CAN'T HAVE, CREATE - FUNDAMENTALS OF ALL PROBLEMS

A lecture given on
18 July 1961

Well, you're very lucky to be here listening to this lecture today. gnats all I got to say. What's the date?

Audience: 18th.

Thank you very much. Eighteenth, AD 11, July, probably. Saint Hill Briefing Course.

Understand something happened to you people today.

Audience: Yes.

Oh, I'm sorry. I'm very sorry. It's a very, very difficult, trying world, isn't it.

Now, we're going to turn back the clock to 1952. Philadelphia Lecture Series and Scientology 8-8008 are the basic texts on havingness. That's basic and fundamental on havingness.

Havingness is a very dominant situation. It's a very dominant thing. I have worked from time to time down through the ages here and put together Be, Do and Have as the primary activities. Now, you are probably more acquainted with Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought and the discussions of games conditions.

Games conditions. A very, very important point. And all of a sudden it emerges as far, far more important than it ever has been, because now we're back to games conditions and its relationship to havingness. And in this book Scientology 8-8008, along with other things . . theta-MEST theory, differentiation, association, and so forth . . we get in here some general discussions of havingness. And this is the first written text on the subject of havingness.

And it says the goal of processing is to remedy scarcity and abundance in all things. Well, that's what's important about this. Remedy scarcity and abundance of all things.

And on the 17th of July . . this book, remember, was written in the winter of 52-53 . . and on the 17th of July in 1961, why, I suddenly undid. . . I've been thinking about this, by the way, for just weeks . . I've been working with this for weeks, but I suddenly found out a simple modus operandi by which you put this into effect.

I call to your attention that all we had previously was Creative Processing. That was the key of how you remedied scarcity and abundance in all things, and a lot of people couldn't run it. And they got into bad trouble trying to create things, and so forth. Now, the next datum, just a few weeks ago, that fell out of the hamper, was just this. And this is a very important datum because you will be using it in processing undoubtedly from here on out.

The status of affairs right now is that I could set somebody down, put them on an E-Meter, and probably in five or six hours, at the outside, have them Clear as beer. Now, that's about the step we have just got through taking And that step derives immediately from having resolved how you remedy the scarcity and abundance in all things. And that's what I'm going to talk to you about today.

Now, let's look at this very, very important datum concerning havingness. I have finally gotten the interrelationship between havingness and creativeness. And when you've got the interrelationship between having and create, you pretty well got it sewed up because these things look a little bit separate. They look different, one to the other. Creating things . . well, obviously, after you've created something, you may have it and you may not have it. That's the way we've looked at it. It may be taken away from you. It may as-is. A lot of things might happen. So that just the fact of creating something doesn't mean that we have something.

I'd like to make a discursion right at this point. I see we have some nice new students, some very fresh-looking students. The wife of one of our students was on the phone last night saying if her husband didn't come home instantly and at once that she was going to take a gun to him and meet him with divorce papers at the airport. I don't know whether anybody's communicated this to this student or not at the present moment. Well, I see they have. All right. That's fine.

But almost precisely at the moment she was calling, I was writing this same student a note telling him he had to be here another week. Now, my postulate goes on something like that.

Now, aside from welcoming you new students, you'll notice some notices on the board. I invite you to read the board. And they tell you that you have to learn the whole course in the first week. That's right. Because we've got to have time to digest it after we learn it. So, I want you to pay good attention to those things and get those wheeling and dealing in a hurry because nobody has arrived at this course yet knowing how to do any of those things, which is quite interesting.

There are only seven things you have to know about auditing, and these seven can be just brrrrrrerp off just like that. There's nothing to it. And we haven't had anybody arrive here yet that knew how to do one of them, much less seven. And how Scientology has been done through the world, I'm sure I don't know.

They're little things like the TRs and reading an E-Meter, and things like that. And we actually have never had anybody coming here yet that knew how to do one of them well. And the students who have been here for a while, I congratulate you because you now know how to do these things pretty good.

Now, that's just getting it out of the road, and anything I have to say about theory or what you audit depends first and foremost on the ability to audit. And the ability to audit is . . consists of these seven things, not a theory. You see that? These stand totally independent of any theory. Now, these things are nailed in brass, and if you know how to do them, you can audit. And if you don't know how to do them, I could give you the pearls of Ophir and you'd feed them to psychiatrists. You understand?

All right. It's all very well to know the new theory and the new thing, to get all excited about that . . because I was pretty excited about this myself . . but those of you who are new or haven't been here very long just pay attention to that board in there, because none of this is going to work for you, not for five minutes, on anybody or on yourself unless you know these seven principles of auditing which have to do with E-Meters and TRs and that sort of thing Okay?

All right. So, I give you that dire warning in the middle of this, not only to you but the fact that if you take this material, which I'm about to give you, and "psychiatrize" it and "squirrelicate" it, you're going to have somebody in the soup, man, because you have got both red hot pokers straight into where the thetan lives. And if you can't audit, you're not going to be able to handle this, boy. That's all. We already had one student today screaming. It's easy. it's easy. But to bring him all the way through it and make him feel better afterwards, that depends on your knowing the seven things. Okay?

So, a major breakthrough doesn't immediately change the seven fundamentals of how to do it. Okay? These fundamentals, these tools, Pre-havingness Scale, and the rest of these things, are all part and parcel to what we're doing here.

Now, havingness went into a revival . . I'll get off of this cross professorial note here . . and this revival of havingness came about at the Johannesburg Congress, practically the night before the Congress. I got some kind of a chart to draw, to show people so they'd understand some of these facts, and that was the birth of the Prehav Scale. But you'll notice it got called the Prehav Scale. And that's all of auditing. Pre-havingness. I don't care whether it's done by that particular scale or not. It is pre-havingness. Pre-havingness.

Now, the relationship between creativeness and havingness . . I have just licked that. Now, that relationship is this, and this has to do with the fundamental formation of the reactive bank. And this is very important.

When a person can't have, he creates. That's the law on which man operates. Now, you'd just never dream it under the sun that that went together that way, but that's the way the crossword puzzle fits. That is the way this big French roll of bread crumbles.

When you can't have it, you create it. And that is the formation of the reactive bank. And that is the most fundamental law of the reactive bank now discovered. We have now gone down in diving suits well below the surface of the bottom of the ocean. That's the bank. That's the story of the bank: If you couldn't have it, you created it.

