

HAVINGNESS

A lecture given on
28 November 1961

Okay. Well, amongst those present we have people who have from time to time heard me make this lecture. It always comes as a vast amazement that this particular item gets forgotten. Havingness. What's the date?

Audience: 28th.

All right. You're up in present time, thanks for bringing me up there. It's November 28, 1961 and this is a lecture on Havingness.

Now, I can see one or two or three or four or five who have all of a sudden have heard me over the past six or seven years all of a sudden say, "What! You mean you've forgotten Havingness?" It's because I have, of course. And then I bring it to your attention with a thud that Havingness has an enormous importance and that you must run enough Havingness on pcs and then we go into a big spurt on the subject of Havingness and then in very short order everybody forgets Havingness. I forget Havingness. You forget Havingness. They skip Havingness. And there we are.

Unfortunately, in the first Saint Hill, we allied Havingness to Confront. And the two have been together. Havingness and Confront have been together. They don't belong together. Havingness belongs all by itself when you're running something else because the something else is the confront.

Now, that's the first point that you should remember. If you're running a subjective process upon the pc, the objective process is Havingness. In other words, it isn't true that Confront is the only subjective process in the world.

Havingness is the adjunct to any subjective process and Havingness is itself. It is itself and it belongs hand in glove with all subjective processes.

Now, I've just glanced at somebody right now who hasn't had enough Havingness run and it's one of those jump conclusions. You all of a sudden say, "Now, let me see. Let me see. Let's see." And I figure out extraordinary solutions, you see. And we figure out what is it now. "Is it this, it's that," and so on.

And for many years, it has always come back to, "What? Havingness! Nobody's running Havingness. Uhhhh. What do you know?" And then things go along smoothly for another month or two. Until we forget it again.

Actually, we keep havingness in, I suppose, for about six months before it evaporates again. And then it usually stays evaporated for something on the order of about six months to a year before we bring it up again. It's quite

interesting.

I wish to call it to your attention that havingness keeps going out in processing as well as on the pc. In the technology of processing, don't you see, we ourselves get so interested in the subjective difficulties of the pc that we run our own havingness down. That is to say technically as the auditor.

We sit there, you see, and we say, "Now, what is this modifier?"

"Oh, it couldn't possibly be, but here it is. Ho-ho-ho-ho."

And we're just getting in there, you see and we're very interested about the whole thing and everything's going along marvelously and the tone arm's pretty stuck, but that won't bother you much fixing that. Now, let's see now. All right. Now, let's get that G plus M. Ah, that's the thing Let's get it there, you know. Boy, I don't know. Can't read the E-Meter, but otherwise everything's going along fine, see.

Why can't you read the E-Meter? Why is it stuck?

Well, there's two reasons it's stuck. ARC breaks can get so furious that they do not register on the meter. And thereafter, nothing registers on the meter. In other words, the auditor loses his command value over the pc.

All right. We take some—here's the example. Now, this is about havingness, but it's also got to be about ARC breaks because these are the two things that go hand in glove.

All right. We have two people standing there and we have a pc. Now, neither one of these two people is the pc's auditor, see. Neither one. One is the fellow who stole his wife. Ha-ha-ha. Years ago, you see. And stole his wife and busted up his marriage and he's always detested him ever since. That's one of these fellows, you see. And the other one is a good friend of his. Now, we have the third party on the E-Meter. And the fellow who stole his wife says to him, "Are you withholding anything?" And we get no registry.

And the fellow who's his best friend says, "Are you withholding anything?" and we'll get a registry.

The fellow who stole his wife says, "Have you told me any lies?" and we get no registry.

And the fellow who is his friend says, "Have you told me any lies?" Same tone of voice, see. And we get a registry. You see that?

Now, the pc who has a severe ARC break—a very severe ARC break—hasn't got a friend in the world including the MEST universe. Everything has gone out. And Havingness is a wonderful entrance point in for an ARC breaky pc because he's always in a games condition when he goes into this condition. He won't let anybody else have any command value over him of any kind whatsoever.

He is in a games condition. He has ceased to be part of the group. And the first and foremost part of a games condition is not permitting the other fellow to have anything So frankly, all you would have to do, basically, to get an ARC situation mended up would be to run Havingness. Isn't that interesting?

Well, it's a—it's a wild mechanism because, frankly, if this fellow who stole his wife were to run Havingness on him for awhile, he might run it. And if he did run it, you'd get a registry on the meter of some sort or another. He might even come to the conclusion she was no good anyway. See? He might even come to an agreement.

But let's look at this again. Here we have the fellow who stole his wife. And here we have his best friend. And here we have the third party on the E-Meter. And the E-Meter will not register on the person who has no command value over the pc. You know, you could just roll on the floor with laughter at the thinking of all of these cops who have been training like mad up at the Keeler institute. The Keeley institute, you know, is the one where they cure drunks, you know. And the Keeler institute is the one where they teach lie detecting and make them.

A Keeler lie detector costs \$18,000. It is 1/1,000th as good as your E-Meters. But they have thousands and thousands and thousands of graduates. And the lie detectors don't work. And courts have learned this. They've hanged enough people now and jailed enough people who didn't done it to find out that the lie detector in some hands is very unreliable. Horrible joke.

It won't tell any lies. It does nothing but tell lies. Who knows what it does. It frankly just doesn't register. There are two hundred cops in the United States operating—they are actually ID men, usually very, very highly paid specialists, who can operate one of these great big Keeler lie detectors. two hundred men. And they think it is a peculiar knack. It's a knack.

Well, the psychiatrists—you know, they—no psychiatrist will argue with you about the fact that I can probably process people—psychiatrize them. Because I have a knack.

I always argue about this thing called a knack. If anybody's got a knack, it has mechanics and it is understandable and it is acquirable. It's a good safe basis on which to travel and then you won't go around thinking about knacks. It means that two hundred cops have the ability to go into ARC with criminals. And that's all it means. And that, of course, becomes very understandable to you. Naturally, there are thousands and thousands of cops that can't go into ARC with anybody. And really, actually, it's a rare cop that could go into ARC with somebody. So naturally they only have two hundred, two hundred operators out of the tens of thousands they've graduated out of that institute. Becomes understandable, doesn't it? Because these fellows who can make it operate have a command value over the person they're testing.

In other words, somehow or another, they can get into ARC with them and they don't know how it's done. They know none of the mechanics of it. They don't know anything about the mind. They think it registers the brain and perspiration. And there it is. There's two hundred of them can make a lie detector operate and there are tens of thousands of them who can't.

Now, that tells you something about the E-Meter. The E-Meter has a hole in it. And the hole in the E-Meter is simply this: It will not operate in the presence of an operator who has no faintest command value over the person who is on the machine. That is it. And that is the hole.

You could come along to somebody that hated your guts, put him on the machine and you could say to him, "Well, have you robbed any banks? Have you eaten any pork sausage lately? Have you told me any lies? Do you dislike me?" Even that one. No reaction on the machine. He's talking to a blank wall.

Every faculty which this person has is alertly in present time dedicated to just one purpose: not being under the influence of. Got the idea? Only it's ridged and it's reactive. And the reactive bank itself is just duuuu. And the analytical mind, duuuuu. You—don't you get the idea? I mean it's raining in Siberia. So what? No, it just means that little to him that—the fact that this operator would ask him a question who isn't in ARC with him. See, no ARC, no operation. That's all. So that's the hole in the meter.

