

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: ANATOMY OF MAYBE, SOLUTIONS

A lecture given on
12 July 1961

Thank you.

Well, I didn't mean to interrupt Suzie's talk.

What is it? The 12th of July?

Audience: The 12th of July.

All right. What she can tell you is far more practical. And she can tell it with a lot more bayonets probably.

Well, you haven't had a chance to ask any questions, and I've been informed by Mary Sue that you are now getting into a shape that you know what you don't know. So, what question would you like to ask today? Great, isn't it?

Female voice: Don't disappoint me.

All right.

Female voice: I was wondering when you decide and how when to put the ten-way bracket from a five-way bracket. When you decide?

When you decide to go from a ten-way bracket to, pardon me, a five-way bracket to a ten-way bracket?

Female voice: Yes.

Ah, well, you're dealing with a problem which has actually no basis in mechanics beyond this: The reason you go to a . . . from a five-way to a ten-way bracket is the plus-minus proposition. It's covered in the anatomy of maybe and I think that is covered in what? That's Scientology 8-80, isn't it?

Female voice: Yes.

And that's the anatomy of maybe. And a continued uncertainty on the part of a pc . . . a continuous no-cognition, the pc who says . . . never says, "What do you know?" is hanging so hard in maybes. And his maybes are so fantastic that as you look this thing over you'll see from the anatomy of maybe that the way to take it apart is take it on the plus side, take it on the minus side. "How have you done it? How have you not done it? How have you coughed? How have you not coughed?" You get the idea? And his idea of "Maybe I will cough" disappears.

"Maybe" does not have in itself, you see, any faintest reality in fact. It is simply a manifestation of a positive and a negative; and your positive and negative manifestation add up to maybe.

Now, problem one consists of postulate A versus postulate B and between these two postulates you get an indecision, don't you see? But usually postulate A is "do it," and postulate B. is "don't do it." That is the commonest variety of a problem.

And if you ask somebody that you're trying to take problems apart by solutions . . . which can be done; I'll tell you how to do that in a moment . . . you would say some version of "do it," "don't do it," and then the decision can emerge. But as long as he's hanging on "I've got to do it. I mustn't do it," then no decision can emerge. And "maybe" is simply a counterbalanced insistence on "must" and "must not," or "it is" and "it is not." And these things equally insistent, adds up into the indecision of maybe, but the indecision of maybe is not itself a fact. Have you got the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. If that's not a fact, then you've got to take apart the thing by taking apart its two sides. And then the indecisional character or the maybe character, the uncertainty . . . and this is quite important in psychotherapy because we're not handling the whole subject of anxiety. The whole subject of anxiety is resident in this anatomy of maybe.

Well, anxiety simply is . . . consists of "must" and "must not," "is" or "is not." And these things are so counterbalanced that of course, the person can't make up his mind, and anxiety is simply a heightened or frantic state of maybe, you see.

So, all right. Let's . . . supposing you have a terribly, terribly, terribly anxious or nervous pc who is very indecisional and doesn't know whether to come to session and doesn't know whether or not to come to session and thinks there might be great consequences in coming to session or not coming to session, and wonders whether or not they should do it this way or should do it that way and they are just dramatizing indecision all the time, all the time, all the time. Actually, you should know that it is a mistake to run a five-way or six-way bracket on them. you would have to run . . . pardon me, a five-way bracket . . . you'd have to run one of these ten-way brackets on them. Got the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

Because they're . . . they cannot land. They're incapable of landing on plus and incapable of landing on minus, so the longer you run anything in the middle that is avoiding this tremendous condition in which they find themselves, why, the longer they're going to be in processing.

And this is the case that never says, "What do you know?" You've run this case, you've run this case. This case gets no cognition's. This case doesn't ever say, "Well, I'm getting better." This case never says, "Well, there's some way out of the hole." Or the case never even says, "I'm getting much worse." You know? It just goes on grind, grind, grind, grind, grind, grind, grind, grind. Well, you've run into the anatomy of maybe. And the total absence of cognition winds us up into the total presence of uncertainty and anxiety.

"I don't know whether I should be processed or not, you see, because if I am processed, da-da-da . . . you never know. And if I . . . I . . . I don't know. I . . . you know. I . . . isn't there ter . . . some terrible consequence? Are you very sure that it doesn't hurt the mind?" And so on and you'll run into all of this.