This tells us all sorts of things. All this last winter and summer, I have been collecting little odd data that looked like something strange and didn't look like it was quite part of the puzzle.

It began with an observation that Italy routinely goes into a renaissance every time it is licked. Obviously, the best thing possible for Italian civilization is to get whipped. That's quite an odd, random factor, isn't it? If they get licked, they have a renaissance. You'd think it would be quite the reverse. You'd think they'd go into a decline. But they don't. They have a renaissance . . arts, government, everything goes on a resurge. All you have to do is lick the Italian, and, boy, does he produce.

It goes into such things as the roses which you see out here on the terrace. I have long known, as most gardeners have known, that all you had to do was cut a rose routinely and it bloomed. Only they put it down to this. That the roses have to be appreciated. And if you don't cut them, they aren't appreciated, so they don't produce roses. Now, that's the modus operandi that most gardeners think occurs or halfway think occurs with regard to roses. And that isn't true at all. The abuse of a rose causes it to produce roses.

All right. Now, let's look a little bit further here. All these observations, one after the other, plus a long story which I myself went through . . . It does you a lot of good for me to get out into the real universe every once in a while and get out that rope ladder and get off the Ivory Tower, you know, and go out and rub elbows with the sweating humanity, you know.

And I have been fooling around with ships for a long time, and this was another correlative factor. I found out I couldn't get a ship from South Africa, so right away I started to buy ships. And I've been trying to buy ships ever since. And then I found out I was now creating ships, and I was beginning to build ships, and this wasn't totally a waste of time because I've done a rather fantastic thing . . design a ship hull . . Earth apparently hasn't had one because they have very calm seas here on Earth compared to most planets. And resulted in designing a motor. And apparently they don't have a motor on this planet. I heard people say this an awful lot of times. But all this directly derives from the fact that I couldn't have a ship. So I had a bit of subjective on the thing.

That wasn't where we got the main part of it, but that all kinds of little observations of this character have gone on and on and try . . these are funny bits of the crossword puzzle. What are all these things?

And all these things add up to this fact: that if a rose bush can't have a rose, it creates roses. It also adds up to this interesting fact. That if a shipyard is building ships, it is because they can't have ships, and that's why they build ships that only last for seventeen or twenty years. That's why the great Empress of Canada, which was just launched up here, has an aluminum . . boy, is that British . . superstructure. Its whole superstructure is aluminum.

Isn't that interesting, because in something on the order of about thirty-five years it's going to be a mound of gray powder. I know now aluminum doesn't work in shipbuilding because I have been in receipt of tremendous catalogues which are very beautifully put together and pamphlets beyond count, released by Kaiser and the Aluminum Company of Canada, and all of them are so insistent that aluminum can be used, and they are so hysterical on the whole subject that I began to look up the data. And looking up their own data, you find out that, at the most, a few decades and the aluminum is a pile of gray powder.

Also, you can't weld it. you have to solder it, and if you use zinc, why, that won't hold under the sea water conditions. And there's all these reasons. But you must use aluminum to build ships.

I think they just put out about two million pounds in money to build the whole superstructure of the Empress of Canada out of aluminum, and it'd seem to me like that many tens of millions of pounds invested in a ship should last longer than about thirty years. It'd just seem to me because you start adding it and dividing it and subtracting it, and you find out that it just . . the ship just sitting there is going to cost a half a million quid a year before you do anything to it at all because it's all going to disappear in about thirty-five years. And you ask yourself odd questions like this, and you come up with this odd observation. If somebody is creating ships, it's because he can't have ships.

Ah, but let's take one further look at this. He's going to make sure that you don't have a ship. If he's reactively building ships, it must be because he can't have ships. So, he's for sure going to Q-and-A with you, and you're going to wind up with no ship. Oh-ho. So, of course the ships on this planet, with all the materials available out of which you could make ships that would last . . well, teak and cypress last practically forever.

There is an old ship I was trying to get my hands on down in Las Palmas; she was built in 1885. She is much sounder than the dollar. She is in beautiful condition. 1885! And she's built out of teak, and the teak lasts forever. But has man enthusiastically been building teak forests all over the place so he could have lots of teak to build ships with? Oh, no, nothing like that. Do you see cypress growing everyplace in the swamps so that you could have wood to build ships? Oh, no, you see Oregon pine.

Well, you say, well, it grows fast and there are lots of reasons for it, but even Lloyd's tells you that Oregon pine lasts. And I've never seen an Oregon pine hull after it's been in the water twenty years but what you can't see daylight through the dry rot. Now, a lot of surveyors will argue with me, and so forth. But they argue, and I can still find examples whereby the ships which they build have no endurance, and they go to pieces, and it costs a lot of money. Well, now there's an interesting field. one that I happen to know something about. And out of this we get this interesting series of observations, and suddenly a total explanation of what this is all about.

If they . . they really don't want to build ships and they certainly don't want you to have ships. Shipyard worker goes in and he works for something on the order of five pounds a day, but when you get the bill his wages were fifteen pounds a day. Why, that's fascinating. That's just a method of not getting ships for anybody. It's very interesting.

I think the reason the US government punishes all the producers of the United States is simply to get them to produce on some reactive basis. But the government is a no-production body, so it's going to make sure that nobody else produces, but the immediate result of not permitting anybody to have anything is to make everybody create something. So the stupider the government gets with regard to handling production, the more is going to get created. And the more passive a government is and the less interested a government is on the subject, the less is going to be created in the country. Isn't that an interesting fact?

There's all sorts of cross observations under all of this that make life much more comprehensible. That isn't what's important to us. I'm just giving you background music . . the various things I've looked at that were close to me, and so on.

I've been rubbing elbows on the subject of ships and I've monkeyed with a lot of other things in the last few months. And looking at life in general it has seemed very interesting to me that there's evidently some cross relationship that goes further than the overt-withhold mechanism. There is something more than the overt-withhold mechanism.

Well, actually, it was described, in theory . . it's a marvelous thing to eventually understand your own work. But I find myself in that interesting position every once in a while, and I'm of two minds with regard to my own past work. And one mind says, "Boy, that was sure stupid," and the other mind is "Boy, that was sure smart," you see. I mean it's two minds definitely.

But this havingness situation compounded with the games conditions of Scientology: Fundamental of Thought actually give us the answer to any case. Games condition. What do we mean by a games condition? Says in Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought, it's preventing people from having things. But how far can we go on this basis, and what is this all about, and what do we mean by things?

