, and you show him the rudiments of making somebody sit down and look around the room and find out something he could have. And you explain to him that he's not supposed to let the person jump up, but if the person appears too restive, to talk him into sitting down again. This person would be able to produce an increase in the health and happiness of that particular case. It would almost be beyond his power to depress these three factors.

Now, that's the sure grounds you're on today. You were never on that ground before. So that when we teach you to do this with exactitude, when we try to make you adjust into an optimum action, the mere fact that somebody is trying to make you adjust into an optimum balance of this thing will demonstrate to you that there is a balance, and you can find your own, and we will have done our job.

But there is this mechanical thing called technique. What technique do I run on whom? That question is out of date. It's an out-of-date question. Unless you can get this fellow to have some havingness of one kind or another, you won't get him to be able to confront life at all, and therefore, will never have increased his awareness. And you've had it! Now, whether you sneak up on him with Waste, Substitute, Objective Havingness, Subjective Havingness, mocking things up -- whatever you do -- you'll have to do something in that line. See, I'm afraid there's just no escaping that datum.

I've been three years trying to run away from it -- follow my natural destructive bent. Never escaped it, so I decided I'd better sit down and learn more about it, and I did. And it boils down to the fact that nearly everybody jams in some fashion on the sixth dynamic, and the personability of the individual is the seventh dynamic. So we have the seventh in jam with the sixth, and we have life.

You see, the seventh would have no sixth in it in its purest state. But the second that the person goes into communication, he begins to believe it's best to have a form to confront. And immediately that he's got a form, now he is dealing with objects, and so we're at once into the sixth. So you're working here, not on the first dynamic; you are certainly not working on the second dynamic; you're certainly not working on the eighth dynamic.

The truth of the matter is, auditing, as you calmly look at it here, is apparently a third-dynamic action, and sure enough is a third-dynamic action. A group called Dianetists or Scientologists is engaged upon a third-dynamic activity each time any one of that group sits down and addresses any other one of that group.

Why is it a third-dynamic activity? Because the seventh and the sixth have combined into a third. So actually, it really isn't totally a third-dynamic activity unless the third dynamic can be said to be a product of the seventh and sixth. And you're dealing with the seventh and sixth. So therefore, you're dealing with thetans, objects, particles and spaces, and their interrelationship and significances in terms of forms and scenes. And that, I'm afraid, is all there is to it! I mean, if you think that a thetan is going to get well simply because he sits down and changes his mind, you're being silly.

A person could change his mind over and over and over and over again and still not be able to look at a space. Perfectly all right. This fellow says, „*Graveyards are bad. Graveyards are good. Graveyards are bad. Graveyards are good. Graveyards are bad. Graveyards are good. Well fine, I don't think graveyards are so bad.*“ And you take him down to the graveyard then. He takes a look at the graveyard and he goes, „*Yeekkk!*“

Why? He was perfectly willing to confront the significance of a graveyard, but it happens to be objects occupying a space, and he could confront neither.

So what's technique consist of in the final analysis? A bunch of figure-figure? No, logic is a concatenation of substitutions. Does it amount to the exact process to run on the exact preclear? Nope. It depends on how close you can get to havingness with any particular preclear, so as to shove him into it. Where do you have to start in order to sneak up and tip him over into it? See? And that's all technique consists of today. „*Technique-ing*“ could be said to be a rug-pulling expedition.

But any technique can be immediately graded on how closely it adheres to what we call the Havingness Scale, coupled with a games condition, which is basically: Preclear at cause; bank, mind, universe at effect. Auditor at cause; preclear at effect of the auditor. Preclear has to be run at cause, so you have to have game condition there and you have to have something on the Havingness Scale. You have to have these two things.

Now, we get quantitative about it and we discover that we have something that isn't going to improve anybody: quantity. We're after quality, and we are practicing in the field of quantity. And these two things are entirely different but, unfortunately, you have to pander to quantity in any preclear.

He feels, in terms of havingness, that „*there's not enough of it.*“ Boy, that's the silliest thing you ever heard of -- there's not enough of it. Here is something that could mock up any quantity of it, and he tells you there is not enough of it.

So you get a games condition here out of this cause and effect, and you get a quantity of games as one of his considerations. And over on technique you have quantity of havingness. How much is there to have? How much is there to confront? How much is enough to confront? How much is enough to contribute to?

Any time you've been hovering over tipping some waitress, you were trying to answer the question „*How much? What quantity shall I contribute to?*“ See? Any time. These are the quandaries: How much? How much? How much? And it actually is the big bug-bear of the entire universe.

Somebody comes along and he tells you, *„Now, in order for a male to be fertile, it is necessary for him to have three* – “I don't know what the figure is -- it's three billion per square centimeter... (Don't take these figures at all, because it's not biological.) But anyway, it must be that number of sperm for a person to be fertile and to be able to re-create his own species. And somebody who falls below this number, some incredible number like only a few million per cubic centimeter, or something of that sort, he isn't fertile.