The person is saying to you "maybe." The person is saying to you, "indecision," "anxiety," all that sort of thing. Well, practically every process you do on them, you ought to somehow or another bend it around so there's plus and minus, plus and minus, plus and minus, plus and minus, see.

Never run a plus, plus, plus, plus, because you'll get a stuck flow promptly; and never run a minus, minus, minus, minus, because you'll get a stuck flow promptly. And that is what decides it. The condition of the pc is what decides it.

Now, about one pc, maybe, out of every . . . this IS an inaccurate figure, but it's just somewhat of idea of order of magnitude. Maybe one out of twenty never says, "What do you know."

All right. Well, that particular pc . . . when you're sizing them up, you run them for a little while . . . just make up your mind, everything on this pc has got to be run plus and minus. Everything

So, this would make the rudiments sound like this: "Do you have a present time problem? Is there a present time problem you don't have?" Got it?

Female voice: Yes.

"Do you have an ARC break? All right. Is there an ARC break you don't have? Thank you very much."

“Are you withholding anything? All right. Very good. Very good. Is there anything you’re not withholding? Fine. All right.”

You could even go to the redact ad absurdum of asking such a pc, “Is it all right if I begin this session now? What would happen if I didn’t?”

And you’ll find that your noncognizing pc will all of a sudden be saying, “What do you know?” you know. And this long grind, grind, grind will tend to disappear and go into limbo.

So, that is when you decide this. The greater the anxiety, the greater the indecision, the greater the uncertainty of the pc, the more you must run both sides of an auditing command; and it just depends on that. And most pcs . . . the large majority of your pcs . . . this just falls into place and you can do it most any way you want to do it. And it’ll go along. And you would do a Prehav Assessment and it’s Failed Leave, well, you don’t have to run Leave. They may dramatize Leave a little bit immediately after you’ve run Failed Leave, but doesn’t matter. You can get away with it, don’t you see.

But if this person is one of these “can’t change,” “don’t go anyplace,” so forth, you assess them on Failed Leave, you know instantly if they’re going to blow straight across the scenery. They’re going to disappear on you if you say “Failed Leave” about twice without saying “leave.” Got the idea?

You should recognize this as that particular case, because I think that case is the bane of your existence. The case actually will change, but never seems to notice it. Yeah. Well, that’s how you handle that case. you can take that case apart like you can count pennies on a table. Okay?

Female voice: Just something more to add here. Would it also depend on terminals . . . running terminals? SOP Goal on the terminal or on the pre . . .

No, ma’am. Doesn’t . . .

Female voice: . . . only on the precl . . .

. . . doesn’t determine. Terminal has nothing to do with it. On most SOP Goals cases, you just run the level . . .

Female voice: Right, thank you.

. . . and that’s fine. But if you’ve got a super anxious pc who is being very doubtful about everything . . .

Well, this kind of a manifestation . . . you’re running . . . you’re running a terminal . . . you’re running a terminal “whizzlestick.” And this pc just doesn’t know if that’s the level or not. You’ve assessed Cause. “Whizzlestick, Cause. Well, I don’t know whether that’s the level or not. I wouldn’t be sure that’s the level. Are you sure that’s the level? That couldn’t have fallen on that, could it have?” That isn’t the level then, really, is it? Well, the auditing command you put together had better be Cause-Not Cause. Okay?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. You bet.

Male voice: Ron, on Routine 1A, when you’re running “Recall a PTP” or one of the processes, can you change during a session, and when?

All right. In running Routine 1A, and you’re running “Recall a PTP,” or whatever you’re running, can you change within the session? The mildness would be the determination. The answer is “yes.” Not ordinarily, but it could be done. And it would be determined by the mildness of reaction, not the violence of reaction.

If you’re getting tremendous tone arm reaction, and you’re getting tremendous pc reaction as a result of running such a process as “Recall a PTP,” it would be an Auditor Code break to shift it not only in the

session but in the intensive. Because it's running too hot and it's running too heavy, and it would be too painful a shift to suddenly alter the auditing command.

But the other side of it, you can. The thing doesn't seem to be doing very much. You're . . . you know, you're getting some tone arm action. You're getting a division of the Tone Scale or something like this, and the pc seems to be doing it rather easily. And they were having a little difficulty a short time before doing it, but they all of a sudden start doing it easily or something, and it looks like it's getting a little too easy with the pc or something like this. you could shift. You could shift to Confront.