Well, anything you can name is a thing. You name it . . it's havingness. You can name it . . if you can name it, it's havingness. And if you can guess at it, it's havingness. And a thetan is only unhappy when he can't have. And his idea of quality . . . Well, amongst us, I think personally it could be reformed.

But if you deny him any given thing, his instant and immediate reaction is to try to obtain it . . so that prohibition in America makes drunkards out of the whole country.

Now, I know how to make a successful civilization now that would just go like a hot bomb just using this principle. I would find everything I wanted the civilization to have in it, and then hire nothing but police and agents in all directions with bureaus and departments to prevent each one of these things from existing. And then I'd make sure that I had real knuckleheads in charge of these bureaus so that they would not be in the least effective or efficient. Well, just name the number of things you want in the society or the civilization and then form bureaus to prevent each one of them, and you'll immediately get a demand. That's the way you create demand. You don't create demand by supply, and that's what's wrong with economics. You create demand by prohibition.

Now, how do you create creation? By just running a broad can't-have. That's all. That's all you have to do. And everybody will create it. Now, if you were to run a million-pound advertising campaign in England stating categorically, giving fines . . particularly in England; England works on this like a gorgeous thing. I mean it's marvelous. You get instant reaction on a games condition. And if you made it absolutely against the law, completely and utterly to have a cat, cawow! You know you wouldn't be able to see the pavement anyplace? Well, think about it for a minute, you see.

Everybody'd kind of get even with you. They'd immediately start breeding cats, man. Well, I can see it now. The Secret Cloak and Dagger Society for the Breeding of Angora Cats, or whatever. Having clandestine meetings, you know, and everybody wrapped in cloaks and meeting behind back doors, and so forth. A whole secret fishing industry springs up so they can smuggle fish in. The government passing regulations "No fish for cat consumption will be imported into England." I can see it now, man. That's the way it'd go, too. that's the way it'd go.

Now, oddly enough, the games conditions situation can get so bad that if you insist on people having something, they also don't want it. So if you insisted on England having nothing but slums, you would immediately improve the standard of lying. But unfortunately, by insisting that they have nothing but council houses with very, very nice appointed apartments for one and all, you're going to get slums. They're going to uphold the standard of living. If you're going to uphold this standard of lying with great violence, you see, people are going to listen to everything else. I think the total birth of rock and roll in England is the attitude of BBC toward culture. I think so.

After all, old BBC sits up there, and they just figure day and night how they're going to make everybody cultured. And the net result is, the only thing they . . they haven't got Bach and Brahms being played on the streets. Man, all they've got is rock and roll and the Whiffy Tiffy Five, you know.

Unless you knew these rules, man's activities would look totally incomprehensible, and as . . once you know these rules, his activities look very comprehensible .

All right. Let's say that we want three-sixteenths-inch size bolts produced in enormous quantity in Manchester. Well, the first thing we do is put 1 heavy tax on such bolts. And we prohibit their being sold in any of the stores. Everybody's going to produce three-sixteenths-inch bolts. That's for sure. They're going to make them, left and right. I can see it now. They take quarter-inch bolts and swell them up and half-inch bolts and shrink them down, see. Everything's got to be three-sixteenths, man. It's right there. Bang! Nothing else will do. So this all looks totally irrational.

You'll go into a community, you'll arrive here on Earth, it's a new area to you, and you start looking around, and you see this happening and that happening, and the other happening, and it doesn't make any sense to you at all. Well, you don't know what the law has been. So therefore, you can't read the opposites because your games condition is going to bring into existence the reverse. If you run a can't-have on people, they're going to create it. It's very interesting.

You take a district, and you utterly prohibit, one hundred percent crime, and everybody goes just a little bit bugs or crime starts to occur around and about the place, or something like that. It is totally police action that creates crime. Everybody knows this sort of instinctively, but they never quite look it over. I've operated down in parts of Los Angeles, South Alvarado and Main and that sort of thing. It's as much as your life's worth to go down there on a weekend. Hang around those bars and gin mills and marijuana joints. They just stack up the bodies like cord wood.

It's nothing. You pick up some guy on the corner, and he's cut from ear to ear and bleeding gore all over the pavement. Nobody's paying a bit of attention to him. That is too usual.

Well, it was very odd in operating in that particular area to look what man was actually doing or what he would accept or what he was trying to do. And it was very peculiar that the police were trying in some measure throughout that area to squash all of this kind of activity. And they were particularly hot in those particular activities. There is more police per square inch on Main and South Alvarado, and so forth, in Los Angeles than any other place on earth. It's totally populated by police. And it is the seamiest, lousiest, scummiest skid row in the world. Well, isn't this fascinating?

Look. Well, you see, reasonability throws you astray. You say the place is rough, therefore they have to have police there. No. You have police there to forbid roughness, so you get roughness. Now, I have actually seen police create roughness. It goes this far.

Here's a guy minding his own business. A cop walks up to him, turns him around and tells him to get out. Well, what is the fellow doing? He's doing nothing. Well, that was why he was told to get out. It's all too calm here for the cops, man. And the next thing you know . . I have actually seen a man beaten till every tooth was knocked out of his head and stamped on and everything else. And there wasn't going to be a single thing going on. I mean, the fellow didn't do anything or otherwise. The cops just had to have some trouble.

It was very interesting. One of the cops, after that foray was all done, was all beat up. He was just black and blue, and he was in terrible condition and all this. And this other fellow got away, by the way. And I was standing there explaining to this police officer how I had helped him all I could. I did too. And he was trying to create trouble; I helped him create trouble . . for himself I was helping him beat the guy up, you see. I was operating as a special police officer myself, you know. Just somehow or other, every time he'd raise his hand to strike, you see, his wrist would hit my arm or something like this. He kept getting in my road. That's what I kept telling him. It was a very confusing brawl.

He explained to me afterwards over a glass of whiskey, and so forth, he'd never been in quite as confusing a brawl. He'd never . . .

But that it was possible to keep law and order in these places was very, very easy to observe. Because in those areas where I was, they didn't have any trouble. Now, that wasn't some special monkey business I was pulling off. In fact, I wasn't looking for any trouble either way. I wasn't either trying to make people be good or be bad or try to start fights or otherwise.

Actually there was law and order in that immediate area because nobody was running a can't-have on anybody. There were no can't-haves being run.

I'd talk to all the guys that came in, and so on.

