

## CCHs - CIRCUITS

A lecture given on  
27 June 1961

Thank you.

Okay. Well, this is the 27th of June, or was the last time I looked. It might have slipped.

You're apparently doing all right in a mild sort of way. The biggest difficulty people are having right now, although they don't know it, is CCHs: how they are done. What was that, way back there in the dim, historical past? You know, that sort of thing. Big conferences about it all.

The monitoring and regulating factors which lie back of the CCHs should be placed in your hands. There are some monitoring factors that answer all of these questions if you want to get down and figure them out. And that is simply, the CCHs are a physical activity. They are not a mental activity.

That tells you at once that they are not verbal. So if you go ahead and whistle "Yankee Doodle" and give the Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, compounded with William Pitt's lecture on the protection of colonies, what's this got to do with the CCHs? Got the idea? I mean, you could give the CCHs totally mum and they would work.

Look at what answers as a stable datum, see? Therefore, do you ever ask the PC (and take his data) the following question: "How is it going?" And then do you take his data? Do you then use the data to determine whether or not the process is flat? No, I will say you don't.

Now, why do you say, then, occasionally to the PC, "How are you doing?" Why do you say this at all?

Well, I call to your attention—I think it's clause 16, isn't it, of the Auditor's Code, which has to do with remaining in two-way communication with the PC. And that is all that has to do with. And it wouldn't matter if the PC said "I have eighteen bayonets protruding in my stomach." The PC has not visually been observed to have a single change of comm lag or physical twitch, jitters, screams, fusses, yammerings—there's been no change in anything the PC is doing for twenty minutes.

And you say to the PC, "Well, how are you doing?"

And the PC says, "Well, my stomach is full of all these bayonets. And I've had this somatic turning on and off in my left zorch, and so forth."

And you say, "Well, that's just fine. Well, thank you very much. All right. We're now going to do the nest CCH."

That sounds weird, doesn't it?

Now, two-way comm with the PC. Now, in CCH 3 and CCH 4, why do you say to the PC, then, "Are you satisfied that you did it?" That restrains you, fellow Scientologist, from pulling a gag I've seen happen too often. We don't care if the PC said he did it or didn't do it or couldn't do it or hadn't been able to do it or was satisfied that he had done it or thought he had halfway done it or if he answered you in Arabic. We would say, "That's fine," and we would give him the nest command. You got the idea?

Now, to keep the PC in two-way communication, we do the same thing, only we talk to the PC. But talking to the PC in the CCHs, you might as well be talking to the birds. It has nothing

to do with your running the process. Just make up your mind to it. Because I'll tell you what I do; and the CCHs work for me very well. And I tell you what I do.

Never with an invalidative statement or frame of mind or anything of the sort, I move a book from the left to the right. See? My left to my right, you know? And the PC, I hand him the book. And the PC picks up the book, and the PC scratches the back of his neck with it.

And then I say, "Well, are you satisfied that you did that?"

And the PC will say, "Oh, yes, I did that."

And so I take the book—and maybe not the exact motion—I turn the book on edge, and I move it from my left to my right. And I turn the book upside down the next time. (He thought he did it that time too, except he stepped on it.) And I'll turn it upside down, but I will keep moving this book Tom the left to the right until the PC does it. Otherwise, it's a flub. It is a flub.

It's a delicate balance between invalidating the PC, you see, and making sure that you duplicate the auditing command that isn't Rat, because the one from the left to the right is not flat. Couldn't be. He hadn't a clue. You got the idea? He just didn't have a clue.

You moved the book from the left to the right and the PC picked up the book and scratched under his armpit with it. And you say, "Well, did you do that?"

And the PC says, "Oh, yes. Yes. I did that." And you take the book back, and to keep from invalidating him you turn it around the other way and you move it from the left to the right. And you faintly differ it in the position of the book or something of the sort, or your hand or whether you extend your little finger or something, but it's still a motion Tom the left to the right at the same rate of speed. Got that?

All right. And I keep duplicating that type of motion until the PC is flat on it.

Hand motions, same way. Same way. I asked him if he contributed to the motion, and, shucks, he was running halfway across the room, you know? And he says, "Oh, no. Yes. Yes. Oh, yes. Yes, yes. I contributed to the motion all right."

That's good. He gets almost the same one again, and he gets it until I think he did it too. You understand? That's a delicate balance.

If a PC starts feeling invalidated because you were repeating the same motion, well, a lot of things could be wrong. "But I did that," he says. Ah, yes, but a PC can say "Well, I did that" if you moved the book from the left to the right, and then on the next motion of the book you moved it in a circle behind your own head. And the PC says, "But I did that." What did you do, PC? Yes, he just did that. He moved the book from the left to the right by scratching the back of his head with it. You got the idea? You'll run into these.

Well, so why plunge in that deep before it becomes idiotic, don't you see? The PC did it, he did it, and if he didn't do it, he didn't do it. But you mustn't be pedantic, because instead of an acknowledgment you give an invalidation. And as soon as you start giving an invalidation instead of an acknowledgment, why, the PC stark going downhill, not uphill, because you're giving him lose, lose, bee, Bee, lose. And you've got to give him win, win, win, win, win. All right. He thinks he did the same one by scratching the back of his head with a book when you moved it from the left to the right. Well, that gave him a win. You said, "That's fine."

Now I go ahead and move books from the left to the right, don't you see? I keep going on moving books from the left to the right, but not accusatively. It's a very delicate point.

Physical motion is all that counts in any of the CCHs. And it doesn't matter what the PC says. You're trying to keep in communication with the PC, and that is all there is to it. Follow? That's all there is to it.

You'd feel awfully strange if a robot clanked into the room, sat down in the auditing chair and began to pump your hand. As a matter of fact, you'd feel a little queasy. And in view of the fact that this has probably happened quite often on the track—that a robot walked in and started to dismantle you or something of the sort because you'd just had your doll body revoked—you react very badly to something that doesn't communicate. You probably wouldn't even object to the robot dismantling your doll body if he came in and said, "Well, I got an order here from the general council that you, having been guilty of moper and dopery in high space, are herewith deprived of one doll body, and we're going to take it apart and leave it on the bench for seventy-two hours."

(No, that's what I used to do. This is a different one.)

And you probably would have gone along with it. It wouldn't have been quite so bad, but some inhuman, unspeaking, unthinking, unfeeling set of cranes suddenly move in and start pulling the doll body apart, some uncertainty has entered into the situation.

So therefore, I keep the uncertainty out of the situation in doing CCHs. I say, "Well, this is what we're going to do." And I do it.