So when you ask somebody, "Do you have an ARC break?" you might as well be whistling "Dixie." If the person has a very severe ARC break with you as an auditor, you aren't going to get any registry at sensitivity 16. Why? The person has ceased to regard you as having any command value over him of any kind whatsoever.

So what could you err in there? Ho-ho-ho. How could you err, huh? You could say, "Well, it doesn't show on the meter, so he doesn't have one." You could even go so far as to say, "Well, the meter is clean. You couldn't possibly have an ARC break with me." And there's how the E-Meter gets invalidated for people.

If you've been over a rough course of auditing and have had a rough time with an auditor, the possibility is that this might have happened to you. The person says, "There can't be an ARC break because there's no reaction here," and proceeds as though there isn't one. When you know doggone well there is one and the meter isn't registering it. And you're liable to turn around and say, "Well, the meter's at fault." The meter isn't registering something that's there. Well, that is one thing the meter won't register. An extremely severe ARC break is not registerable on an E-Meter. That's what it boils down to. Bang, it's not there.

So at that moment, your humanness must take over. You have to be able to look at somebody and tell whether or not they have an ARC break.

Now, if you're of a disposition that will not permit anybody to have an ARC break when you are doing a good job, you're never going to be able to assess a lot of people. I mean it's just—a lot of people sit down and you just never get any assessment on them at all. I mean you can read everything. You can read lists, you can do it all right. You can have your little finger cocked in the right direction, your pencil at the proper angle, E-Meter set up properly, everything proper, only you just never come up with an item. Why? You don't have any command value over the pc. Because the E-Meter wouldn't tell you he had an ARC break and if your disposition is such that you're damned if this person's going to have an ARC break around you. And if you're—well, actually, old Joe—the only thing that was really wrong with this man's auditing, he went into an absolute panic. All somebody would have to do is just shed one tear. It didn't even have to be a very moist tear. And he'd rabbit. You'd just see him going down the track, man, with the greyhounds baying behind. He was out of that session faster than any rabbit ever got out of the box. Actually panic. Just practically turn white.

Well, you'll probably run into this phenomena amongst some auditors maybe at one time or another. They—the idea that the pc has an ARC break—this ohhhhh—”he'd better not have a misemotional ARC break. No. No. No. No ARC break. Thank you very much. Now, we're going to go on with the session and keep it all calm.” You get the attitude?

Now, if a person had that attitude he, of course, would never detect humanly the fact that the pc had an ARC break.

The pc is sitting there glowering, not confronting—these are some of the symptoms—won't confront the auditor. He knows a pc with an ARC break always looks somewhere else. Won't set any goals for a session. That is not an invariable test, by the way, but it's—it's something that you should investigate. Glum, gives very shorthanded answers. And is getting no tone arm action no matter what you run or just gets a climbing tone arm which sticks.

Now, that's a bad thing for me to say because all levels at an early run of 3D—on a 3D terminal—stick. But you would get this other phenomenon moving in on you also. Tone arm's at 5.0. It'll stay at 5.0. Why?

Well, the meter's inoperative, that's why. Meter's inoperative because the pc has an ARC break. So you get no tone arm action. You get no operation of the process, your rudiments are apparently all in because the meter isn't registering on any of them. If it won't register on an ARC break and there is one, then it won't register on present time problem, room, nothing. It'll register on nothing. You see? It just goes out.

So the humanness of the auditor is necessary to check on the point of whether or not the pc seems to be cheerfully in-session—is pc seen to be audited. That's why you're going to get a shift of rudiments on this particular line. Why it's coming right up. But that's a human detection point.

Now, if you've detected that point and resolved that point, then your E-Meter operates, see.

Now, a person can make another error. A lot of people, a lot of people have already gotten the idea that they know more than the E-Meter. They sort of feel that they know more than the E-Meter. They have an idea that they can tell better what the person's terminal is or something than the E-Meter. You understand?

There's a resistance in this particular line. Well, I'll tell you exactly where that resistance is born. They know that there is something they know better than the E-Meter knows. There's something they know that the E-Meter doesn't know and they have never rationalized it out to themselves. And there is something that they know better than the E-Meter knows. But if that is squared around—that is to say they know—they know better than the E-Meter; they know whether or not this human being that they are auditing has an ARC break or is feeling cloudy or is feeling upset or is willing to be audited or not willing to be audited, they can sense the atmosphere of the session, in other words, and they know it isn't right.

Now, these people have sometimes asked the pc for an ARC break and got no registry of any kind when they knew darn well the pc had an ARC break and that the session atmosphere wasn't right. You follow that?

And so the natural conclusion is they know more than the E-Meter. Absolutely correct. They know more than the E-Meter. On a human situation of that particular character, they know more than the E-Meter. Right there on that one point of ARC break.

Now, it'd be an error for an auditor then to suppose that the E-Meter knew more than he did about an ARC break. That would be an error. But it would be an equal error to say and a dangerous one, for the auditor to believe that he knew more about what was the right terminal than the E-Meter. See? The E-Meter is rightest in its sphere and the auditor is rightest in the other sphere. Got the idea?

And if you differentiate those two things, why, life will make more sense as an auditor. You see how that is? If you have no command value over the pc, of course, the E-Meter will not operate because the E-Meter depends for its operation on your impingement upon the pc. And if you can make an impingement on the pc and you have some command value on the pc, well, the thing operates, but if the pc doesn't know you exist, you get that nonconfront that you'll see during the middle of an ARC break. The pc will look away; will not look toward the auditor. He will look up, he will look down, he will avoid the auditor's glance. Have you ever seen this?

Well, the E-Meter's right there with him, looking up, looking down and avoiding the auditor's glance.

So this person who considered they were smarter than the E-Meter, absolutely right within that sphere; they're smarter than the E-Meter. They can detect an ARC break when it exists and the E-Meter very often cannot. But if they carry that over into thinking they know more about what is the right goal and terminal of the pc than that, we get a situation which I'm having posted on your bulletin board that recently happened in California. An auditor that always knows better than the E-Meter out there found a wrong goal and terminal on somebody who was—kicked up one awful ruckus. They were busy running the wrong goal and the wrong terminal and everybody was very happy about having the wrong goal and the wrong terminal. And it was just the pc's knuckleheadedness that made him upset.

Oh, there were no casualties involved beyond the pc was practically blowing his brains out and splashing stuff through the correspondence lines and was very, very upset and another auditor, St. Hiller, got ahold of him and straightened him out. And bingo, that was all set and they straightened him out and he smoothed out and everything's going along fine now. But it was hell while it happened.

And I happen to know the auditor who did this always knows more than the meter. He chose the terminal and shoved it down the pc's throat. You got the idea? You know.

His list—"Looks to me like 'a goat' is your terminal. Is it goat? We're going to run goat." God help you if anybody ever did this to you.

I can tell you because I have actually been audited up to total levels alive on the Prehav Scale. There wasn't one level that wasn't kicking. They were all reacting on a wrong terminal, somewhat as a test. And I'm telling you I've got a very good subjective reality on it. Er-uhhh. You don't feel like you do in 3D. 3D, you feel, well, it's ghastly—as you get the runs—it's ghastly. But there is some possibility that if it—somehow or another if I don't die in the process, I will come out the other side.

Well, in this one you don't feel like that. There is no explanation of why you feel that way. You haven't got any faintest notion of how you feel that bad. It's just the roofs are going in and you're dizzy and you're this and you're that and you're the other thing.

Well, every level alive on the Prehav Scale. No, thank you. We turned around on the other one and cooled it off to 50—down to 57, down to 22, just bang! Bang! And that was all right then.