People kept trying to hire me, by the way, because it was bad for business to have these brawls, and so forth, occur. And I've been offered some very fancy sums to keep on with this job. It was very, very amusing and entertaining to me. They took me as the real McCoy, you know. I must have been the real thing. I thought, that . . boy, that's the biggest fraudulence I ever pulled in my life.

Anyway, there where you didn't run a super can't-have and a super no-have enforcement of some kind or another, nothing would happen. I'm talking about a rough area of the world.

I've had ships, I've had places of this character, and as long as you yourselves weren't in a games condition with the people present and you had some control in the area, nothing happened. Things just went on and everybody was happy and cheerful, and so on.

And so we get this oddity. We get a Captain Bligh, who was an awfully good officer, but he did have a mutiny. Bligh did have a mutiny. Good officer. I wonder why he had a mutiny?

Well, he had a fellow by the name of Mr. Christian. And Mr. Christian was running a can't-have on the captain. The captain ran can't-have on the crew. And I'll tell you, running a can't-have on a bunch of sailors where a bunch of beautiful Polynesian women are concerned is a mighty hard thing . . an adventurous thing to do, if I may say so. I myself never tried it personally. I never tried it personally.

Myself not wearing any halos in this particular department, I've followed quite an opposite course. I remember running the Golden Gate Bridge one time with radar only, with a Golden Gate pilot . . San Francisco Bay pilot . . standing there getting grayer by the instant, with nothing but cotton-packed fog. You couldn't even see the bow. Running down a fairway full of ships at frank speed. He'd never heard of radar before, and it was brand-new in the war, you see.

And of course, I could see Alcatraz at the other end of the entrance, and [could see every ship in the fairway. And down the line we went, crash, bang; turned on our tails, snap, boom, underneath the Oakland Bridge, bang onto our mooring spot. Down went the anchor, shook the pilot by the hand. He didn't have to apply any motion to his hand, it was already shaking. And boats away! And if he had examined the situation very carefully, he would have seen this was perfectly reasonable, sensible activity.

I myself had innumerous dates on the Top of the Mark which I would be Late for. And all of my petty officers undoubtedly had numerous dates along the waterfront that they would be late for, and all of the crew undoubtedly had numerous dates elsewhere. Well, it's very fantastic, but nobody was running a can't-have on these characters. You get the idea? Quite the reverse, but not any enforcement on it either.

The reasonable, sensible thing to do from this crew's point of view, of course, was to get ashore as fast as possible after a long cruise and get their liberty boats away by four-thirty on the button. that was the reasonable thing to do because, man, that beach was just crammed with dames, man. Crammed. See, that's a reasonable thing to do. Bligh didn't do that.

He says, "You see all those beautiful women?" He said, "Nope. Hgh! No." Games condition. Now, we read in the annals how he didn't create the mutiny. Isn't that an interesting thing to read? He didn't create the mutiny. Well, he . . you see, there is nothing against running a can't-have. It's supposed to be a good thing on this planet. So when you sailed in here from wherever you came from and took a look at this scrambled hamburger, you were probably amazed because the one thing that is bound and determined to produce a complete upset throughout the whole civilization is allowed on this planet, condoned a hundred percent.

You are only a sterling, upright, pat-him-on-the-back citizen if you run a good, solid can't-have in all directions on everybody. Now you're a good man. Let's put him in charge of the National Provincial Bank or something. See, let's put him in charge . . he's a good, safe man, you see. That's a good, safe admiral. Um-hmm. Um-hmm. Runs can't-have on all the sailors, all the officers, the Navy Department, everybody. Okay. Good. Let's appoint him, see.

Well, this must be an excellent army because the sergeants and captains and generals in it won't let anybody have anything Must be a fine army. Look it over. Must be. That's the test. Are they strict? What do you mean by strict? You see?

You have governments that don't govern. Well now, how can you possibly add this up in any other fashion than the government is running a can't-have on the people with government. But they don't take these odd, decisive steps. They don't take odd, peculiar, sensible decisions. They don't act when they're supposed to act, you see, so they're good fellows. Got the idea?

The best thing you can do is, of course, create as many problems as possible. And the way you create problems is . . and we're right back to the common fundamental . . is run a can't-have. And as soon as you run enough can't-haves, you're going to create problems.

We had one here in the last two weeks. We had somebody in Accounts turn me in an accounts record on which some four or five thousand pounds were not shown. Well, that's interesting. When you're very interested in getting the show on the road and keeping everything together, and so forth, you all of a sudden read your bank statements, and there are four or five thousand pounds less. But I had told this person not to reconcile these bank statements anymore, but it looked like the bank statements had all been reconciled. This accountant was running a can't-have. The immediate result of this has been canons in all directions. A can't-have suddenly appeared in the organization, and there's all sorts of discussion and offbeat activities, and everything you could possibly think of just as a result of this.

Rumor lines going around left and right, and so forth. This is all tempests in teapots or in tea saucers. But it all came from one little can't-have. Got the idea? And this thing went zoom zoom zoom zoom!

So "can't-have," in addition to being the fundamental of the reactive bank, is also the fundamental of all problems. If you want to create a problem, run a can't-have. That's the best way to create a problem. Your problems normally look as though they're don't-haves. You can look at your problems as mainly don't-haves. You have a problem of what to do with the weekend because you don't have a . . you see, a car or something or other. You get the idea?

So they look like don't-haves. Well, how did you get into a don't-have' That's the fascinating question. How did you get into a don't-have? How come you haven't got this thing that you need? That's the question to ask. And all of a sudden you can materialize it. Here's exactly what you do. you say, "Well, got a weekend coming up, and I don't have a car, so there I have problems of what to do with the weekend." That's a very mild version of a problem, see.

Look out in front of your face. What have you done at that moment? You're liable to spend the rest of the weekend trying to build a car or something. In some various via, you will have something to do with the scarcity of cars because you ran into the fact that you don't have one. you may have one where you normally live, but right at this particular area you just don't have one.

Well, how did you get into a position where you can't say presto digitanjo pretslosis or something and have this car materialize. How are you in a position in life where you can have a don't-have run on you? Because that's sort of the last ditch of "can't-have," isn't it? The don't-haves. That's way downstairs. Well, how did you get in that position? Well, it's the overt-motivator sequence.