Now, you can make all kinds of mistakes in running the CCHs, but that stable datum will set you right on most of them. It's a physical action, it's physical observation, and those are where the CCHs live.

Now, there's another one; there's another one: No command in the CCHs is left understood. You don't clear a command and then insist that the PC do it from there on out. In other words, you don't say "Now, you're always going to turn counterclockwise," and then we never thereafter give him an order to turn counterclockwise. That violates the rules of auditing commands. And the principal rule of an auditing command is, it is given now, in this unit of time, and nothing has any Validity except this unit of time and the command that is just given. You know that, as an old standby from way back when.

Well, don't violate it with the CCHs. Don't say "Well, Dow hereinafter as aforesaid you're going to turn counterclockwise," and then correct the PC if he turns clockwise. Oh, no. The PC has no orders to turn clockwise.

You say, "You give me that hand." If there were no designation of any kind, it would be perfectly proper for the PC to give you either hand.

If you say "You turn around," in CCH 2, and there's no designation of any kind which way to turn around, then any way that the PC turns around is right. Right? There's no designation.

Now, if you want the PC to turn in a certain way, then before you give the auditing command, put your hand on his shoulder and start to turn him and say, "Turn around." You got that? That's a designation, isn't it?

And "You give me that hand": you nod at the hand. Pointing at the hand, you will find if you practice it, is not feasible. You can't point at the hand and then pick up the hand and then do this with the hand; it is just too much. But you can nod at his right hand and say, "You give me that hand." It's a physical thing, anyhow, you see?

The thing is all actually done by theta communication and physical motion. The two things are combined, and the English language has nothing to do with it. But we just stay in communication with the PC. You got the idea? So that's why we have the commands.

Now, putting the hand back in the PC's lap causes a great deal of difficulty to one and all. Now, what do you do? Do you put it in his lap or something?

Well now, if the PC's hand were to be very limp as he extended you the hand—if the hand's very limp, you see; you've actually had to take it by the wrist, and it's out there in an acute state of catatonia right now—and you drop his hand, if by some accident it were to strike his knee or strike the edge of the chair, you would have been in violation of a primary function of an auditor, which is to safeguard the PC from harm during a session. If anything makes a PC scream—it's you preventing somebody from coming in the room, you preventing him from lousing himself up. You get the idea?

Because it's your responsibility that the PC can be audited in that session, particularly at that moment of the auditing command. And you go ahead and drop his hand in thin air, and he knocks his wristbone, or something like this, against the edge of his chair, and so forth, well, that's a silly thing for you to do, don't you see?

The same time, it is equally silly to take a PC's hand, when the PC is putting it decently back in his lap every time—to call out a couple of destroyer escorts and have it escorted back there. You got the idea? That again is silly. So the things that are silly in the CCHs or that seem silly to you are probably wrong. You've probably got them wrong. You got the idea?

There really is no one-two-three-four-five-six drill. This was invented later while trying to teach the people, you see? There really is no such drill. The PC is giving you his hand quite nicely. Well, all right. So you take his hand. And he's removing his hand from yours quite nicely, on an acknowledgment, and putting it in his lap or on the arm of the chair. Well, what else is called for at this point? Nothing else is called for. You simply sit there, give him the command, and take his hand, thank him. But then all of a sudden he's getting coy and he doesn't want to give you his hand, so you pick his wrist up and move his hand over and put it in your hand. Right?

All right. Now, at this time you notice that the hand, as it touches yours, is in a complete state of inertia. Well, you certainly are not going to drop it any more than you'd drop your watch. You've got to put it someplace, so you put it back in his lap. Got the idea?

So reason governs these things.

All right. Now, let's take this fact, which has got some auditors a bit loused up, because a lot of auditors knew 8-C, and 8-C is not Tone 40.8-C. 8-C is not a CCH. We only carelessly refer to CCH 2 as 8-C. It's not 8-C. It never was. 8-C goes something like this: You say to the PC, "Look at that wall."

No—not 8-C; not the first 8-C. The first 8-C is "Walk over to that wall." "Touch that wall." See? "Walk over to that wall. Thank you. Touch that wall. Thank you. Walk over to that wall. Touch that wall. Thank you." That's it. "Walk over to that wall. Thank you. Touch that wall. Thank you. Walk over to that wall. Thank you. Touch that wall. Thank you." That was old 8-C in, I think, in its most virgin original form before it got raped by misunderstandings.

Now, the next evolution on this line is unimportant, because it evolved pretty far. But frankly, Tone 40 8-C, unlike CCH 1, Give Me That Hand, improved through complication. It is better in the final form that it was in. But the final form of development I don't think was ever printed. And it was a you preceded each part of its commands. "You look at that wall." And the auditor would point to the wall. "You walk over to that wall." Now, there was a further point of complication, is "You walk that body over to that wall." Skip it. That's getting too complicated. But "You walk over to that wall. Thank you. You touch that wall. Thank you. Turn around. Thank you. You look at that wall. Thank you. You walk over to that wall. Thank you. You touch that wall. Thank you. Turn around."

Now, that was a high point of complication from old SC. Now, this point of complication went further. It's "You look at that wall. You walk that body over to that wall," or "You make that body walk over to that wall. With your right hand, you touch that wall. You turn that body around clockwise." Now, you see, that's going just a little far.

It is what works. It is what works. And that earlier one that I gave you, "You look at that wall": All right, the PC looks at the floor. Clank! Your jaw comes up, straighten your hand out on his jaw, and wham! he looks at the wall, see? That's it. You grab him actually by the back of the neck and his jaw, and he looks at that wall. If he squinches his eyes, that sort of thing, you've still got this hand ready and you pull his eyelids open. That's correct. That's a perfectly correct action. Got it? All right. And he's looked at the wall.

And now, "You walk over to that wall." And he walks over to that wall or he gets carried over to that wall, but there's some kind of action takes place where he transports himself from where he is to where you want him to be.

Now, when you say "You touch that wall," you therefore don't pick out a spot for him to touch and you don't pick out a hand for him to touch with because it is not an understood proposition at all. You haven't said it in the auditing command, so therefore his putting his right knee against the wall is an adequate response to the auditing command. Correct?

All right. Now, in view of the fact that you actually intended him to touch it with his hand, after a while if the right knee seems to be just a little bit too insouciant or something of the sort, I have been known to add in "With your right hand, touch that wall"—not as a correction of my own auditing command, but on subsequent commands. But that's a change of the command and so it isn't so good. And you'll find out that if he will touch the wall even with his knee, it takes a little longer but it will run out his resistance to performing the maneuver. Do you understand? So there's no sense in being pedantic about it.