This is something like I was saying, you dig up the ore from the bottom of the mine and put it out on the dump. Well, you could shift over onto Confront. And all of a sudden watch that tone arm fly again, see? You can do an adjustment like this. you can always do an adjustment on processing when the process you are running is no longer producing marked results. But, if you change a process before the rule of change has occurred . . . the twenty-minute test has occurred . . . you have committed a serious blunder not to go back sometime and complete that process. You got the idea?

Male voice: Yeah.

It basically would mean that you probably made a mistake. It comes under the heading of rectifying an error. A person would . . . would run all right on Confront, but won't run at all well on Recall, and you ran Recall; and Confront won't get a heavy needle reaction, and so forth, but then, a heavy tone arm reaction. But you don't get much on Recall, see.

Well, it's actually the correction of a blunder. What you do would bring him, by cycle, up to PT whether running Confront or Recall or anything else. You get him solidly in PT and shift.

And that would be the main thing that would determine whether you could shift or not, is can you get him into PT? See? If he's out of PT and the tone arm is moving like mad, well, you wouldn't shift. You'd carry on, that's all.

Any auditing command, of course, can be modified. If you weren't able to modify an auditing command or change a phrasing of a process or a different approach on the same subject, of course you'd be hung with your own mistakes; and you'd also be hung with the diminishing change.

This pc, you've run him for . . . you ran him all day yesterday, and you run him on "Recall a Problem." Just as simple as this, you see. And that tone arm was just whizzing, man. That was going over and jumping on . . . hitting the needle on the head, and turning the sensitivity knob up all by itself, you know. And just really whizzing.

When you bring him into session, and all of a sudden it isn't whizzing Check your rudiments. Your rudiments are all in. Just not getting any reaction on that process today. Well, don't waste auditing Don't waste auditing Shift it over. see if you can assess another command here that does get a big heavy needle reaction, and run that one, and that would be your basic criteria. I m not trying to give you anything complicated.

By the way, if you ran "Recall a Problem" during the whole of that session and the next session, it'd probably come back to doing its business all over again, you see. It's just what's faster.

As long as you're running Problems, run them any confounded way you want to, or in any fashion you want to; but there are certain rules that have to be followed if you're going to do a good job of auditing and one of those rules is you don't change a process which is producing marked change on the case. If your process is damped out and isn't producing very much change, why, shift it in its type or wording, making a big loud note in the middle of a . . . in caps on the middle of your Auditor's Report . . . that "this process was changed when not flat" or something of that sort, see. At least let somebody in on the secret. That answer your question?

Male voice: It does, thank you.

All right.

I'd like to say something more about problems and types of processes that could be used on problems here, and here's a good time as any to say them. Here's an interesting point about problems and solutions.

I may have given you too much of an impression that it is impossible to run a solution. Now, no, that is not factual. You can run solutions. There are many ways of running solutions and getting away with it. But I'm talking about running something like this, preventing the person from examining the problem and always insisting that he run a solution. Yes, that is impossible. But you run solutions on cases all the time. SOP Goals. What is a goal? A goal is a solution to some problem. You've learned that already. You've seen that.

All right. Another comment I'd like to make here is it seems to be tentatively true . . . from observation of reports and from what Mary Sue says . . . that those people who are being run on Problems and being given Security Checks and being assessed on SOP Goals are getting rather rapid trouble-free assessments on SOP Goals. Does that confirm your understanding of it? And those people who aren't being run on any preparatory processes and Security Checks at the same time are making poor, long-term, scramble progress. Is that the way it looks like? Hm? Well, tentatively, we make the observation that a case runs faster in a Goals Assessment if run on Problems and Security Checks at the same time . . . at different periods of the day.

All right. Now, let me say some more about this solution thing. There is a whole problems process, a very old one . . . at least three years old, two . . . two, three years old. It's probably older than that. I'm always finding something new had a precursor, or some two or three years before that it's already occurs in the notebooks. And that is, you take the condition of the pc, off your own bat, you assume that it's a solution to a problem. Of course, you'll be right. But you assume that it's a solution to a problem. This is the way of doing this, you see.