You see, you run enough can't-haves until you create a situation of don't-have. And then all of a sudden you can look around and not-have yourself See, you've opened the gates on the motivator. By running a can't-have, you've opened the gates of the motivator, and you will eventually wind up, not with just can't-have, but you'll run up with a don't-have. It's very, very simple. It's one of the idiotic, Simple Simon mechanisms, but that's the O/W sequence as applied to the games condition. And that's where we arrive at now with the practicalities of auditing. I'll stop reminiscing to you about this and that and get down to some "practicalitis."

And it just adds up to simply this: that if your pc doesn't have anything, it must be because he has denied it. As elementary as this. He must have denied it. If he has a low quality of something as his favored quality, it must be that he is operating on this kind of an activity mentally. He can't have a good one, but nobody wants a bad one, so he's got a bad one.

Now, you've seen that guy around. You'll find them in the electronics world. They've got the whole backyard full of impossibly decayed machinery, electronics, junk, and so forth. There's always a spool of wire, you know. The wire itself is broken in fifty places and nothing you can do with it or about it, and yet that's it. And nobody wants this wire. And you run into this and you puzzle yourselves with this problem. You say, "Well, why does he have the wire if nobody wants the wire?" And of course, you've answered your own question. He has it because nobody wants it. And if nobody wants it, then he can have it. And that is his first test of havingness with regard to wire. He can only have it if nobody wants it.

Have you ever realized that there might . . I know it sounds incredible to you . . but there might be, there just might be an explanation for the old ladies' hats you see in London. They're too incredible to be believed. Well, that's the only hat they can have. And they can only have it because nobody wants it, obviously. You get it? You get that kind of an answer.

Now, the total absence of something does not mean the thetan is without it. This is the other interesting fact. The total absence of something doesn't mean the thetan is without it. You're going to find it in his reactive bank being obsessively created. Haw-haw-haw. And the further it is out of sight and the further it is out of his sight or anybody else's sight, of course, the more covertly he thinks he has to create it. So the covert creativeness which goes on, called a reactive bank, is a remedy of havingness. And that's all a reactive bank is.

Now, you run a can't-have on somebody on sex. And then one fine day you find people are running a can't-have on you on the subject of sex. And you're very puzzled because these two facts don't necessarily or easily associate. Well, now if you go on that far, you will find out that second dynamic activities are impossible, see. you can't have these second dynamic activities. So therefore, they're liable to take some kind of a flip. They'll go off in some different direction, and you start building up various types of second dynamic activities that you could have. you got the idea? And when these too fail, of course, you wind up with these even hidden from yourself but still being created in the bank. you get how this is? So they don't only pass out of somebody else's sight, they pass out of your sight too.

So we get the degrade of quality. We get the downgrading quality, you 3ee. A fellow can't have a Cadillac. So, he thinks he might have a Buick. But he actually can't have a Buick, so he settles for a Ford. But he can't quite have the Ford, so he settles for a 1928 Austin, Baby Austin. Now, he's all set to buy this, and then he finds out that he can't have that because it can't be licensed anymore or something of the sort, don't you see?

So, we're auditing him . . we find a car wreck. Hey! What's this? You know? This guy is stuck in a car wreck. No, he's not stuck in a car wreck. He's stuck in having a wrecked car. you get the reinterpretation of the thing? That's something nobody wants. See? Life sort of ran a can't-have on him in cars, so his cars downgraded, downgraded, downgraded, and then disappeared. There wasn't anything lower, I don't think, than a 1928 Austin. Unless it's a vintage Stutz Bearcat 1912. Vintage model. Mint condition. I'm familiar with the car. It was never in mint condition.

All right. So you get the degrade, you see. And the degrade is only what a person can have.

Now, what emotion or feeling can a pc have? Now, let's just depart from the nature of things of just solid havingnesses, and let's move over into what feeling can the pc have? And do you know the common-denominator complaint of most people who are around the bend is that they can't feel anything anymore or they can't emote, and they have no more sensation. That is a common denominator way downstairs, and then you get a little bit upstairs and you find everybody has something that they wish they could feel more about. They can't feel about certain things anymore, and they . . this upsets them.

That is what? That is nothing more nor less than a can't-have on a feeling. So the feelings degrade. The beautiful, exhilarated, superserenity of Tone ~0, you see. Well, that's impossible, you know. you have to gaze at your navel for forty years on the tops of Everest, and every time you climb Everest, you know, you get wiped out and all kinds of things. That's impossible to obtain. 30 we will settle for a little enthusiasm, but of course, that's really an overt-act to be enthusiastic to people, so it's best to be conservative. Except bank managers set us such a terrible example in that that nobody wants us to be conservative, so the best thing to be is sort of bored, the best thing to do is angry but you can't . . nobody'll let you be bored. You won't let anybody else be bored either. And so the best thing to do, well, let's start crying. But you don't want people to cry and people don't want you to cry, so you can't have that one either. So you at least could be good and degradedly apathetic. Oh, but nobody wants you to be apathetic, and you don't want anybody else to be apathetic, so you wind up with no feelings. But you can mock 'em up way at the back of the bank.

Now, at the first Saint Hill ACC, I talked about two routes. Experience, and another route that we were using at that particular time, you see. These two things we've now combined, because the experiential factor is havingness. All of a sudden it all can be lumped under one heading Experience is havingness. If you regard all experience as havingness, then all experience can be restored.

In other words, take these doingness and beingness factors and add them all under havingness. In other words, make beingness and doingness junior to havingness.

All right, we get a beingness. Now, we can't obviously be some of these scarce and rare beingnesses which are way up to the top of the list of social stratas, and so forth. So we settle for lesser beingnesses and lesser beingnesses and lesser beingnesses. And we get into this sort of state where we're not being anything right where we are particularly, or we maybe are being a bit of something which is not too acceptable to us, and we mock up some kind of a beingness . . reactive mock-up of a beingness. And of course, the first grade of beingness that we're liable to mock up is something terrifically desirable and then pretend to be it. But we're not it. you got the idea?

Now, little kids do this all the time. I want to call to your attention that children are not allowed to fly airplanes in this society. This is an omission. Undoubtedly, it is done to deny people airplane crashes. But the truth of the matter is that a little kid is not permitted to fly airplanes. He is not permitted to be an aircraft pilot . . nor train as one. They say, "Go to kindergarten and learn your ABCs," and he's only interested in learning how to read bank-and-turn indicators, and engine temperature gauges, and so forth. This is all he's interested in. But they say, "Go to kindergarten and play with those blocks." And we find this little kid buzzing around, buzzing around, buzzing around, buzzing around, buzzing around. He's creating being an aviator all the time. why is he creating being an aviator? Well, nobody's let him be an aviator. See, there's the explanation. You got the idea?