I went around like that for two or three days, by the way. Co. It should happen. I'd been noticing this along the line, you know and it had seemed to me to be a bum show to get the wrong one, but I didn't know quite it could be that bad. It is very bad.

I don't wish to scare you about it. The way to be relaxed about it is simply do a good job. But don't, for heaven's sakes, ever develop a careless attitude on that one subject. Or you'll have somebody just climbing the wall. It's very hard to pull them back too. You can, but to that point, that point, Level III auditing incorrectly done is very poor show. Class III auditing has to be done by an expert. There's no doubt about that. The fellow really has to know his business and then everything goes along pretty well. Not otherwise.

All right. Back on this ARC break. How could you do anything else in desperation but get the wrong terminal and the wrong level on the pc if the meter wasn't operating well.

This final desperation. You just say, "Oh, well, to hell with it. He's a goat. Bang! Run a goat. All right. We'll run a goat. Goal: to clobber the auditor. Okay. Who would clobber an auditor and not—and bleat? That would be obviously a goat, so we'll just run a goat."

See, if you just took 7,642 hours to get an assessment, you would long before that, you see, have gotten in the frame of mind, well, let's find something even if it's a false thing. I'm one who can understand this quite easily.

So it has been—it's been an important step here to put together the mechanics of exactly how things don't get found. And the way they don't get found is there's an ARC break, the meter goes out of operation because the auditor has no command value over the pc. That would be the piece of missing nomenclature, missing technology and missing bric-a-brac that would stand between you and a rapid assessment. You haven't detected the degree of ARC break.

Now, in the first place, you're dealing with Homo sap. And let me assure you that Homo sap is a very ARC broke bloke. That's how he got here. You run into some bird and he's nattering around about auditing "You talk about auditing all the time. Oh, you Scientologists make me sick. The idea—bla-blabla-bla-bla. He's just saying, "I got an ARC break. I got ARC breaks. I got ARC breaks." What's he mean. "I can't talk to anybody about my case. And you better not talk to me about—about my talking—talking to you about the case because I know I can't talk to anybody about my case. And I've never been able to talk to anybody about my case. And I'm not about to listen to anybody else's case and therefore, I'm in perfectly good shape. I have to be because I'd never be able to talk to anybody about it if I weren't."

That's what you're listening to when somebody won't listen to auditing or Scientology. That's really the whole situation. He's simply saying, "I can't talk to you about my case. I can't listen to anybody about their cases. No difficulties must ever come my way and I'm not going to tell you about any of my difficulties."

The way he phrases this of course, is, "What is Scientology? Isn't that some kind of a racket? What are you trying to do?" You know.

You could shut off such a person. We every once in a while come up with pat shutoffs. But supposing you ran into somebody and he was saying, "Well, I can't talk to anybody. You people. You people, bunch of frauds," you know and so forth. What he's really saying is, "I can't talk to anybody about the case, you know. Oh, you people are a bunch of frauds. And what are you doing with this, I mean, trying and so on. Some kind of a racket isn't it?" and so forth.

And if you just suddenly say, “Why can’t you talk to anybody about your difficulties,” you’d sink him, you know, just like, just like a 16-inch shell salvo into the side of a small, unprotected and unarmored tramp. It’d just stop him. Try it some time.

Somebody starts sounding off and telling you all about how bad you are and how you shouldn’t be asking him any such ridiculous thing about auditing—just ask them bluntly, “What can’t you talk to anybody about your difficulties?” Make them answer the question. They go half crazy on you, you know. I mean, ahhhhhh, it never occurred to him before.

Of course, what is this, first step of auditing, he had the fellow in-session?

All right. Along with this, the ARC break realization about the meter, has come another rudiment lineup which simply asks the basic definition—this is old processing by definition—just ask the fellow bluntly if he’s in-session, by saying what? “Could you talk to me about your case?” Of course, that’s the package statement of definition of in-session. Definition of in-session is willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case, so you just combine them in the two questions. I thought I was pretty clever when I finally figured that one.

“Would you talk to me about your case?” You’re just asking him those two things in one sentence. “Will you talk to me about your case?” Bang! If he’s got an ARC break, that’s the last question he will answer. He can’t answer that. He won’t answer that.

That is the one thing that he won’t want anything much to do with.

Now, you’ve got along with this another process that if he doesn’t answer this positively, you can run this other process and you’re all set. In other words, this person will go into session and the meter will start functioning and that’s it.

All right. You have to run all four questions. You can’t run two. We ran two or three 2s and they were—they ran all right, they ran all right but not for a real long run.

All right. Now, that area you can consider pretty well taped. You see the sense of it and you’ll get a reality on it and you’ll see it start operating for you. And I’m sure you’ll see something on this order. You’ll get a pc and you’ll say, “Well, do you have an ARC break?” and so forth and there’s no registry. And you’re going down an opposition terminals list.

They’re dangerous, opposition terminals lists anyway, you know, to a session because you’re quoting and chanting every enemy the fellow ever had in his life. Hold somebody in-session while you’re doing this is quite heroic, anyway, you know. And you’re saying—well, the fellow’s a housewife and you’re saying “tradesman” you see, “children.” Anything you could think of, you see, that could get in the road of this sort of thing.

You sort of dimly might possibly appear sort of an enemy yourself after you’ve been chanting this list long enough. Particularly if you didn’t find it on the first go.

You understand that finding anything—a Sec Check question, a 3D item—finding anything on a case is more easily done the more rapidly it’s done. That’s one of these things. They—as the error lengthens, the difficulty increases, you know. The length of time necessary, if it is increased, the difficulty is greatly increased.

Well, so you’re noticing there that you’re getting just little ticks. You know, just little ticks and so on, about the width of one of these “set” dots. You’re getting one of these little ticks. It’s going dut, you know. Dut. When you find a live item, you know, a good, hot, live item, you know. “Do you want to kill a policeman?” Dut—dut.

Straighten out their ARC breaks. Straighten them out with the ARC Break Process 1961. Go down the same list and watch the reads. The reads increase. Well, why do the reads increase? Well, the auditor now has command value over the pc's bank. So you get an increased read, of course. Simple as that. I think you can observe that and I think you will observe that.

Now, the reason we have to talk about Havingness, the reason we have to talk about Havingness is the greatest little chewer-upper of Havingness you ever heard of is the ARC Break Process. And the greatest chewer-upper of Havingness you ever saw in your life is 3D. Oh, this has no peers. Running levels on 3Ds for Havingness—chomp, chomp, chomp, chomp, chomp, man.

I saw a Walt Disney cartoon once of a goat that somebody had. He was a small goat and he ate up everything in sight. And he ate up the farm and he ate up the fields and he ate up the fences. And finally this farmer got real smart and he took him out and he put him on the railroad track—the railroad that went from his farm to San Francisco—and headed the goat in that direction, the goat eating up the railroad track as he went. And that's kind of the way it is as far as Havingness is concerned. Man, it really gets chomped up.

In the first place the fellow doesn't want this mass that he has. But it is mass and you know a thetan's motto is: anything is better than nothing. But this mass is an introversion mass and the more you run the mass the less he's got the physical universe, so even if the mass didn't increase or decrease, if the mass just stayed the same, it is introverting him. And the more a pc introverts the less universe he has. Simple, isn't it?

So he would get the feeling of losing havingness by simply contacting some introverting thing. Something that introverted him very badly would give him the feeling of no havingness. He wouldn't have had to have lost any mass. He is surrounded by the physical universe, he's got just as much bank as he had before. It's always been there kicking his teeth in. Every time he ever got sick, this mass that you're now running out, of course, was what moved in on him. Anytime he got pneumonia, anytime he ran fevers, anytime he did this or that or went off the rails in some other direction, it was the mass which you are handling which did it to him.