Now, I'll straighten you out quite clearly about this. It is "You look at that wall." He does. You say, "Thank you," Tone 40. And you say, "You walk over to that wall." And he does. And you say, "Thank you." And then you say, "You touch that wall." And he does. And you say, "Thank you." And then you say, "Turn around. Thank you." And that is about all there are to it.

That is a very simple evolution. Now, as I say, you can get too pedantic and so forth. But that factually—that factually—is a more operable command line than a complicated command line, and it is more effective than old 8-C by considerable.

Now, when you've got this fellow whizzing and dealing, you could hand yourself some loses if you said to yourself "Now, I intended for him to touch the wall with the heel of his left foot by Tone 40 intention, unspoken, and he didn't do it. He touched it with his hand. Therefore, I've had a lose." Yes, you could fix yourself up to have some loses that way. But that's nonsense. It exceeds the process. It has nothing to do with the process. You want this fellow under control and you want him to get the communication, and you want him to gain havingness, and this is a very fine process with which to do it.

All right. As far as CCH 3 is concerned, this is old Hand Space Mimicry, and it just doesn't matter much what you say. There are a set of commands. They haven't become unduly complicated or anything of the sort, except you don't dispose of the hands. You don't do anything like that. You give it onehanded with an unwilling PC. You only use one paw, and with the other paw you steer him through the motions. Okay? And the book, same way. You make one-paw motions with the book. And if the PC doesn't do it, of course, you tuck the book in his paw and you move the book in the motion, and you thank him for it and take the book back. All right.

Now, CCH 1, now, has as its additional ramifications—had the left hand, both hands, all kinds of hands. You understand? Well, why call it another process? Why call it another

process? You don't have to do these things. You don't have to not do these things. But you do the process that isn't flat. That is to say, if you're saying "You give me that hand. You give me that hand," and the fellow (pardon me, you don't have to say "You give me that hand," just say "Give me that hand")—the PC has been giving his right hand for about twelve, fifteen hours of auditing, and this is getting dull even to you, because he's been flat on it for some time, every time you went by it and so forth, start nodding at the other hand. See? Bust down his automaticities.

Now, I use these things that every time I come back through the CCHs I will break down an automaticity on this proposition. I bust up the installed machinery. And that's the only reason you flip over to the other hand or start saying "Give me those hands," or anything of that sort. Now, there's another point here. It has value, in other words. It has value. And that is the only thing that regulates an auditing command or process. Does it have value? Well, it does. It has value.

Another thing I do consistently in running the CCHs you might be interested in is that I change my pace every now and then. It's "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you." (paused "Give me that hand." (pause) "Thank you." (shorter pause) "Give me that hand." (short pause) "Thank you."

Now, originally, when this was being done in London, they were studying, actually, to give the same auditing command newly in the same unit of command, and they were actually building up machinery this way. And the guy could build up machinery against this thing faster than you could tear it down. And the way to bust up machinery on CCH 1 is by occasionally varying the pace.

And the PC will jump it. I just sit there and look at him. You just never heard of his hand, you know? You haven't said "Give me that hand" yet, you see? And here's his hand out there practically busting your chest open, you know? He's jumped the command—jumped the command one way or the other. And it's a good control factor. And I still actually pick up a person's hand, put it back in his lap gently, something like that, and then give the auditing command. You got the idea? I'll refuse his hand if I didn't ask for it. But that's only when it's too pointed, and there's no particular reason to communicate it because the communication is usually enough. The person is made aware of the fact that they've jumped the auditing command, and they haven't been aware of the fact they've been jumping the auditing command, you see? The last five or ten that you gave them, they've been jumping the auditing command. Their hand is halfway over at the time you say the auditing command. Of course, it doesn't have too much to do with the verbalization of the thing, but you haven't even laid the intention into him yet, see? So you're not auditing the PC. He's gone on some kind of a machine.

Well, the way to bust that down is put comm lags in your auditing. Speed it up or slow it down slightly. You don't even have to do it extremely. And the PC is giving his hand at this rate: "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you." He's giving his hand at this rate, you see? That'd be pretty fast. All right.

So you say, (short pause) "Give me that hand. Thank you." (short pause) "Give me that hand. Thank you." "Give me that hand. Thank you." "Give me that hand. Thank you." "Give me that hand. Thank you." (rapidly) "Give me that hand. Thank you." (pause) "Give me that hand." (pause) "Thank you." Got the idea? You can practically see the cogwheels on the machinery fly off. You know, the guy—"What—what's this? What's—what—what's going on here? Oh, there's an auditor here. Oh! Oh, oh. Something new has been added to this room. I hadn't noticed this auditor before."

Now, of course, the original of the CCHs was that the individual was given an auditor by the CCHs, and we found out the main thing that happened—we found some auditors, by the way, who were never found by the PC. For some peculiar reason, the PC just never found these auditors, and it'd sometimes happen, factually happen, that PC after PC wouldn't find the

auditor. And yet we found when we taught this auditor to run the CCHs, that he normally could get away with this, and he called attention of himself to the PC.

But this wasn't when we had the CCHs. This was afterwards. This first mechanism was given to a PC . . .

I think it is trait—well, it's actually traits B and C, I think, are the main traits, see?

Female voice: A, B and C, Ron.

Well, it's A, yes, but it's C that I keep my eagle eye on; and if C doesn't rise during an intensive, well, I just conclude he never found the auditor, that's all. And if he never found the auditor, there's no reason to blame the auditor. It's just the PC has a rather poor power of observation. And you should have been running the CCHs, that's all, because they were the remedy for this sort of thing. When we'd see graphs of this character we knew something else was indicated, and so on, and developed some drills by which this could be done. There were a great many of these drills, and they finally peeled down to the most effective of these drills, which became CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4. Those are the most effective of these drills. These are the ones that seem to have an effect on almost any case.

Now, the purpose of those was to find the auditor, and therefore, if the PC goes on automatic, he hasn't got an auditor, has he? Well, a PC can go on automatic. Now, you needn't worry about it too much. It doesn't put any strain on the situation. You just run the CCHs right, and this automaticity takes care of itself. But I will call to your attention the fact that it is silly to continue to pace your auditing commands on an automaticity if you don't expect one to occur in the PC. See, if you want one to occur in the PC, always keep your auditing commands exactly at the same pace.