This is reactivity we're talking about. By running the can't-have, we get the creation. This is reactive. What confuses everybody is all of this can take place on an analytical level, a totally analytical level. And we say to somebody, analytically, "Well, you really shouldn't drink so much alcohol because it makes you drunk, and you've got a class in the morning or something." And they say, "Yes, that's right." And they don't drink. See, that throws all of our computations out that the way you get people to do something . . .

But oddly enough, if we did this to them very often and if we did this to them in some unacceptable way so it's a can't-have, so the communication is a can't-have, they can't have the communication. And they can't have the liquor. They'll all of a sudden start feeling a little dizzy all the time. What they're doing is rekindling their past drunkennesses. You've run a can't-have on drink, and they've started rekindling their drunkennesses, and they start going "Thuuh-thuth, now, see what you've done to me," you see. And they use it for some new purpose. But the truth of the matter is that by running a can't-have, not by as a friend of theirs helping them out or something like this . . you see, that level can exist . . but we run a can't-have, a good games condition . . our motives are as impure as a politician's, see. They're really impure.

Now, we say, "Well, you really shouldn't drink anything this evening, you know." We've sort of privately, reactively got our eye on the bottle, and we see there's only three drinks left. All of these mechanisms take place below the level of ARC, of course. So that absence of ARC is almost a direct requisite for a reactive creation by reason of can't-have. It must be a can't-have run without ARC or some portion of ARC or mis-ARC. You got the idea? The can't-have really has to be run, man. It really has to be run.

Now, people all over the place are working day and night on this. saw Sergeant Bilco on television last night and I never saw quite so much can't-have on the army in my life. But that was a gorgeous program whereby these recruits come in under a military school graduate who is some military prep school graduate, and they've all been drilled up already. And they want Bilco to take them out on the rifle range and teach them how to shoot. And Bilco's trying to beg off. And all he's doing is run a can't-have on them on training, you see. And he thinks of fifty dozen different ways to insist that they not be trained. Real gorgeous.

But do you know the condition of peace which avails every place is simply a can't-have on army activities. They just run a can't-have on all these soldiers. Soldiers like to come back and tell you how beat up they are after a war. As a matter of fact, they don't, you know. It's only lying around shore bases and things like this and waiting forever and not doing anything that really upsets them. They're denied the experience of war.

Generals, of course, are the people who will run can't-haves hardest. You get more peace and more war along with the peace and more explosive peaces which develop instantly into war under generals than any other single class of person. Man, you can have yourself some nasty international situations if you get somebody who is totally insistent on peace. Why? He's reactively running a can't-have on war.

See, it isn't that war is good or bad. He's just running a can't-have on war. That's what he's totally devoted and dedicated to. And he runs one hard enough, he'll get one. Somebody'll create one. why will they create one? Let's look back at the first rule. He's run a can't-have on the subject. Well, man, don't run a can't-have on the Germans on the subject of war because they react on it too easily. They mock it up at once. The best way to handle the Germans is, you can see immediately, is to get into good ARC with them and explain to them how they must get ready to fight. We don't care what, but just ready them up to fight in all directions. Explain that there's alien races on Arcturus or something, you know.

No, keeping the peace does not consist of running a can't-have about war and getting out with a bunch of propaganda about, "I hate war, and Eleanor hates war. And James hates war. We all hate war. And that is why we are going instantly and immediately into one that we should have entered five years ago." See? That was a real mess. But it's all on, "you mustn't have war, you mustn't have war."

Now, if you don't think that wasn't reactive, it went this far. There were no bulletins about the war. There was a can't-have on war run by the US Information Services on the American public. And it was the wildest can't-have on the war I ever heard of. you could read newspaper accounts about what was going on in the part of the world which you were in, and they bore no slightest relationship to reality. Now, I don't know that it was doing the enemy any harm or any good. But I know now that it had nothing to do with the enemy. It was just a big can't-have on war. Everybody was involved in fighting a war, but simultaneously everybody was running a can't-have on the subject of war.

Man, the trouble you got into in World War II for going and attacking the enemy. That was something that just wasn't done. you think I'm kidding, but it's true. That's the most trouble you could get into. you couldn't get in any trouble sitting still. You couldn't get in the slightest trouble saying, "Well, the engines are broken down, and I haven't got a full crew. And nobody's serviced with provisions and the refrigerators won't cool the meat."

Everybody'd say, "Oh, well, good boy, good boy," you know, and pass on down the line. They'd just leave you alone. But if you ever said, "Say, you know, there's a whole bunch of Japs or something just landed on that island over there, and I'd like permission to go over and run a harassing patrol." Man, they're liable to put you in the booby hatch or something, you know. You were non persona grata at that moment. You had broken the prevailing mores which is "there mustn't be a war." But somebody should have called it to their attention: there was one in progress.

After a whole United States fleet had sacrificed itself holding the Japs back and buying three or four month's worth of time, they then said some old, obsolete ships have disappeared in the Pacific. It's the most fantastic story I've ever read. I read it the day I stepped off of a boat from that exact area, how these old, obsolete ships which didn't mean anything anyway had kind of sunk at their moorings or something Well, you get somebody who can't walk, he'll run no-motion on everybody. Right?

All right. Now, there is the interlocking complications of existence. People are running can't-haves on things that exist. Let's move it up now to that state. Let's run a can't-have on something that exists. Let's say it doesn't exist. We get a total delusory state.

There's a whole religion devoted to this called Christian Science. I'm not mad at Christian Science. We are indebted to Christian Science. But unfortunately for the Christian Scientist, their can't-have runs to the degree that the physical universe isn't here. you try running 8-C sometime on a Christian Scientist.

Cawow! Cawow! Cawow! You're going directly against their most basic can't-have, which is they mustn't have a physical universe. What does it amount to but you mustn't have a physical universe when you tell somebody there is none here; there is no physical universe. Nobody asks the intelligent question: "Then where the hell are we?" No, everybody says, "Oh, I see. I got that. Yeah. Ooohh." Let's look over and see where these things come.

What do you suppose this Christian Scientist is then going to do? What's his bank going to look like after a while. Cawow! What would be the basic mass of a bank of a person in Christian Science? To have a can't-have on the whole physical universe, now, what's their bank going to look like?