Don't be too amazed if in running 3D or something like that, you put your hand on the hot brow of the pc or—why it would seem a little bit warm. Or if you put a thermometer in his mouth you'd find he's running a temperature of 102. Don't be amazed about this. The thing to do is to handle it smoothly. Because nothing is going to happen to the pc at all if it's even vaguely well handled. It doesn't have to be perfectly handled, you understand, it just has to be vaguely well handled. You'd have to do something like, he says, "Well, I'm stuck in all this mass."

And you'd have to get up and say, "Oh, to the hell with you. I'm tired of auditing you. That's the end of the intensive as far as I'm concerned." And hit him with the chair. It'd take something of that order of magnitude to completely wind it up. Or running him on the wrong items. Running him on the wrong items would really fix his clock.

So, introversion. Well, I'll give you an idea. The person's walking along saying, "What a beautiful day. What a beautiful day. What a beautiful day. Isn't it a lovely day." And he's looking around and here's all the birds and orioles and crows and airplanes singing in the sky. And you walk up to him and you say, "Uh—what are you worried about?" And he loses it, you know and he says, "Argh. What the hell do you mean what am I worried about? What's the matter with you?" You know, rour-rour-rour-rour-rour-rour.

Now, if you were—had some method of measuring his concept of his havingness—immediately before you asked the question and immediately afterwards—you'd find his havingness would have dropped. See, he's lost the beautiful day. Well, the beautiful day hadn't disappeared. It's just his idea on whether it's there or not or whether he can keep his attention on it.

Similarly, you find this fellow sitting on a park bench and he's worrying and he's just wallowing, you know, he's worrying and he's worrying and he's worrying and he's worrying. Walk up to him and say, "Look at the beautiful day." You get the same effect. PC's havingness at the moment is his worries, see?

So all you had to do... The formula, the formula—which I think is employed here and there—is "Anything the fellow has at the moment, tell him he's got to have something else." Anything a person's attention is on, put his attention on something else. This is an educational activity. This is how—actually it's a much more effective method than brainwashing

It's a good thing no Russian wants anything much to—I know no communist in Russia wants much to do with Scientology. It's a good thing. Because they could really brainwash people, just on the theory—now, anything the fellow's thinking about, make him think of something else, see. You wind up brainwashing somebody. In other words, the person's attention is very contentedly on his bank, why, make him look at the wall, suddenly, see. Suddenly make him look at the wall. He gets zz-zz-zz-zz. See. Or if his attention is very contentedly on the wall, suddenly make him look at his bank. You got the idea? So a sudden shift here. Now, this is one of the defeating effects of Havingness.

But, when you're running a person's ARC break and he's all out of ARC with you, he wants to go out of the session. He's thinking about—well, at first he starts thinking about he isn't getting auditing and then the next thing he's thinking about—he sort of thinks he probably ought to put his attention on something else. And then the next thing he is thinking about, is actually, physically leaving session. He thinks he ought to just pull up himself by his coat collar and walk out.

If you could catch him at the point when he just thinks he ought to be thinking about something else, to run Havingness, you of course are complementing exactly what he is doing. He's looking around the room. Well, show it to him.

The second you did that, you would get command value on the meter and could therefore straighten out what's wrong with him.

I mean, he's already looking around the room thinking he ought to leave session. That's a very extreme case, you see. Well, if you ran Havingness at that particular time, you would heal the ARC break. That's a very smooth way to handle it because of course you've taken over the control of his attention and he moves right straight back into session very nicely because he actually runs out what you were doing.

Almost any pc run long enough on Havingness will get all of his rudiments in. Isn't that fascinating. The earliest rudiment process, by the way, at the time they're called rudiments was "Was it all right to audit in this room? Was it all right for me to audit you?" That was more or less the gist of it. That isn't the exact wording.

And we're right back there again. We've moved back all those years back to 15th Street in Washington. And just on that, what is a rudiment? Well, of course, we're not asking it with that degree of simplicity. But we are asking, "Well, is it all right—would you talk to me about your case?" and we're going to find out how his havingness is. See. Or we're going to find out how his havingness is and then going to say, "... talk to me about your case," you know. That probably is the proper order.

Person's attention is on the physical universe. Bring him from the physical universe down into the session, rather than flick it out of the session.

Now, what's this amount to? This amounts to this: that Havingness is that activity which is run when needed and when it will not violently deflect the pc's attention.

I'll give you an example of that. Pc's sitting there and saying, "Wow, you don't really suppose, you don't really suppose I—hey, you know, this is pretty bad. I thought I've been going down all through the years being a good boy and here I actually find—no, I don't know."

And, he's dealing with the possibility he might have shot somebody or murdered somebody at some time or another, you know. And he's just all intrigued with this and uh . . .

You say, "All right. Look around here and find out something you could have. Thank you. Look around here and find out something you could have."

He says, "What? What?"

You say, "Well, look around here and find out something you could have." "What? What? What about? Who? Where? Where? What? What room?" see. "What wall? Which universe?" See, wooooo!

Too heavy a shock, flick of attention, see.

Similarly, the person is running, all of a sudden, very well on Havingness; they're just starting to find out that there is a room there and the mass is releasing and you say, "All right, now, let's get to the bank."

See, both of those are errors. Person is looking around and saying, "Well, I could have that piece of fluff. And I could have a corner of this piece of paper and I could have the end of my nose."

And you say, "Squeeze the cans," he does. Looser. You say, "All right, let's get back into session now. Let's—let's get going on this other thing."

And he had just at that moment begun to wonder if there was a room there, don't you see? And he never gets a chance to complete the thought of "Is there a room there?" He wouldn't have completed it for another three or four commands, at least, you see.

So observing these factors, Havingness can do some marvelous things, but neglecting them, it can really, really upset people. But of all processes— don't let me startle you about Havingness or say it's dangerous in any way—of all processes, the safest process to run on anybody, anyplace at any time is their right Havingness Process. And that is the—always the safest process to run.

You can always run the Havingness Process on the most ARC breaky and upset pc. You can always run a Havingness Process on somebody who was almost totally spun in. You can run a Havingness Process on somebody who was badly injured. You can run a Havingness Process on somebody who hasn't eaten, hasn't slept and is going psychotic right in front of your eyes. You could run a Havingness Process on anybody almost at any time. And it is the safest process to run.

It cannot be overrun. Don't ever be cautioned into believing that it can be. It cannot be overrun. I'll tell you what overrunning and underrunning a Havingness Process is in just a moment.

But let us take the situation of—the pc comes into session. He has bounteous and peculiar present time problems. They are all there, all ready to leap up on the meter and give you one God-awful mess of a time. His rudiments are wildly out when he comes into session. He has ARC breaks. He doesn't know whether he's going or went. And you're going to sit him down and you're going to go all the way through the rudiments. You're going to straighten out every single rudiment on its own merits. Wouldn't you love a better way to get this out of the road? Huh? Wouldn't you love a better way to get this out of the road? Or, so when you did hit them, they blew. Wouldn't that be nice?

Well, ask the room question first and your humanness—consult your humanness, not the meter. Ask the room question first. Aw, let him set some goals for the session or something like that, anything, you know.

And at that moment decide whether or not this pc is in any kind of shape to be audited. Decide that at the moment—decide that right now, you see, at that point. And if he's not in any kind of shape to be audited, by your adjudication, your humanness—you say, "Ah, set goals for session?"