On doing CCH 2, you'll find this PC is halfway across the room and you haven't said a word. And I am rather fond of making him look a little silly. You know, somebody's been jumping the gun, I'll just stand there. You know? "What's this all about? What's this?" See? They normally come back to where they were. I don't even tell them to come back. They will, usually; they come back and stand there, contrite. It brings it home. It brings it home.

But, of course, these points make them find the auditor, don't they, without invalidating them terrifically; because actually you are not invalidating them, they're doing something weird that has nothing to do with the process. This makes them very aware of the fact, too. Busts it up quick.

Now, running the CCHs are then based upon what is doable, and making every auditing command newly, and based as well on the fact that they are a physical process. They have to do with theta-MEST.

It's a direct theta-MEST process. Your command is a theta command. That is to say, you're laying it into the guy. You could probably do the CCHs— if you were real good, you could probably do the CCHs without opening your mouth. If you don't believe me, if you're running real hot someday, think the auditing command to the PC. You know, in other words, transmit it to the PC. I'm calling this to your attention because an auditor could really muck up a PC this way, you see? Puts the intention into the PC's head, and then comm lags, and then gives the verbal auditing command, and then criticizes the PC because the PC has jumped the gun. This would be a wonderful way of invalidating a PC. You get the idea? You actually could do it.

Because in running a PC, it happens all too often. I mean, I'll be coaching or something like that. I don't play fair on Upper Indoc coaching and that sort of thing; I start doing it Tone 40, and they'll eventually go straight into the process, bang!

What you can observe, however, is think the auditing command at the PC, you know—I mean, put the intention there, independent of your verbalization. Put the intention in the PC's head

and watch his hand jump to touch the wall. It's quite interesting. If you're good at it, you can make him do it. But that you can't do it is no particular reason for anything, because one of the things that can make you fail to do it, the PC might be rigged wrong. And you put the intention in his head to touch the wall and he stamps his foot, you see? Doesn't mean anything, except he's got his switchboards crossed.

For instance, I was very much invalidated one time. There was a fellow came to call, and I didn't particularly want to see anybody that particular day. I had a lot of work to do or a lot of loafing to do or something of the sort. I was trying to figure out something. And so I thought an intention into the living room, you see, that he would leave. And, by gosh, he didn't. And you know, I thought "This is very upsetting," you know; I mean, "What's the matter with me? I'm slipping my-cogwheels and I have Ailed utterly," and so on. I went about my work and eventually the nattering and snarling and so forth kept on coming. Didn't have anything much to do with what we were doing, you know?

Had some acquaintance with this particular individual a couple of years afterwards, and I found out something very interesting: The individual was on an intentional reverse. See, he was totally inverted on intentions. And thinking the thought into his head that he should leave would glue him in the chair, you know? Just stuck. I never did run the reverse experiment on him of thinking he should stay glued in the chair, particularly, but I have, on others, and actually seen them practically be catapulted out of their chair. Fantastic thing, you know? "Stick in the chair" and wham! They're going, "Well, we got to go now." And they just came for the evening, you know? Terrible, terrible situation.

Actually, unless you were doing a whole-body control of the PC, you could think—like you can think at a MEST object and make an ashtray sometimes move or do something weird. People running Upper Indoc sometimes have funny things happen with ashtrays, and so on. They get quite upset about it and they think they'd better not do it, and things like this. But the best thing to think at an ashtray is "You have gravity; you have no gravity," you know, that kind of thing, if you want something funny to happen with ashtrays.

Anyway, if you're just thinking an intention at the PC, you're just as likely to activate one of these crisscrossed . . . It looks like the janitor relieving the switchboard girl during a noon hour in which an emergency occurred, you know, and every wire is out of its socket, and they're all in crisscrossed across the boards, and all phones are plugged to all phones and all of them wrong. So, of course, you call up the president's office or something like this and you get the electrical-maintenance shop, you know? And it's just all crosswired. And you run into that in running the CCHs.

So it actually isn't "all the PC's fault." The PC is not necessarily being recalcitrant when he doesn't follow your auditing intention or starts to blow up or wogs or does something like this. What you're actually doing is you're giving him the intention and the guidance to carry out that intention, not the intention then called upon by the switchboard.

If you want to have some fun sometime with an E-Meter, start talking to the entities in a body. There's all kinds of screwball phenomena that we've run into. We probably have more phenomena and nonsense that we have discovered about life and so forth in Scientology than they've accumulated in the whole of the last fifty thousand years—ininitely more. It's really, really goofy.

You could sit down and start talking to somebody's circuit and just get the PC to relay what the circuit said. And for some peculiar reason, you hook in the circuit harder and harder and harder and harder and harder. And of course, the oddity is that a circuit hooks in on drop of havingness, and that you're making a communication line talk across to a circuit. You are (1) validating the circuit, and (2) you are running down its havingness. Because a circuit has no livingness in it. It is simply a motivated mass. And if there's anything running it at all, it is mass. So you get a circuit to communicate very much, and mass goes. If you want to pull somebody's circuits in on him, run his havingness down.



There's a funny experiment that goes with this, by the way. It takes rather special conditions to operate, and you have to be pretty sharp to get this thing. There's two or three of these. One of them is a problem. That's the commonest one and the easiest one to do, is the individual tells you you have [he has] a present time problem. So you say, "Think of a solution." And he gives you a solution. You say, "Good. Think of another solution to this problem. Oh, good. Good. Think of another solution to this problem." And you wonder why this PC is starting to go wog, man. And he does. He starts to go wog.

Because you're doing something to the stable core of an area of motion, and you're leaving all the motion on automatic, you see? And what happens is that—I got the mechanism on this a few weeks ago, and it's in my notes somewhere—but what happens is actually the person is not confronting the actuality of that thing at all. He's not confronting what is actually going on, he's confronting a solution to it, which means he's trying to not-is what it is, and the problem mass moves in on him. And it's quite interesting to watch.

You can ask a PC, "Do you have a present time problem?" You're fortunate, yes, he's got a present time problem. All right. You say, "Now, do you have any masses anywhere in the vicinity of your body?"

And he says, "Yes. As a matter of fact, there is one out there about four or five feet."

You say, "All right." Now, here's the exact mechanics of this: You say, "All right. Now, what is this present time problem of yours?"

And he says, "Uh . . . well, um . . . actually, uh . . . Joe and Bill and Pete uh . . . have all ganged up on me and they won't speak to me."

And you say, "Where is this black mass now?"

He says, "Well, it's eight or nine feet out there."