Oh, now wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. There's some difference in the quality of the sperm? No. How come? What is this factor? It's the consideration of quantity. In order to create a child, any ovum is only satisfied with being sure that there are enough billions and billions and billions of sperm in order to accept one. How do you like that?

Now, everywhere we find this quantity quantitative. It works this way: There's some people will notice there are five books on the shelf, so they can have one. There's only one book on the shelf, they won't be able to take it. Somebody else comes along and there's one book on the shelf, so somebody grabs it. That's just his difference of idea of how much is enough. And that question varies from every preclear to every pre-clear. There's always a variability in that question: How much is enough?

And there's always some point in a case where greed appears. *„How much is enough?“* Ahhhhhhh-ohhhh! They run greed on women down in the Middle East. How much is enough women? Some old dog has three thousand concubines in the harem, you know? You mean he needs three thousand concubines? Well then, why would he be writing me a letter to get so he could have one child? What would he be doing, doing that? And yet he has done that, some such sheik. Interesting, isn't it? Fascinating. I mean, how much is enough women? And if you asked him just bluntly, *„How many women do you need?“* „Oh,“ he'd say, *„Well, I have another caravan-load coming in Monday. And we're trying to get the stock up around here.“*

You ask somebody in Ireland *„How many women do you need?“* and he'll say, *„What do you take me for? Need a woman? You're crazy. One is too many.“* Now, it isn't necessarily true that the Irishman is worse off than the Middle Easterner -- not necessarily true on the subject of women -- because one might lie on a harmonic of the other. One might be sanely objecting to women and the other obsessively possessing women. And the one who is obsessively possessing them may be three thousand feet lower on the Tone Scale than the person who simply objects to a woman on principle. See?

Now, in order to enjoy any kind of marital relationships at all, it is obviously necessary to be able to have, for the husband, one woman. What a neat adjustment. If we look in other parts of the world, and we ask in Tibet, *„How many would enough women be?“* And they say, *„Well, there shouldn't be any fewer women than one per ten husbands“* -- polyandry.

And we look in the Middle East: *„How many would enough women be?“* And he says, *„Three thousand, but we're getting enough in soon.“* And we ask in Ireland and one woman is too many. What an interesting span of opinions racially; these are different racial opinions.

Well now, it varies amongst individuals tremendously, and that is what varies. The very thing you would expect to vary would be quantity; the answer to this question „*How much is enough?*“ And wherever you're dealing with havingness, you're dealing with „*How much is enough?*“ and a couple of other things.

Now, these couple of other things are very important. You see, if a person doesn't have enough, there is a scarcity. If the scarcity is too great, there isn't. So he doesn't confront it and isn't aware of it. Things become nonexistent, usually, merely because in the consideration of the individual there aren't enough of them. So therefore, he never sees them.

If there was only one fireplug in the town, half of the people in the town wouldn't even know it was there, and the other half would take visitors around to see it. The whole subject of fireplugs would be so bad off that they would go to another town that was full of fireplugs, had one on every corner, and they'd be barking their shins, morning, noon and night. See, no fireplugs! But there sits a fireplug. Yes, but there are no fireplugs. You get the idea? So that consideration fits in with havingness and it's a very vital consideration. The consideration of scarcity: Not only how much is enough, but how scarce is scarce.

Two other considerations fit in with this. One of them is importance. How do you make some thing or some class of things important? By varying their scarcity or abundance. You make things important by varying their scarcity and abundance. But you say that's the silliest thing in the world; matches are very important in this society. Aw, you wouldn't find many people that would agree with that. There's lots of them. They're very cheap -- lots of them. But I imagine the first few matches that were on display, everyone thought they depended for their novelty upon the fact that everybody was paying attention to them. Well, there were very few of them.

Now, you can get out in some area of the world where there are no matches, and so on, and men who know all about them (men who know all about matches) are there; they're without matches for quite a while. And you invite them into your home, and you put a box of matches on the middle of the table, and they will walk over to the fire and take up the fire tongs, pick up a coal in order to light a cigarette. Almost burn their noses off. But there are some matches.

The matches don't exist. After that you give them matches. You leave matches on their bureaus. You give them matches. You fill their pockets with matches. And they still haven't got any matches! They'll come around and ask you for a match! Do you see this? In other words, you've confirmed a scarcity.

You could have lots of other considerations, but the importance of something can be monitored by its scarcity or abundance, and then established by a former scarcity or abundance -- which is quite fascinating to us, because that is the basic clue of the mind. It's a former scarcity of abundance which establishes mis- scarcities and mis- abundances in our existing world.

Now, when a person has too few of something, they very often dislike it. They don't halo it and put it in the museum. They simply detest it! -- which is one of the more fascinating discoveries of Scientology.

A woman in the Old West, you would have thought at once was something that everyone would've put on a pedestal. Well, they occasionally put one on a pedestal for a short time, but the bitterness of these old-timers against women that they had never associated with and knew nothing about is something that used to dazzle me when I was a kid. I used to sit and listen to these old boys talk about how horrible women were, but they hadn't ever known any. They were so scarce, they were bad. You see that?