"Ah, I guess so and so on."

"Would you like session goals for life and livingness?"

"Well, I guess so, no, I don't set goals for life and mmmmmmmmmmmmm. . .

Or, "Do you want to set some goals for life and livingness?"

"Yes, I'd love to. If I could think of any." Or something like this, you know.

All right. That's your indicator to run Havingness. Not the ARC Break Process, Havingness. Clank. Why? How did it all get caved in on him anyway, huh? He's been going around thinking worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, interiorized, interiorized, introversion, introversion, introversion; of course he's got more, more and more and more PT problems, of course he's got more and more of them. He's been looking inside until he's cross-eyed. See, looking in and looking back under his ear and he's been looking under his right eyelid and been peering into the dark abysses and masses of it all and so forth. He's badly interiorized.

Well, the probability is he's interiorized on things that have nothing to do with what you want to have happen in the session. He is worried about his wife and his terminal is a riding master.

The opposition terminal of a riding master is a fox. And we're going to run wife on him, are we? Not smart. We have a present time problem? "Yes I have a present time problem. Yes, I was up all night arguing with my wife."

Now, we're going to say to him, "Well, all right, okay. How do you feel about it now?" Clank. Oh, Christ, here we go up in smoke. Why? It's his wrong terminal. It's his wrong everything He's having an argument with the wrong terminal.

You say, "Now look, during this intensive, for God's sakes, please only get into fight with foxes. If you've got to beat somebody, beat a horse, so we can run it out. But knock off this beating your wife. Just for the duration of the intensive." I don't think you could do that. I don't think you could do that.

Anyway, no, a smart thing to do is never collide with this PT problem at all. See, just never collide with it, never pay any attention to it, at this time. Sets his goals, we decide, well, rudiments are out, we decide, our sensitivity, our swamishness, our ability to telepath across vast distances, all of these various things. That's—here we go. They're out, something tells me.

Or just for the hell of it or just because you were running a lot of introvertive stuff last session, see, doesn't have to be any very pat reason, but you just say, "Well, we're not going to go down the rest of all those rudiments and run into all these problems and straighten that out today. Today we're going to get something done." And the way we're going to get something done today is the moment the pc says, "Oh, well, goals for life or livingness, ohhhh, can you think of any for me?"

You say, "Well good, all right. Now, look around the room and see if you can have anything. All right. That's fine. All right."

And the pc's Havingness Process is "Throw—get the idea of throwing mud at that wall. Thank you," you know or whatever it is—first command right there, see. Didn't matter whether the meter reacted or didn't react. Because you're way in ahead of your ARC Break Process, you haven't even brought up the subject of ARC breaks. You just decided they were probably—they probably existed. They probably would exist, you

decided your meter probably wouldn't operate well or you decided that the pc was getting too darned interiorized and you're tired of that tone arm going up and sticking that heavy every session. Anything you decided, it didn't matter what.

And you just run Havingness. And you go ahead and run Havingness. And that's what I want to tell you about in this lecture, with all these other things that have come up newly, I should tell you something "oldly," which you might very well have handsomely managed to park under the wrong brain cell, mislaid it.

Havingness ain't run against the can squeeze. It's run against a pc's ability to have large objects in the room. Havingness is tested on a can squeeze. You don't need a meter to run Havingness beyond testing to find out what is the pc's Havingness Process.

Now, once you can find the pc's Havingness Process, you're all set. It's whether or not the pc can have large objects in the room. And this again, we're up here in the human equation. You always run Havingness till pc can have a large object in the room or many large objects in the room.

And you don't stop running Havingness when the pc says, "Well, that little spot of paper there, I can have that. And I can have a corner, well, that's pretty big, I can't have that. I could have the shimmer on this screw here on the E-Meter. Uhh-ahh, I could have that sigh. I could have the back of my head. I could have sensation in my toe. That's about all. Oh, yeah, I think I could—yeah, I've got a slight toothache, I could have have that, have a toothache, yeah."

"Well, squeeze the cans. Good. Oh, that's looser now. All right, well go on."

You see, when you were running Confront—this is why I'm telling you Havingness got mixed up with Confront—when you were running Confront, that is all the Havingness you needed, to run Confront. Now, the old rules of Havingness have gone astray because of these Confront Processes. And when you're running Havingness independent of actual, the companion Confront Processes, you don't run it this way at all. You run it against the largest object in the room.

You want to find out if it's the right process and you want to check that every now and then. But by every now and then I mean once or twice or three times a week, let's check it somewhere in the session. Let's run a few commands of it and check it. "Oh well, his Havingness Process is still working." You got the idea? That's all you want to know.

Now, the workingness of the process, in actual handling of Havingness, is whether or not he can have large objects in the room. That's it. There is no other thing. That is then enough Havingness. Now, you can leave the process. And don't leave the process until he can have large objects. And that's the rule of large objects on Havingness.

Now, when you're running it with regard to confront, you actually could practically, you could run large sections of case with the Have-Confront, you see. That Have-Confront system is a marvelous system; it's all by itself. It is a system. It—and havingness got loaned to it. Remember Havingness isn't residual in this system. Havingness is itself

The old HCO Bulletin October 6, 1960 took these all together and put them together as Havingness and Confront. It still gives you all these Havingness Processes. But when I'm talking about running Havingness, I'm not talking about running Havingness and Confront. I'm talking about running Havingness, just itself, only. And yes, you've got to have the right Havingness Process for the pc. Yes, you've got to test—you've got to find it by can squeeze. It's got to loosen the needle on a can squeeze. If it's not, if it doesn't, why, it is the wrong Havingness Process and will wind up with him looking inside of his skull. It won't wind up with him looking out at the room. So you find it by can squeeze.

You don't find it by also testing the Confront. You just find the Havingness Process. Now, having found it and having used it a session or two, the smart thing to do is run three or four commands of it and test it again to find out if it's still working. But, you understand that running with this, only a few commands of it were necessary to get the individual to have the confront work again. This is a different system. That's a different system. This havingness is itself.

So, all right, we start the session, we "Look around the room, see if you can have anything?" The individual says—we don't care what the command was. We look at him, we find out he's sort of out of sorts, he doesn't look too good to us. He looks rather secondhand.

All right, what a wonderful thing to do right away is just don't even start a long series of questions about it. Set his goal for life or livingness, "Well, yes. Still be here at the end of the session."

"That's your goal for life or livingness. Any goals for life or livingness?"

"Well, no, I guess not then."

Well, that would be a very extreme case. Your next action, smile brightly and say, "Well, now. All right." You got to know the pc's Havingness Process: "Throw mud at the wall. Thank you."

So you say, "All right, now. Going to run a little bit of Havingness here. All right. Throw mud at the wall. Thank you. Throw mud at the wall. Thank you. Throw mud at the wall. Thank you. Throw mud at the wall. Thank you."

Well now, running that process we can't tell very well whether he can have any large objects or not, unless we occasionally ask him, "How much wall are you hitting?" And you'll find inevitably, he'd say, "Just a little piece."

And when he finally says "the whole wall," well, all right, that's fine. All right, that's fine. That's enough Havingness. Right then, that's enough Havingness.

Now, you can tell if a Havingness Process is working because the tone arm goes up on this type of havingness run and blows down. It goes up and then blows down. And that's the original where you got blowdown, where that—where that term came from, is by running Havingness. You can always get a blowdown with Havingness, if it's the right process. Of course just before it blows down, sometimes, the pc feels like he's being killed slowly between two gigantic bricks, but it will blow down.