Audience: Solid. Solid.

Well, they're going to have a whole solid bank, aren't they? That's real good, huh?

And just for kicks sometime, you ought to get somebody that's been in Christian Science and ask them to swing around Arcturus and other places because it's all in their minds. It's all present. Everything is all present. It's all inside. All being obsessively created internally because it can't exist externally. The insistence on a thetan on the somethingness of existence and on the first Axioms is utterly fantastic.

Now, how are you going to use this?

Do you realize there's a . . let's get into some very practical practicalities here in ending this thing up. You've got a bunch of people, for instance, in England who can't think. Try to run a think process on them. A bunch of people down in South Africa . . they cant think. You say, think at a time.

Kabow wow! "No. Can't, can't think of a time." Oh, this is "faschinating." Have you ever run into anybody and you try to run a think process on them, and you had to change it over to "Get the idea?" Did you ever do that? You had to change it over, actually. You could . . well, we had ways and means for a while of not-ising . . of running the not-is off of thinking. It was back about the 4th London ACC. Ah, but there is something very much worse than this, as a process, that is absolutely deadly. Utterly deadly.

Look, if they can't think, they must have O/W games condition on thought. Ha-ha! There must be something there whereby they have preventing people from thinking. So if they can't have a thought, then they have added it up to a can't-have on a thought. Oh, this is very fascinating. A can't-have on a thought. Therefore, people are going to run can't-have on them on a thought, aren't they? And that is going to be very interesting, and with that one observation we can antiquate every Security Check we have. Aren't these people withholding all of these various things so as to deny other people from thinking things about them?

So there is one two-command process which knocks out a Security Check necessity. Now, we're still going to do Security Checks, we're still going to have them, but recognize what they are. If the individual is withholding a thought, he is doing what? He is running a games condition on you on the subject of "you can't have it." And this is going to render him in a condition where he's going to have less of it. And if you can make him get off his withholds, which is to say give you the thought, you have then stopped him from playing this particular games condition, and he feels much better.

But why does he have all these discreditable things anyway? Well, they don't exist. They haven't existed. For instance, why is this fellow nursing to his bosom having robbed a candy store of a bar of candy at the age of five? Why? Why has he got this thing pulled into his bosom. Why won't he tell you? Completely in addition to the fact that he doesn't want you to have that thought, that thought is scarce. If a person is withholding, the thought is scarce. And if the thought is scarce, we must assume then that there's damn little robbery and theft in candy stores. He's got it cut down, see. It is not in abundance. It's in scarcity. And so the individual is taking these immoral actions, criminal actions, actions of . . against the mores of the society . . well, the reason he withholds them is because they're against the mores of the society and therefore scarce.

They are scarce because they are against the mores of the society. So if he can get hold of one of them, he has a little jewel there in that little plush box tucked away, you see, under the left oblongata. It's a scarcity.

But then he holds on to it for this other mechanism. He doesn't want you to have bad thoughts about him. And of course that's totally recognizable, but it's in the same category as games condition. He's running a can't-have of bad thoughts on you. You're not supposed to have bad thoughts, so therefore you mustn't think these bad thoughts in any direction, much less against him. Got the idea?

So this is a basic process, this "What thought . . " well any . . I don't care how you phrase it . . you don't have to write it down as a command because it's just a theoretical process . . it's "What thought haven't you permitted another to have?" and "What thought hasn't another permitted you to have?"

Well, that immediately starts doing all kinds of weird things with the Security Checks we've got. Because it's the . . one of the basic modus operandi of why the Security Check exists. The person is running can't-have on thoughts. He doesn't want you to have bad thoughts. So if you ran any such auditing command . . well if you said, "When haven't you wanted another person to have a thought?" or "What thought haven't you wanted another person to have?" Accompanied . . to get your flow in properly . . "What thought haven't people wanted you to have?" You've immediately jumped over the top of all Security Checks. Get the idea?

Now, another mechanism about this is, you tell somebody, you say, "Think of a woman. Thank you. Think of a woman. Thank you. Think of a woman. Thank you." And then just keep tags on what kind of women he thinks of. It's quite therapeutic, by the way, but you're making him create women. All right.

"Think of a woman. Thank you. Think of a woman. Thank you. What kind of women?" First, he gets nothing, perhaps. It's probably quite invisible. He probably gets some generality. He probably thinks of the general idea of women. He probably doesn't have any broad concept of it at all except just women, you know. And then he starts thinking of specific, departed women. You know, they're specific, but they're departed. Therefore, he hasn't got any picture of them. And then as you run this process, you eventually come back up to a basis where he can get dead women. So he gets dead women and dead women and dead women. And then he gets sick women. By the way, if this is running perfectly, it runs through all the sequence of the funerals.

You have certain strata of funerals, you see. So you have women's graves, and then you have women being buried, and then you eventually get women dead in state or something of this sort. And then you get women dying, you see. And then you get women sick and about to die. you got the idea? And it goes back up this line.

What exactly is happening here? You're making him examine the scarcity of women, that is all. And it runs backwards, and eventually the process would be flat if at length he was able to think of a present time woman with the greatest of ease and actually get a perfect 3D picture of her. you see that? Well, actually, just "Think of a woman" would do this. You're getting him to exercise the automaticity of the downgrade of women. You see that? Not a recommended process. That's not a recommended process. That's a test process. And a very simple test process and a very valuable one. Australia of autumn 1959 . . spring Australian time.

Now, what is this? What's the next process? What is a valuable process? How would you work these theories around into a process now?

All right. We find this fellow's deficient on the subject of women. One of the things he's probably deficient . . we detect that he's deficient on women . . is because perhaps he has peculiar ideas about sex with men. you don't condemn this. you just . . it's just indicative that he obviously can't think about women. If he's a man and he can't think about women, he can only think about men, well, there's something weird going on here. So therefore, he must have a hell of a scarcity on women. Well, here's the gag and here's the formula by which you put together the games-condition process.

Whatever it is that you find him inverted or nonexistent on, you develop a process by which you can discharge his using that item in a games condition on others, and others using that as a games condition on him. And because you're running out stable data all the way on this, you add a confu3ion, a problem or emotion along with it.