And you say, "Well, describe this problem you have to me."

And the individual says, "Well, it's uh . . . it's Joe and Bill and Pete, actually, and uh . . . the problem is, is I don't seem to be able to get along with them. I don't talk their language well."

And you say, "Well now, all right." You say, "Well, where is this mass now?"

And he says, "Well, it's fifteen or twenty feet out there." You're liable to get this type of response, you see?

All right. You say, "Well, good. Good. Think of a solution to that problem." And he does. You say, "Where is this black mass now?"

And he says, "Well, it's out there eight or nine feet." "Good," you say. "Well, think of another solution to this problem." And he does. And you say, "Where is this black mass?"

And he says, "Well, it's out there about four or five feet."

And you say, "Well, that's good."

You say, "Think of another solution to this problem." And so he does, and you say, "Where's the black mass?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, what black mass? Things have gone black."

All right. Now you say, “All right. Now, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem.” He does. You say, “Where’s this black mass now?”

“Well, it’s out there about a foot from my face.”

“Good,” you say. “Think of another problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. All right. Now, where is that mass now?”

“Well, that’s—it’s five or six feet out in front of me.”

You say, “Good. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Where is it now?”

“Well,” he says, “it’s out there about twelve feet.”

“Good.” You say, “Well, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Where is it now?”

And he says, “Well,” he says, “it’s way out there.”

You say, “Well, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem.” And he does, you know, and so forth. “Where is it now?”

He says, “It disappeared.”

You say, “Well, that’s good. Good. Think of a solution to that problem. All right. Where’s that black mass?”

“Well, it’s over there on the horizon.”

“Good. Now think of a solution to that problem. All right. Where is it now?”

“Oh,” he says, “it’s out there about twenty feet.”

“All right. Think of a solution to that problem. Where is it now?”

“Well, it’s out here about four feet in front of my face.”

And “Good. Now think of a solution to that problem.”

“Well, it’s gone black.”

And you can run that silly problem . . . For some reason or other, people who have problems who are capable of seeing at all visually will always tell you that there is a black mass connected in the vicinity, and solving the problem brings it in, and getting problems of comparable magnitude pushes it out. It’s a matter of confrontingness, is the clue to this. If they’re not confronting the problem—they’re avoiding it, you see it, of course, on any vacuum arrangement at all that’s bringing it in, of course it just moves in closer. And then if they are looking at it, it tends to move out, don’t you see?

Now, you can do the same thing with havingness. You say, “Well, what problem have you got?”

“Well,” he says, “Joe and Bill and Pete and they won’t talk to me anymore.”

You say, “Good. All right. Now look around the room and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around the room and find something you can have. Thank you. Where is that black mass now?”

And he says, "Well, it's out there about nine feet."

And you say, "Good. Look around the room and find something you can have. Look around the room and find something you can have. Look around the room . . . Where is that black mass now?"

And he says, "It's out there about twenty feet."

And you say, "Well, look around the room and find something you can have. And look around the room and find something you can have. Where is it now?" He says, "Well, it's disappeared."

You say, "Good. Think of a solution to that problem."

Back it comes.

And you can just play hurdy-gurdy with this problem, you see? Out it goes, in it comes. And it's within your control to move this black mass in on the PC or move it off of him, just on whether or not you have him gaze at the stable datum in the middle of it: solutions . . . You see, that stability alone is being held there by the motion, the unapparent motion in the mass. That's all confusion, you see? You're getting him not to look at the confusion when you ask him to get a solution, you see? And you've got that mechanism. When you "think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem," you've said the same thing as confront it. It's a similar statement, in other words. "That is the problem?" you see? Well, you've said confront it. You get the idea?

"invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." What if you had him doing that? Well, you've taken the automaticity over of his bank creation of that black mass, except people don't for some reason or other do well on this. I do all right on it and a lot of PCs do, but enough people don't that we don't use it anymore. No creates. That is to say, we don't run create loosely. If it turns up in the Prehav Scale, run it. So it half-kills the PC—he'll run out of it.

Here's the crux of the matter, however: that you can move around, by the regulation of problems and solutions—or mass and no mass, which is havingness and no havingness—you can move around black masses in the bank. Now, that is a simple one, and anybody can do that particular set of experiments and achieve those results, more or less. Of course, the PC has to be able to see a black mass. Sometimes they see only invisibility's and this and that, and sometimes they're so snarled into problems that nothing can move off. But on the average PC, you could probably run this experiment.

Now let's take the next experiment that proceeds from here—I said, the more difficult one. The PC has a circuit. You say, "Do you ever have voices? Ever have any voices talking to you?" The psychiatrists have been worried about voices ever since there's been psychiatry. It's practically synonymous with insanity if somebody has voices talking to him. Well, gee whiz, they ought to look at my collection, man. They ought to really look at my collection, because—it isn't so much voices, but I usually compose piano music by listening to it. And I will set up a circuit that plays piano music and then forget to take it down, and a half an hour later all of a sudden here's some piano music, you know? I'm never startled about what it is. And then I say, "Well, that's it," and that's the end of that piano music, and will take it down. You get the idea?

I wonder, for instance, how wind will sound in a certain rigging rig, you know? Is this going to be a real noisy rig, you know? And I'll set up a ship and some wind and let her howl, you know? And that's the way it sounds, too. And then say, "Well, I've found that out now," and I will set the whole thing aside and skip it, you see? I just cease to create it and it's no longer there.

I can set up moments of force—moments of force, tension, compression and that sort of thing—and check something out visually, rather than set it up mathematically. Just set it up and—well, give you a problem in a derrick, something like this. Now, when the derrick is stayed at certain points, and the stress is added at certain other points, which way is the derrick going to bend? And actually will build the derrick up and push the points to give it the stress, don't you see, and see which way it's going to bend and that sort of thing. and it works like that. And it sure saves an awful lot of wood carving and string tying and all of that sort of thing. And these things are usually right. And this is just methods of setting up situations synthetically to find out how they will operate in the real universe. And that is not uncommon. The weirdest one I ever heard about—it was Nikola Tesla, when he invented alternating current, set up an alternating-current motor. And what he wanted to know . . . He had set it up so it would work, you see. (And we've had the same motor ever since; nobody's even changed a bolt in it. And it's too bad he didn't set up a better cooling system in it.) And he let it run for two years—his problem was will it last, you see? So he set this thing up in mental imagery, you know? He set it up in the bank and let it run for two years, and at the end of two years he decided that it was pretty well designed, so he built it. That's Nikola Tesla. That was the way that boy invented everything.