By running the Havingness, you know, the bank is sort of. . . Tension is coming off of things and things are changing and he feels very uncon—and he "what wall" and he's fooling around and then all of a sudden, why, immediately he all of a sudden says, "Oh, well, yes, I could have the whole ceiling" Bang, it blows down. Pow! That is the behavior of a tone arm on a Havingness Process, if it's the right process. Quite valuable to know, isn't it.

Well, on some of these processes, how you are going to follow the rule of the large object is up to you, because I'm not going to sit here and give you a pat solution for every one of them. In the first place, you'd never remember them. But that isn't the real reason—is I never would. I'd never remember the solutions I gave you here because I don't need them.

When I see a pc who doesn't have his havingness up, I don't have to consult any rules because he looks like somebody who doesn't have his havingness up. He behaves in that fashion. There's nothing very esoteric about it. He is picky and choosy. And a person whose havingness is up is bangy, see, all pow and pow and pow and pow and pow. And the person whose havingness is way down is—cautious—maybe—I guess. There's a vast difference in the attitude. It is a wild difference. It's not hard to detect at all.

Individual gets a certain look in his eye when he starts looking around to have things. That's not the time to stop the process. But he starts sitting back and relaxing a little bit and he's not much worried about his case and so forth or anything and he feels he's in good hands. Along about that time—that feeling generates the same time, “Well, I could have that bookshelf and I could have the fireplace, I could have the chimney, the chimney, I could have the wall, I could have, have the room.”

Well obviously, he could—little, big, big, big, bigger, bigger, he could have quite big objects. All right, he can have a large object.

“Okay, is it all right with you if I give you two more commands and end this process?” Pang-pang-pang. He's happy to have you do it, there's no ARC breaks messed up in it.

Now, you should know a few of the facts of life—is that havingness runs the bank. And the reason why you don't run havingness to any large quantity while running the thirty-six processes in the presessions, is because the confront was running the bank and you didn't want the havingness running the bank if the confront was going to run the bank. You understand?

This was senseless. The confront would run the bank much faster than the havingness would run the bank, you see. So it was silly to run very much havingness with it. You just ran enough havingness with it to keep his attention flexible and so forth and went back to the confront to get something done.

Well now, the havingness I'm talking to you about comes directly, intimately and immediately out of this list of thirty-six new presessions. It's the Havingness Processes and they are all by themselves. They are themselves. And they are in order of frequency on pcs.

The confront, scratch it out. You're not going to use it. You're not going to have anything to do with it. Why? What are you using for confront? You are using Sec Checking, using Problem Intensives. You're using 3D. For heaven's sakes, you're using all kinds of assessments that are reaching into his bank with red-hot pokers. Why do you want a confront? That's enough confront for anybody.

I'll tell you, the pc in the first throes of confronting his terminal goes between rage and extreme pleasure and horror and he vacillates, man. He's got enough there to confront without you saying, “What could you confront?”

He'd tell you every time. You've just got through assessing a ditch digger on him and he says, “Well, I could confront. I could confront a ditch. I could confront a digger. I could confront a ditch digger. I could confront a—a ditch, a ditch digger.”

That would be about the way it is. But you're asking him to do all this and you're asking for all these Confront Processes anyway.

No. The depth of reach is accompanied by a reduction of havingness. That is, his awareness and so forth is being shifted so that it requires a rather heroic remedy. And it requires a real remedy. Just as it is extreme in the degree of what you're reaching in the reactive mind, so it requires an extreme remedy.

And that is you've got to run havingness just as it's supposed to be run. No, no hunt and punch. If you're going to start running havingness on the pc, run it to the rule of the largest objects.

There are large objects in view, when the pc can have those, why that's it. Well, how you are going to determine whether or not he can have it with some of these things, I don't know. But that's your problem. You think for a while. You've been wearing me out the last eighteen days, so. I'll just leave you that one. You can figure that one out yourself. How you can apply the rule of the largest object to “What beingness around here could you confront?” you know. Pretty tough. Actually that's not a very good Havingness Process unless you're auditing in a mass room—with masses of people or you're auditing it by a window or

you're in the middle of a railroad station, there is a good one. But sitting in a room all by yourself on a desert island, self-auditing it, it wouldn't be very workable.

All right. But it's enough havingness. Now, it's going to run the bank. Now, don't get upset about this, it's going to run the bank. The pc is going to go out of PT and back into PT. And this is signaled by what would seem to you to be dope off, but isn't. The pc can see, but not look, if you could imagine this.

You can make mistakes with this just on this basis: the pc looks like he's a gone dog, so you stop the process. Pc's sitting there and the pc's going, "Bla-bla."

You say, "What wall could you confront?"

Pc says, "Bla-bla."

And then pretty soon the pc—you say, "What wall could you confront?"

Pc—he looks like he's out cold.

You know, he'll get madder than hell at you if you stop the command. Because he's doing it. He's doing it. He's doing every command.

You'll get some guy on the basis of what could he have, well he could have the hair on the back of his head. He's answering, sort of. He gets so totally interiorized while doing the process, don't you see, that he can't see even as far out as his eyeballs. And he can actually get to a point of where he can have a sensation inside his neck. Or he can have a little something inside of one temple. He can't have that wall. You're demanding too much of him.

So you just keep on running the process and the rule is, it's a very clean-cut rule, that no matter what happens to the pc during a Havingness Process, you keep running the process until he is back amongst us. You always continue to run a Havingness Process. That's the second most important rule in it. One is the rule of the largest objects. Large objects of the room. You've got to have the large objects. Pc has to be able to embrace them or see them, experience them, do what he's doing with them.

And the other one is, you must continue to give him the Havingness command at the same rate that he has been answering it as before. But the rate is not as important as the fact that you must continue to give him the Havingness command, whatever it is, no matter what the pc does with his eyeballs.

Now, a pc can somewhat get into trouble, sometimes on havingness, by having things he can't see with his eyes. He is facing in this direction and he keeps saying he can have things in back of him with his eyes sort of glassy. Well, I don't quite know what to do about this, to tell you the truth. Because I've had it happen, I've run that way and so forth. I've never had anything very desperate happen. But if a pc looks too much without looking, you know, he's having things he can't see, there's a possibility that he's having bank. And when he's having bank, his havingness goes down, not up.

But it's a lesser chance. If it happens that the pc's havingness apparently is decreasing while he is running the process it may be because he's simply having bank. He's having things behind him—you can tell all the time what he's doing—or he's having things in the next room or he's having things on Venus or he's having things in London and he is being audited in Brighton. And, ware shoal. Don't necessarily stop the pc cold, but just become wary.

Because pcs do this: you won't believe it until you've seen it. The first time an individual runs into this one and knows it for sure, it's a shock. To know that a person can actually have been going around in life, this

whole lifetime, without ever having seen any part of the physical universe. That is always a shock. When you get a—when you get an actual reality on it and you know that that's really true. Pc never sees that shelf over there. He puts up a picture of the shelf. Which is a varied shelf, by the way. And he sees the picture of the shelf and he never sees the shelf.

It's a shock. It's a hard thing to believe. This fellow's been driving cars. The state has issued him licenses to drive, everything else. He's never seen a road. He has always a picture of the road under the wheels of the picture of wheels, you see, while he holds on to a picture of a steering wheel, while he picturesquely picturizes down through the country lanes, at 90 miles an hour. It gives one to think.