In other words, you take whatever the item is that you find him inverted n or nonexistent on, and you run a games-condition process

Here's an example. Your confusion and stable datum is what accounts or the last command. The guy . . if he doesn't as-is some of the confusions and problems and motions in connection with this, he will be content to just sit there and run the stable data of the games condition out from the middle of it and wind up in a confusion. So you've got to throw something else in there to make him as-is the conf . . the motion. Got the idea? Whatever it is. Or the problems with regard to it. You've got to bring up his confront on the problem of it. Otherwise, you're just taking apart a game for him.

So the last part of the command, or the third part of the command, is to rehabilitate the games condition. And when that is missing, the games condition doesn't necessarily rehabilitate easily and the process takes a lot longer to run, and he's going to feel like you're taking a game away from him. So you run this last one.

He's short of games, too, merely because he can't . . . The way you deny people of games really, is to give them things they can't confront. And, of course, that's a marvelous way to deny everybody havingness.

So the fellow can no longer confront problems, so he can't have new games. You got the idea? Because new games require havingness. So the confront of problems is necessary to the rehabilitation of all new games. Right? All right.

Now, here's a sample of this. Here's women. "When have you denied another a woman?" "When has another denied you a woman?" "What problem about women is not present now?" Now, those three commands would take any of these oddball sexual difficulties and just knock 'em out brrrrrrr.

Now, let's take a woman, and she has a lot of trouble with men . . having lots of trouble with men of one kind or another. Of course, you give them the same command, only it is addressed to men. "When have you denied a man to another?" "When has another denied a man to you?" And "What problem about a man is not present now?" Now, why that form "not present now"? Well, you remember my lecture on not-ises. Well, that's the not-is version of problem confront. And that's a murderous process, man, because it unnot-ises everything involved. Got it?

Well now, that basically is the road out as far as games conditions are concerned. And it started back there with Scientology 8-8008, and went through the vicissitudes of problems and Creative Processes earlier than that, and then problems, and came up more recently into the Prehav Scale, and has moved out into a highly workable, functional activity. All you have to do is establish the nonexistence or the downgraded form of something in the pc, run a games type process on the pc, and the pc's going to snap out of it.

Now, how does the Prehav Scale fit in with this? Well, you could actually assess it on the Prehav Scale and find out the person was very short on something or other. Well, it's . . he's got something; he reacts badly on something so you simply consider he's short on it. And let us say it was leaving It's as indefinite as this, don't you see. This would be your Routine 2 application of this sort of thing. You assess it on the Prehav Scale just as you normally would. And you find that he is short on leaving When I say you find he's short on leaving, it simply means you've assessed and found out that the hot button was leaving so you run a games-condition type of process on this and you would find that the person would recover in maybe a tenth of the time or something like that than he would on a general run. And the gamescondition process would be something made up out of leaving But make sure that it makes sense. Just make sure it makes sense. That's the main thing.

You have to work it over. And then make sure that the commands react on the meter before you start running them, because they might be totally unreal to the pc. In other words, it would be, "When have

you prevented mother's leaving." "When has another prevented your leaving?" and "What problem about leaving isn't present now?" And that would be the way you'd put a games-condition process together on a basis of Routine 2.

Now, you'll get some of these levels, and they don't make sense, so you wouldn't say to somebody, "What fail leave isn't" and "What fail leave is" or something of the sort. And it's all up in the air, and he can't quite wrap his wits around it. Well, you have to work around it until you get an answerable command and one that reacts on the E-Meter.

Now, the basic thing that this has resolved and the basic target at which 1ll this work has been leveled, is the problem run into by Peter Williams and the problem run into by us on endless assessment for goals, since a proper assessment for goals obviously is taking much too much time. Well, now why? Because it is not everybody who takes this amount of time in an assessment for goals. What is this all about? It is simply a games condition on the subject of goals. And you're sitting there asking somebody for goals who is in a flames condition about goals, and goals are very scarce, and they're not going to let you have one, man. So of course, they're never going to give you their coal. And you can easily get a thousand goals out of them . . none of which are their goal.

So, you can use a games condition process on goals which is preparatory to a Goals Assessment which shortens the Goals Assessment right on down, 500m! Which is what? Is "What goal haven't you let another have?" or "What goal don't you want another to have?" or any way you want that thing, and 'What goal doesn't another want you to have?" or " . . hasn't wanted you to have?" or any way you want to phrase it, you see. And "What goal would be a problem?" or some such a command. All of a sudden they come off of games condition with you, the auditor, on the subject of goals, they begin to level. find reactively, they are incapable up to this time of digging up a goal and giving you one.

Now, all of a sudden, they actually stretch their goals out. you can find their goal. you can find their terminal rather easily. That defeated that game.

But anyway, a games condition is an unnatural situation since in a games condition a person becomes convinced that only this game exists. And that game always consists of a singleness in that field and a can't-have. And all games consist of a can't-have. And the person gets into the opinion that there is only that game, so they can only run this can't-have. And the more they continue to run the can't-have, of course, the less they have of it. So the thing disappears from view after a while and they've gotten worse, if anything, not better. So there is the long and short of games.

You understand, of course, that originally when you started to clear people, way back, they wouldn't clear because they thought they were losing their games. And when you did get them, by some hook or crook, Clear, then they were left with only one game and became impatient with the idea of being Clear, and so promptly got themselves aberrated up again so that they could have a game, and they expressed it this way: "Well, I wanted to be like other people or have some fun in life, and I felt like I was totally detached from existence, and I didn't want to be this detached."

Well, what was pinning it all down was games. Scarcity of games. And their scarcity of games was so terrific that they felt if they left this game of being aberrated they would never find any new game. And SOP goals, of course, walked them out of this but was walking them out of it, for some people, much too slowly. We were being successful, but at what slowness in many cases.

All right. So a remedy of havingness of games consists basically of broadening their view on the subject of games. And if you can broaden their view on the subject of games, you can of course clear people rather easily. So therefore, all you would have to do is find out all of the basically aberrated games that the fellow was playing, knock them out one right after the other. And getting his fixation off of these things, he'd be able to look around and find out there was more games, and would practically blow Clear almost at once, because he would now be willing to.

But every person going for Clear has become totally convinced that if he audited just one more auditing command, if he said just one more answer, he would no longer have his game. And he will tell you

occasionally that he really doesn't want to be Clear and yip yap yip yap. And he's just talking about one thing: He said "Well, if you run out this game, there are no other games, and I've had it."

So my attention has been very much on that thing, and I am very happy to tell you that I have gotten that wrapped up.

Thank you very much.