Now, I'm not above doing a mathematical problem on an abacus. You know, put an abacus up out there and shuffle the beads on the abacus back and forth, carrying over decimals of one character or another, and keep carrying these decimal setups, and finally add it over on the left and right side of the scale.

An abacus is a very interesting piece of machinery. It's almost an adding machine or a multiplying calculator. They give it to little kids in school and I see these little kids in school going wing-wing with the beads, you know, and they're counting one, two, three, four, five—learn how to count on it or something, or add. Well, that isn't the way you use one. You use them on complicated septisigmal systems or decimal systems or something like this, and you keep carrying them over from one side to the other. I suppose you could write a book four feet thick on the use of an abacus.

Anyway, set one of those things up. Well, of course, that's a very easy thing to set up. It's a very easy thing to set up a column of figures and find out whether or not the figures are right. It is actually much more fun to simply set up a computer that, after you've done the problem, will verify the result.

This is tradition—people like Lecky and so forth. I think it was Lecky, the guy that wrote probably the basic test on navigation for guys that didn't like pedanticism. He said a navigator is no good unless—when he calculates the position he doesn't have a sixth sense to tell him that the answer is right or wrong. He said a navigator is no good who can't do this. Actually, very few people can do this, but the best navigators can all do it. They'll add up columns of figures, and so forth. Susie's seen me do this: go down the line on—not navigation—go down on the line and get about halfway through a problem and say, "Well, that's wrong. That's wrong." You see? You got six columns of figures or something of the sort, but the answer is wrong, and just throw it out and do the problem all over again. Sure enough when I get down to that point, something was off, see?

All right. This simply is an establishment of rightness or wrongness, and it's also done by circuitry.

All right. I'm talking now about useful circuitry. Let's go a little bit further over into useful circuitry. Common circuitry—this is not obsessive circuitry. This is just ordinary, run-of-the-mill voices in the head, you see? But this is the way they are really set up.

We get into a situation where we want to know what it's going to be like tomorrow—weather. We call the Weather Bureau, and they give us a lot of calculations all based on the

rudimagoojits and the wingdings that are going whizzle-whizzle on top of the mutt-wutt. And this all calculates with the dice-o-therms and the cat-a-bars, you see?

Man, there have been more aviators plowed into fog banks and so forth by these dice-o-therms all twisted around the cat-a-bars. I wouldn't be seen dead with one of them myself.

They finally got a practical method of investigating hurricanes. They fly an aircraft patrol over the area all the time, and when they see one, they take its latitude and longitude on Loran bearings and report it. And then they plot its course and speed, and they say where it is going. And even then they predict its destinations wrong.

Weather is not something that is trustworthy. Actually, do you realize that if you plotted out for England "Tomorrow will be fair," that you would be 50 percent right? Did you know that? And you know the Weather Bureau only hits 38 percent? It's interesting, isn't it? So if they just took it at random and told us every day tomorrow would be fair, at least they'd be giving us hope.

But the science of weather prediction is—well, let's be kind—it's in its infancy, and they figure out what the dew point is on the Rye up in North Manchester, and that gives us the Sussex coast, you know? I mean, it's real nice. I've studied with these boys, and they have a very serious approach to life. Let's say that. But what I used to twit them about was their tremendous overweening confidence in the things that were going hurgle-gurgle and their total avoidance of ever reading yesterday's prediction—the only way they could keep their morale up, is the way they used to inform me.

Well, you can set up a circuit that will give you tomorrow's weather. Very easily. I wouldn't go to sea without one.

Now, some people do this and then blame it on the rheumatism, because they hook it into the rheumatic circuit, you see? And then they say, "Twinge— bad weather tomorrow," you see? But you needn't get that drastic. There's no reason to set up an alarm system just because it's going to be foggy, you know?

The facts of the matter is, is what you set it up is out here, and you say, "What is the weather going to be tomorrow?" So you take the increment of time known as tomorrow and you observe it. And that tells you what the weather is, of course, because you look around the scenery, having looked at the increment of time which is tomorrow, having looked around and found whether or not it is raining, windy, foggy, cold or hot, you are then pretty safe—providing you can with equanimity look at tomorrow. That's how simple a circuit is.

Compare it now to all these substitute calculations. If you could simply say, "All right. Let's take a look at the weather tomorrow . . ." In view of the fact that the weather hasn't got very much consequence to it—almost all of you have lived through rainstorms without melting—this is an element of tomorrow which almost anybody could mock up, or almost anybody is willing to observe. There's no great danger in it.

Oh, quite something else: We are in a tremendous emergency with regard to court actions or something of this sort, and we want to know, man, because our whole life is hanging on the rim of the precipice, what is the judge going to say tomorrow, see? Or who is going to win—is Greasy Knees going to win the third at Pimlico, see? We've got the family jewels on it, and we haven't bothered to tell anybody that we put the family jewels on it, you see? Now, there's lots of pressure connected with this sort of thing. So we say, "Let's see."

Well now, look, with what confidence are we regarding tomorrow, you see?

We're regarding it with no confront. because there's tremendous numbers of confronts mixed up in tomorrow that we don't want to have anything to do with. We won't look at the bad decision the judge is going to make or the fact that Greasy Knees is going to live up to his name, and . . . See? We won't look at those consequences, so we get a one-sided view of the

increment of time known as tomorrow. And then that becomes very untrustworthy because we are postulating at the same time that Greasy Knees is going to win the race and the judge is going to put down a favorable decision. So we wind up looking at our own postulates, not looking at tomorrow's weather. And then, of course, we get a wrong predict about 90 percent of the time. Get the idea? So you can predict to the degree that you can confront. And if a person's confrontingness is very bad off, never trust their prediction.

All of a sudden I was going down a boulevard in Phoenix, Arizona, driving along minding my own business. I must have had some kind of an overt that day (probably thinking bad thoughts about Purcell or something), and I got halfway down through the middle of the block, and Wanda the psychic reader suddenly diverges from a stream of traffic on a four-lane highway and drives casually, not even rapidly, this way across the street and runs into me.

Male voice: She mandated!"

You said it! And her father got out and gave me her professional card. I don't think I would have had any confidence in that girl.

Now, her confront was a thing to be horrified about, you see? Nobody got hurt, nothing happened, but this is pretty weird. But her confront was terrible. We found out she was trying to turn a corner, but that was half of one of these five-hundred- or six-hundred-foot blocks behind her! She was turning a corner where there wasn't any!