It's worse than this though. Is how in the name of common sense has he ever had depth perception. Well the truth of the matter is, he hasn't. He hasn't. He's always reaching for the ashtray two inches short and then correcting himself. He sort of—you'll see by his actions. You'll see it, it's very often, very plainly marked. I turned on a person's sight one time who was blind. They were blind, but could get a hazy picture of things. And I turned on this person's sight so they could see quite well and it didn't take them but a few hours to get it off again. It was too unnerving They could see a faint shadow of things and then they could see the thing And it was much safer to see a faint shadow of it than to see it.

But it threw their depth perception all out and they didn't know which one to reach for because they were in different locations. There was the faint, faint shadow of it, you see. They were blind for all intents and purposes. But there was still this faint shadow. And they'd been very dependent on this faint shadow and it had been very, very safe. It had never fallen in and knocked their eyes out or anything of the sort. There it was, it was very safe, little tiny faint shadow.

All of a sudden why, see, the thetan, the person as a thetan, started seeing And started seeing things actually and it scared them half to death. See, that wasn't safe. That was why they were blind, of course. And I didn't run out the reason why the person was blind, I simply turned on the person's sight. I've done it to two or three blind people. They, by the way, get their sight off within an hour, two hours. They'll see brilliantly they—what and they're—you know, go around and then all of a sudden they'll decide that the wall is too white or the curtains are too red or they will decide something else about the whole thing and they pull the switch. So if you think there is—and they get real nasty about it afterwards too.

There are no medals to be won in restoring sight unless you have restored first the willingness to see.

So, where the individual is running a Havingness Process, they sometimes discover this. And the reason you have different Havingness Processes is there are different degrees of perception. And I'm telling you just one of the bugs of perception. In other words, the wall is never there but a picture of the wall is there. They see the picture, they never see the wall.

All right, such a person obviously runs very poorly on a sight havingness, but would much—do much better with a tactile havingness. You know, feel the wall. You improve their havingness. “Look around here and find something you'd be willing to feel.” And have them walk around and grab ahold of things. Repair their havingness.

But you could detect, now, something else about this, you could detect that if there are thirty-six of these things, there must be a lot more. Dick and Jan, after class, we were putting together peoples' Havingness Process and so on and they'd come in and I'd suggest Havingness Processes to them and they'd rehash them over and they'd remember old processes we had and something and I'd—we'd write them down and so forth and issue them and so on and test them out and they'd work on some and they wouldn't work on the others. And we had quite a ball.

And it was a very valuable piece of work that was done by that particular class. They've never really gotten the credit for it. But it was valuable. That was the 1st Saint Hill.

Now, if there are thirty-six of them, there are probably just as likely to be a hundred and thirty-six. We've not found it necessary, however, to use many of these. Do you know that there are quite a few of these on the end of the list that are simply on the end of the list because they have never been needed. There's hardly anybody doesn't find his Havingness Process before he gets to the end of the list. And we've never found it so. So as a result, why, there it is. I've forgotten where it starts, but it starts rather early. I think it's something on the order of twenty or twenty-two or something like that. And we've never used the rest of them to amount to anything, but because we never needed them.

But as you go down the list, by testing the various Havingness Processes on the pc, you will find something that will remedy the pc's havingness. Well, now the next time you test the pc—that Havingness Process goes out in use and we have to have another Havingness Process, well don't necessarily start at the point you left off or start at the beginning, just find a Havingness Process out of this list and if you ran to the unimaginably unimaginable thing you could dream up some sort of a Havingness Process that would still remedy havingness that had to do with the room and the environment and so forth, that would remedy the pc's havingness.

The easiest way to do it is to take this—an awful lot of research work went in on this particular thirty-six Havingness Processes and the easiest way to do is to go down the list and you test each one. And you only give the command about five times, something on that order, very few times. And you just get the person into session and—indifferently into session—and then you just say, “Well, we're just going to test Havingness Processes here,” and you just have him squeeze the cans, hold the cans relaxedly in his lap.

Always make sure that the tests are made with the same can posture, because with these—with these small aluminium cylinders, a person's skin can be off of them and when they're tightened up, the crush-back of the skin on can be different every time you test and you'll go mad, you won't know which is which and so forth.

The American tin can has an advantage over these things, just in that respect only.

So, anyway, you go down the line and you just run it and of course the most obvious and the oldest one, “Look around here and find something you could have,” is of course number one on the list. Not because it's—not because it's always going to be it for your pc, but because it would be so nice if that were it because it will stay in a long time and everything is fine.

So you just give that to him, “Look around here and find something you could have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.” You see, you've done a can squeeze, now you've run this five times, now, you ask him to put his hands in his lap and squeeze the cans again. And you've loosened the needle.

Well, if you've loosened the needle, why you've got it right there. You're all set. But you better run a check, better run a check. Let's run it twelve commands now and see if it still loosens the needle. Run a second check on the thing.

All right, you say, well that's dandy and we've got it and we've got it nailed. That's the pc's Havingness Process.

But if it tightened the needle, that is to say if you got less of a drop the second test, you of course would go on at once to the next one. Now, don't go lingering around waiting for it to tighten the thing up to a coiled spring. This again is most successfully done the most rapidly done. The faster you find it, the easier it is to find.

So you ask for a can squeeze, you give him five commands. You ask for a can squeeze. That's either it or it's not it. It's it if it loosened up the needle. That is to say, the needle dropped further the second test of can squeeze than it did the first time. That is all. The first time it dropped a fifth of a dial. Next time it dropped a

half a dial. Oh, man, have you got it. That's the Havingness Process. That is all there is to it. Do a check out on the thing. Mark it down on the report. That's the pc's Havingness Process. You've got it right now.

All right. Can squeeze only gives a fifth-of-a-dial drop and you say, "Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you." Five times and you say, "All right. Squeeze the cans again." Eighth-of-a-dial drop. You say, "Thank you very much." No randomness here, see. Don't put any randomness in at that point. Particularly don't put any in. Because you're on dangerous ground. You just run his havingness down with the process.

So you say very rapidly, you say, "Well, thank you very much." You don't ask him for another can squeeze. You already know it's going to drop an eighth of a dial, see? You go right on. You say, "We're testing another one now. Point out something in this room you could confront. Thank you. Point out something in this room..." You go on and give him that. "All right. Squeeze the cans." Clang Sixteenth-of-a-dial drop. You say, "Well, that's fine." Don't look dismayed at that point. We'll run you sometime on, "What dismay have you suppressed? To whom could you show and exhibit dismay." A professional auditor process.

Now, you look at this next one and you say, "Well, hell, there's only us in the room. Skip it." You get the idea. And you get the next process and you just test it out like that, see, it's very rapid. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Ha—process, a-ha. Check. That's it. Now, we got it. Dandy, dandy, dandy. And we mark that thing down. And then the next time that we are confronted with any randomness of any kind whatsoever—such as loss of havingness toward the end of session or something of this sort—we got the process.

All right. But supposing you were checking for a Havingness Process and you found a Havingness Process and your p—and it checked out and everything is fine. What would be your next step in an actual session? Because you've got now time to burn in the session. This is a practical consideration. That is to say, you were going to do something else, too, in this session. Well, I would now get the session started. You know how I would start the session? I don't care whether you set goals before you did the havingness test or not. But if you've got the goals, you're going to run havingness. If you haven't got the goals, you're going to set goals and get the havingness. In other words, that's all. And you're going to run havingness. And run it to the large object rule. You're going to get this pc's havingness right on up. Because if it was difficult to find his Havingness Process, then you can be sure that his havingness is shot to hell. And that the fastest, easiest thing you can do to get rudiments in across the board is to run his havingness.