And when people talk about how bad things are, you can add up as a Scientologist that these things to them are scarce. Remedy the abundance of those things and you remedy that bad or good opinion. Quite interesting, isn't it?

Now, the importance of things are monitored in this fashion, then: They are importantly bad or importantly good.

The scarcer something becomes, the more vicious somebody is liable to become about its important badness. The body itself can react on that pattern -- that something is terribly bad because it is very scarce. It must be very bad because it's very scarce. And it can get so scarce and so bad -- the individual is still vaguely aware of it -- that it then attacks him. And a person can become allergic to angel food cake. Quite an odd thing, but angel food cakes are only something that his mother baked at every birthday, and only for his brother. That made him aware of them and made them totally scarce as far as he was concerned.

So he once railed about this and that and eventually would rail against angel food cakes. And one day he takes a bite of angel food cake and it makes him desperately ill. Do you see this? It's the factor of important badnesses and important goodnesses.

Now, if everybody in the country is told that he is unimportant, everybody in the country will go crazy. That's an awfully funny statement to be made that bluntly, but that is just about what would happen. If everyone in the country is convinced that he has no importance and there's no beingness he could possibly occupy, he is denied of all havingness, isn't he? He's unimportant. Therefore, nothing he has is anything that would give awareness to anybody else. Therefore, he is essentially, then, unable to be; and if he is unable to be, then his last resort is madness. And a country which works hammer and tongs to convince everybody they're unimportant is a country which will have broad mental problems.

You'll find many a boy half out of his mind because both parents or the rest of the family insisted that he was totally unimportant. And you'll find many a girl almost ready for the spinbin because the family has insisted that her talent is so precious she must not waste it!

Now we've got the other side of the picture: they have begged her to be important! Important! „*We're going to make you scarce. We're not going to let you use your energy or efforts. We're not going to let you touch or communicate with other things. Now, you've just got to study*

*painting now, because you have this great talent and great art. Your voice must be given to them.*“ And the next thing you know, why, she's down here crawling up the cell walls. Why? She's been made so important that she became totally scarce.

Now, on the one hand, a boy could be made or a girl could be made so unimportant that there was no thing they could be. And the other side of it would be, they must not be any other thing than one. And what have you accomplished? A tremendous denial of beingness and havingness in both cases. Whether it was too important or too unimportant, you've accomplished the same thing.

So some kind of an adjustment about the importances of things is necessary to the sanity of any individual. All aberration is, is some fact taking over and becoming all-pervasively important when it actually is not important. And that is insanity.

All right, responsibility is the other factor. And that goes right in the three things: There is a direct association with scarcity, importance and responsibility. And the motto under that would be *„One does not take care of the pebbles on a beach or the grain of sands in the Sahara.*“ One just doesn't take care of them, that's all. There are too many of them. Quantitative, see? They're so vast in number that nobody has to take care of them at all. And an irresponsibility stems from the unimportance of an individual, or from his total importance on one subject (therefore he's irresponsible on all others).

Now, you try to run creativeness on a person and terrible feelings of irresponsibility are liable to run off. And you're liable to make a mistake. You're liable to start running this, and after a while he says, *„It isn't important anymore.*“ And you're liable to think you've gotten him over it. Oh, no you didn't. You've adjusted the importance to the opposite end, of total unimportance, which is irresponsibility.

And in the final analysis you could call insanity extreme irresponsibility. A person has either had his part in the construction of all dynamics or he's denying that he did and he's crazy. See? He has no other choice. He had to have some part in the construction of things in order to continue to be aware of them. They had to exist in order for him to continue to be aware of them. In other words, existence, awareness -- fit it in. Now, he has to have some responsibility for the world and the way it runs in order to be aware of the world at all. Quite fascinating.

If you run this particular process -- if you say, *„Get the idea of the effort required to create all of mankind,*“ the person will do that two or three times, and then all of a sudden will tell you something like, *„Oh, I couldn't possibly imagine that, and it's not important anyway.*“ His irresponsibility has turned on. And you keep running that same process, and his irresponsibility will increase and increase and increase and then finally diminish, diminish, diminish, and he will finally be able to conceive that it might be a crime to take an A-bomb and wipe out all of man. For the first time he would have met up with enough responsibility on the thing to have matched the entirety of the situation. Up to that time, it is posed as such a fantastically wide problem to him (to mock up all of mankind), that his irresponsibility has turned on.

In other words, at one time he felt responsible for having done this. He has been kicked out of the game, made unimportant, he's been made not to contribute, he has

been made not to have, to such a degree that he can no longer conceive the creation of that amount of thing. You try to get him to conceive it, and he gets the second postulate at once of having been prohibited from doing so. And his irresponsibility turns on, on every side.

So these factors all dovetail very smoothly.

Now, exactly what processes you could run that would turn on any of these things, I'll go into next time.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]