Now, wouldn't you think her confront was rather poor? All right. Now we're going to base a lot of reliance on her prediction. Ah, but her prediction is directly related to her ability to confront.

Now, people who can't or won't confront anything don't even confront present time, much less tomorrow. But they will try to confront obsessively tomorrow or yesterday in the hopes that they won't have to confront today. And, of course, there isn't any tomorrow that they're confronting. That is a totally goof tomorrow, you see? And the yesterday probably isn't right either. Ask them what they had for breakfast, and they'll give you the awfulest ramifications, which is just a total not-is substitute of what they really ate, you know?

Now, here's the situation. If you're in fairly good shape on the subject of confrontingness, you could rise well above weather.

glut let's supposing that hiking up into tomorrow was of no great consequence to us. You know, we didn't particularly want to go through the ritual, you see, of saying "Let's see. What is the date? All right. What is the hour? At what time will we be doing something tomorrow? All right. Now, let's confront the area in which we're going to do that thing. All right. Now let's see. Are they cirrus, cumulus, 'altocastalatus,' nimbus," you know? And do a complete catalog of the situation. Take out our wet-and-dry-bulb reading, you see, and so forth, and get the whole thing straight and write it down. Seems a little bit arduous.

So what you do is set up a secondary circuit. Not because you can't confront tomorrow but because you don't take time to confront tomorrow, you set up a secondary circuit and make it look at tomorrow. It's a prediction circuit. Now it looks at tomorrow, and you set it up to look at tomorrow instantly and give you only one result: yea or nay. You can set up these instantaneous circuits with the greatest of ease, so long as they're just yea-or-nay circuits or something like this. They're not going to give you any complex result, you know? You know, you could even set it up for tomorrow and if it's going to be nice weather, wave a green nag, you know, and if it's going to be bad weather, why, wave a red one. I don't care what, see? It's just boom, you know? And you eventually find yourself possessed of some kind of a circuit that tells you the weather tomorrow.

And one day you're scrambling around, doing something else and you suddenly look up and something is waving, you know, a brilliant red flag.

Now, where you go nuts on circuits is when you say, “Who put that there?”—no, “Who else put that there?” and “What does it mean?” And we can get quite a game out of this. It’s a big game of mystery and so forth. Well, all you got to do is find out the purpose of the circuit and it’ll ordinarily blow up, or you can set it up.

Now, PCs that haven’t got control of their circuits or haven’t taken over their circuits for many, many years, haven’t inspected them—I say many years, I’m talking about many billions of years; they’ve just let this bric-a-brac accumulate and they’ve not done anything about it, and 60 forth—you start auditing them and something waves a red flag. They say, “What’s this? What’s this thing?” you know? Or a little train goes by on the track with a sign in each car. You know, a little sign in each car, and it says It Will Be Bad . . . , and the next three signs are blurred.

And the PC says, “I’m going round the bend,” you know?

Or you ask a PC, “How did you know the answer to that question?”

He said, “Well, this little train went by and it had a word in each car.” That’s the answers to the question.

You’ll find some people go around on circuitry auditing, don’t you see? Only their circuits are so old, so forgotten, so neglected, and were put up in such an anxiety of not-to-confront that of course they can’t confront anything about them now. And any time they get in the vicinity of them, then the circuit tells them what to say and do. And you’re running into this in auditing all the time, and that’s the anatomy of the circuit. It’s just a no-confront of any kind whatsoever. Therefore, running Havingness and Confront along with processes actually improves the circuit.

How does it improve the circuit? It improves confront; naturally, that improves the status of circuits, because circuits only go bad when an individual refuses to confront an area and puts a circuit in it instead. He first did it to save time; later on he began to believe that he couldn’t confront that area, there was something very unconfrontable there. Why is it unconfrontable? Well, he has a circuit doing it, doesn’t he? So therefore it couldn’t be possibly . . .

It’s like the fact that they put a television camera in the atomic blast furnace, you know? Because they can’t put a nuclear physicist in there, they know that. They’ve tried it, you know, and they just can’t make it. I don’t know why not.

Anyway . . . Anyway, that’s remote viewing, or remote knowing.

Now, it’s this other thing I was telling you about. You hear a bird chirping outside, ask the PC to make a picture out there and then bring it in here and look at it to find out what kind of a bird it is. And my God, you get anything from a rhinoceros to a three-tailed whoosis, you know? Hasn’t anything to do with this cuckoo that is out there; nothing to do with a cuckoo. And you very often ask an individual this. This is an interesting diagnostic question.

You talk about bric-a-brac that we know in Scientology; we know so darn much that it’s . . . I tell you, if we were handling this as a scientific activity which cataloged everything we knew, you see, in relationship to it, and then took a paper down on everything there was there; when you realize that a preclear is capable of an infinity of differences, you just multiply infinity times the number of preclears there are and you got that many papers we’d have to file, and I don’t like to file papers.

Somebody will curse me someday for not having written everything down that we ever knew and put it in a library file. But let me call to their attention that people have been doing this for a long time and they still didn’t know anything. There might be something suspect about the method.

All right. You tell this PC, “All right. Now, your primary aberration, and the exact terminal we want to run now: All right, that’s what we’re interested in. We’re interested in your primary aberration, the exact terminal we want to run. All right. Now, over there where it is, or wherever it is, make a picture of it. Good. Thank you very much. Now look at the picture. Now tell me what it is.”

And you know, they will tell you some of the most remarkable things. It may or may not be the right answer, but they certainly are remarkable. They’re certainly remarkable. They’ll get some pictures of childhood influences.

A psychoanalyst would go absolutely drooling mad. The absolute deliciousness of this particular modus operandi would have thrown him into a tizzy, you know, like tigers get when you put perfume on them. Man, that would be marvelous. He’d just have an unlimited data. He wouldn’t have to depend on dreams anymore; he wouldn’t have to depend on anything anymore, anyplace.

All he’d have to do is tell this person, “Now make a picture of what’s wrong with you. Now look at the picture and tell me what it is.”

And the fellow says, “Well, it’s a picture—it’s a picture of my grandfather sitting in front of the stove. And I seem to be in the stove.”

(I did that myself one time—surprised myself half to death.)

“Now what’s this? What’s this?”

“Yeah, well, that’s what it is.”

“What’s this?”

In the first place, you made a picture you told him to make a picture of the bird that he heard and you heard outside the window, and then bring it in the house and take a look at it. And he didn’t get a picture of a bird, he got a picture of a rhinoceros. Or it was a different kind of bird, is the “usualest” thing. It’s an alter-is.