All right. After you've got the pc's—in any session now—you've got the pc's havingness, anytime you get the session whizzing with the Havingness Process, you go in and go through the rest of your rudiments. And you say, "Well, could you talk to—do you feel you could talk to me about your case?" Or whatever the rudiments question is. "Good. Do you have any withholds? Do you have any present time problems? All right, this is what we are going to do." And the funny part of it is, you're going to find very few of them. You won't find any ARC breaks. It's no use asking for them, anyhow. Oh, you could ask for an ARC break. Don't forget it entirely.

But the point I'm making here is, you've minimized the number you are going to get. The pc is in a games condition with you because his havingness is down. That's simple. If his havingness is down, he's going to be in a games condition with you. Well, why should he be in a games condition with you? All you do is put his havingness in and he's not in a games condition with anything, so therefore his rudiments are in. This is a very fast, simple way of getting rudiments in. And now rudiments can be checked with care. Rudiments can be easily checked because your meter registers better.

Now, of course, if the pc said, "No, I can't talk to you about this case." You just remedied his havingness and so forth. I think it would be very rare. I just don't think it would happen, he would suddenly say to you, "No, I couldn't tell you anything about my case. It's very, very secret and it's very, very private and it's very, very this and it's very, very that." Well, of course, you've got your ARC Process.

Now, the ARC Process is very demanding of havingness. So when you see that the pc's tone arm is getting pretty confoundedly cotton-pickin' sticky, let him cycle into PT or let him have a good cognition and acknowledge hell out of it and run some havingness so that you run it at a point you won't give him a bad start.

See, don't put him way down the bank someplace with the ARC Process and then all of a sudden, "Hah! Here's a good chance to scare the hell out of him. Look at that wall!"

He'd be, "What? What? What wall? There's no wall here amongst us infantrymen."

No. Wait till he cycles up to PT. Wait till he has a cognition. He frees up a little bit on his attention. Or he's all of a sudden—appears to come out of something for a moment or he appears to be regarding you in some peculiar way that he hasn't before. Some change has occurred of some sort or another and you think it is safe to shift his attention off the bank to the room. Run some havingness and you'll get a blowdown of that tight tone arm and you can go on and make the ARC Process run much longer and much better and much faster.

This becomes important to you in 3D because you are going to be doing it while running terminals on Prehav levels. You are going to watch your havingness very carefully. And you are going to use it when necessary during, after, end of session, beginning of session and so on, you are going to watch your havingness carefully. You're practically going to blow your pc out of the water, too. If you've run for quite a while without running any havingness, then all the somatics the pc has been accumulating will suddenly go zing! The pc is liable to go out colder than ice. And the only mistake you can make is not going on and running Havingness Process.

Of course, you feel kind of silly the first two or three times you do it. The pc's sitting there—the pc's sitting there, you know, deh. Well, Mary Sue used to have a test for this. She said well when a pc started snoring, she knew he wasn't doing the process. That's the time to kick him in the feet and get him up. Get him around. But you can—you'll get so you can tell this.

And the—you'll finish up a half-an-hour run with the pc sitting there like this, you know or something like this. And going in and out and going u-h-h-h, like this. You go on and run the Havingness Process. Ask him at the end of the line, "Well, did you do all the commands?" "Well, I did all I heard. There was one time when you didn't give me one for quite a while and that upset me a little bit."

The pc has never even been able to signify that he's executed the command. And you must not expect the pc to tell you that he's executed the auditing command. It's no part of the auditing command, either. You'd have to add that. "Do the havingness command and execute it. Thank you. Here's the havingness command. Good. Now, execute it. Thank you."

Don't you think that sounds clumsy? So actually the pc does not have to tell you that he has executed the havingness command. He usually goes uhhhh, or nods his head anyhow in havingness. He's kind of—he never has much to say running a Havingness Process unless he gets a cognition and then God help you. But there you go. The pc will go on doing the thing with his eyes shut, out cold, as far as you can see and the only mistake you can make, the only way you can err, is not go on giving him the havingness command. Because you are now running havingness to a complete havingness remedy, objective. You are not running a limited pickup. Run for the largest object.

Now, when you've started the session, you've got the pc's Havingness Process, let us say and you've started the session, you've run liberal havingness, you're going to be amazed: some of the pcs you are auditing could have the head of the pin, providing it were not present.

It has a lot to do with ARC breaks. I got ARC breaks pretty well taped. I got the meter taped. I found this hole in the meter. I've got that pretty well anchored down. We know about what it is and what it isn't and what we can do about it and we've got that solved. That's easy. Right along with it, just as an extra shovel full, well, we'll throw in this havingness proposition and we'll find out the pcs will have a much easier time of it.

Remember that havingness runs the bank. As you're having him look at the walls he's got pictures going by and he's got this and that and so forth and how intriguing it is for the auditor to take these all up. What process are you running? You're running some Confront Process, aren't you, suddenly, if you suddenly take up all these pictures the pc has and everything No, let them fly by with wild abandon. Who cares what happened to these pictures.

He said, "Well, what do you know, what do you know there's—there's a—a picture of an albatross that just went by."

And you say, "Well, that's good." You don't say, "Could you ever have been the Ancient Mariner?" No, you just say, "Fine" and give him the next havingness command. If anything, a little more rapidly than usual.

Now, it'll run bank. It'll run him anaten. It'll do all sorts of weird things and it'll give him wild somatics. Now, you don't have to run the somatics flat on a Havingness Process. But if a pc gets wild somatics on Havingness—the Havingness Processes that you're running or the process which you're running on him—it is simply indicative that the pc is on the goals-terminal chain of one character or another and it is disturbing the mass of the goals-terminal chain. That's the only importance that it has. And that you shift his attention, of course, causes the bank to shift which, of course, gives him awfully bad somatics. So what. That's fine.

It is not either really beneficial or unbeneficial for him to have the somatics. This has nothing to do with it. He'll probably run into them again some other time or he may never run into them again. Who cares? Only thing it is, is actually you're replenishing his mass and the more you're replenishing his mass and the more ARC he can have and the more beef he can have on the situation, the better oriented he is and the better concept of havingness he is and the more he can run. And the more willing he is to give up a few of these . .

You know, a fellow who can only have a pinhead if it isn't there as his objective havingness, is not likely to give up a single scrap button of an old decayed picture that is in the bottom of a nonexistent crushed mass called a trunk. He wouldn't give it up if his havingness is down. You've got to get him in some kind of a state of realization that there is other havingness. Because the common denominator of all games terminals is games, all goals terminals are games and the common denominator of all games is can't-have. And that's for sure. Whatever else happens in a game, everybody's being sure that nobody else can have. You've got to keep that remedy or you're going to get a games condition.

So, here are a bunch of ways of keeping a pc on an even track. If you haven't got your pc's Havingness Process as you're running on down your assessment, no wonder you're having difficulty. Don't use your Confront Process along with the Havingness Process. Don't use that confront. Because what are you doing with 3D Assessments, Sec Checks, Problems Intensives, anything else that you're doing, you, of course, are doing a Confront Process. Much more violent a Confront Process, by the way, than any Confront Process listed here. Okay?

All right. Well, we got a lot of things solved and we got a lot of things squared around. Develop a sensitivity to know when a pc's Havingness Process is down. Develop a sensitivity to know whether or not your pc has an ARC break and you won't have very much trouble with pcs and your meters will work like startled deer. You can go down a list and the meter's banging there, banging a division, where before it banged an eighteen-thousandth of a micromillimeter. Which is very small. Very small. Large to a microbe but very small. Okay.

Well, I hope that helps you out. And thank you very much.