Well, naturally it’s an alter-is, because this action of taking the picture of the object and then looking at the picture is of course an alter-is of confront. You didn’t tell him to take a look at the bird and say what it was: You told him to take a picture of the thing and say what it was. You got it? So you’ve removed it that much, so therefore he’s just that far from being able to confront it. Okay?

All right. Our next point, then, as we’re looking at this, is a very simple one, is that you’re trying to get individuals to look directly at things, and their circuitry encourages them not to look at things because it’s normally set up to spare them the trouble of confronting, or to avoid having to confront something, so they confront it on a via. And as you audit the PC, these things go live.

Two things make them go live. His havingness drops, so therefore he becomes a little anxious, so therefore he starts relying on circuitry to predict and that sort of thing. Or his confront drops. Or his confront improves, or his havingness improves, and either way these things can go live. In other words, his havingness or confront drop, they go live, on a deteriorated basis. His havingness and confront is improved, they go live because he’s coming up through it, don’t you see?

And all of them are observation on a via. So everything he’s trying to do basically is characterized by alter-iness or observation on a via. Auditing on a via, everything on a via—it’s just on a via. That is the motto of the thetan. It’s not direct, it’s on a via. And your methods



of getting him there are to walk him up rapidly so he has less and less vias, less and less vias, less and less vias, which means less and less circuits, less and less circuits, less and less barriers—you get the idea?—more and more confidence, more and more assurance. More and more ability to confront, actually, isn't it?

That's why you don't have confront on your main list, because itself is a result and an end product; it itself isn't a doingness, it's an ability.

All right. That explains to you, then, some of the oddities that occur, particularly in running in the CCHs. And these oddities are considerable. Because you're activating circuits and you're knocking out circuits, because the direct control and communication brings about a continuous shift of circuitry in terms of havingness. And then because you've got him in PT and he is confronting another body, another being, his own body and the physical universe, of course his havingness is also coming up on that particular basis and you shift through lots of circuitry. And it's a way of plowing straight through circuitry. And you get all kinds of things going live and shutting off, and so forth.

Now, if you were to turn around and talk to these circuits, and said, "Well, how do you think the PC's doing now?"

"Oh, you think it's going to rain tomorrow. Oh, I see. I get it. Hm. I understand. Hm-hm."

If you're plowing somebody rapidly through circuits, what are you trying to do? You're trying to plow him through circuits and raise his havingness and his confront, basically, with the CCHs, which is communication and control, improve his havingness.

Well, what's your end result if you suddenly go into communication with these circuits? Because circuits are coming live and circuits are going out and circuits are coming in and circuits are going out, your PC's liable to say an v thing.

This is a beefy process, you see, your CCHs. And your PC at any given moment is liable to tell you anything. He's liable to predict anything. Anything is liable to happen. So the less attention you pay to what the PC is saying or what the PC thinks or what the PC feels while you're running the CCHs, the better off you're going to be. And that's why you never end a process just because the PC thinks it's flat. And as you're plowing somebody through circuitry of one kind or another, as he is moving up the line, he gets somatics, he gets comm lags, he dopes off, he does this, he does that. What's dope-off? It's just a no-confront of magnitude, you see? And it means that something is happening to the confrontingness of this PC. It's a good indicator.

Comm lag means something is happening to the confrontingness of the PC. Dope-off also means something is happening to the havingness of the PC. Dope-off also means that something is happening to the confronting of the PC. There we go. I mean, it means all those things.

Also there are many other manifestations. All of a sudden a circuit that was set up in cave days in order to remove him from the path of snakes—that when he saw a snake he was supposed to leap violently eight feet to the left—and all of a sudden he starts moving and this old circuit goes into action. And he'll try to explain it to you in fifty dozen different ways but he hasn't even confronted the circuit. The trouble is, he's moved eight feet to the left, or he's tried to, or he feels he should, and therefore he doesn't look that he should move eight feet to the left. What he thinks is there's something dangerous under his feet. You got the idea?

So he's getting all kinds of "survival mechanisms" which are coming in and out, and prediction mechanisms are coming in and out, and series of forebodings and that sort of thing will all operate. Why? Because it's all on this basic circuitry.

Now, you, as you sit right there, use circuitry of one kind or another. As long as the circuitry isn't out from underneath your control and you haven't parked it on the basis that "I will never be able to confront this, I will never be able to cope with this sort of thing, so I'll set up this machine to cope with it because I myself am an incompetent"—and when that is totally the basis of circuitry, from that time on, that circuit gets hidden.

When you're running the CCHs, that circuit is liable to spring out. But what end of it springs out? It's liable to be "It can't be confronted," or "I will never be able to confront this," or "It is impossible to confront this." And the PC thinks it's the circuit that is impossible to confront, when, as a matter of fact, it's the fact that elephants spray water all over you in circuses, and that mustn't be confronted because your mother gets mad at you and spansks you.

This kid goes out and he says, "I'll get even with my mother. I'll set up this circuit and . . ." or any kind of a computation, don't you see?

And these circuits are absolutely infinite in their purposes. They're as infinite as a PC can make postulates. And they run out and a PC is liable to tell you anything in any kind of auditing, and therefore it's only up to you to tell whether or not any of these CCHs or anything else is flat.

I don't think I've ever talked about this at any great length—circuits—but they appear, actually, in Book One. I've never said this much about circuits before. It isn't a matter that circuits are all bad. What gets bad about circuits is somebody sets up circuits because he himself is unable, he says. And when circuits have this type of postulate mixed up in them, why, they get very haywire indeed.

As you get on up the line, you all of a sudden find out that you will set up and knock out circuits just for the hell of it. You wonder what you should eat for lunch. Well, you do this right now, undoubtedly: you wonder what should you eat for lunch. Well, set it up, set it up in front of you and taste some of it. You know, that's quite a common action.

And don't, however, go through this oddity of having finished lunch at a Howard Johnson's or something of the sort, and their pickled pigs' knuckles that day happen to be sour and rancid or something, and don't then take your eating circuit and set it up so that it'll be impossible after that ever to set up pigs' knuckles. Because then something infinitely bad is evidently wrong with pigs' knuckles, so you even smell pigs' knuckles and you feel bad, you see? Where, as a matter of fact, the pigs' knuckles were a long way back. You put them in the bank so that you'd never confront them again, which seems to me to be an odd rationale. But a thetan is very capable of it and does it consistently.

My apologies for making this an overtime lecture, but I thought you might be interested.

Audience: Thank you very much.

Okay.

Thank you.