And then you ask the person, "What problem could that be a solution to?" Now, this fellow's got a headache. Got a continuous headache. All right. So you say, "All right. Now, what problem would a continuous headache be a solution to?" Now, obviously, they're looking at a solution without examining the problem, right? Now, this brings us forward to a method of nulling goals which would be too insidious for words and it is not usable. I underscore that. This is not usable.

This could however be done: We've assessed this person for a cadet. This is the final terminal that emerged, and so on. We could say, without using the Prehav Scale, if we didn't have a copy of one or something . . . this is not recommended, see; this is not a doable action . . . "What problem would a cadet be a solution to?" That's the pc's terminal.

You're going to produce action. That's for sure! That's for sure, because you're going to run him into every problem he's ever had for the last two hundred trillion, or ever since he's adopted this particular terminal. You're going to run him into every one of them. So, clang! clang! clang! Expect action.

It is a thing that could be done which you might get away with. It is not a recommended thing to do. you got it?

All right. Now, I'm just giving you examples here of what you can do with this. you take the . . . the stable datum and you ask him, "What confusion was that a stable datum to?" you see. You're saying the same thing as, "All right, what problem would a continuous headache be a solution to?" See? You're asking . . . you've taken the stable datum, which is a headache and you've asked him for the problem. Because he never confronted that or he wouldn't have the headache, you see.

To get him to confront this, however . . . this is not always successful. This is successful enough to be very useful to you. This is a good way of getting rid of a chronic PTP or something like that. It's not always successful because you may have put him up above the level of his confront, like crazy.

Well, he can't even confront the headache, because he's complaining about it and yet you're asking him to step back into the further never-never land of unreality and confront the problem that that's a solution to. And on some cases, you're going to lay a complete ostrich egg on this, you see. Their confront just is not up to this. That is all. But it is a useful mechanism and is something to know about and it is usable. You can do this.

Now, you can take a goal. Here's something you can't do. you can take a goal and you'd say, "Tell me a problem that goal would be a solution to." We've assessed the fellow, and the pc "to be unencumbered." All right. This was the goal.

All right, and we say, "Well, what problem would being unencumbered be a solution to?" And of course, this is something like picking somebody up and throwing them into the tar pit and say, "Swim, you . . ." But the . . . these are heroic things, so heroic that they will exceed the level of the preclear's reality quite ordinarily and easily.

You could, however, take a present time problem and try to run this with it and you would very often succeed with great rapidity. It would be quite astonishing to you how often you would succeed in taking this difficulty the pc has and assuming, just whole hog . . . it's just assuming that it must be a solution to a problem and just telling the fellow to look at the problem and it would blow up with great rapidity.

You take some fellow who's worried about . . . well, let's take a very common one. Impotence. This is very common. And you say, "Well, what problem would impotence be a solution to?" You know, you keep talking about this.

Or the fellow keeps giving you this hidden standard, and this hidden standard apparently has absolutely nothing to do with his Goals Assessment. You know, the Goals Assessment is here and the hidden standard is over there in the corner, but he tries to find out if the Goals Assessment is working all the time to find out whether or not it turns off the burning in his right ear. We want to get rid of this hidden standard? This is a good way to do it. you see?

It has lighter usages than Goals Assessments, according to my experience, at least, this far. It has lighter usages. You can get rid of PTPs, of short or long duration this way. you can get rid of a chronic somatic or something of this sort rather easily.

And the auditing command that would go along with this is a very pat one. It's just: "What problem would a (whatever it is) be a solution to?" Quite useful. A useful gimmick. You'll get an awful lot of chronic somatics and things like that off your pc with no consequence. We're doing the oddity, you see, of solving problems without the consequences of problems and solutions, which is the greatest oddity in the world.

Scientology is full of these oddities. It's the oddity of getting away with it. We're doing the impossible, living in a universe that is tailor-made never to get out of, you see. Tailor-made. Tailor-made for you never to let anybody else out of it either. And we're in situations which are all tailor-made to stay in. And hitherto getting out of them has been attended by all the consequences of a jailbreak, you know. Complete with sirens and police dogs! It's all booby-trapped.

You solve problems, solve problems, solve problems, you've had it, you see. That's booby-trapped down the line. All right. So all of a sudden we solve problems with no sirens. The front gates of the prison disappear, the prison disappears. We get out of the prison by dropping the prison, not by busting out through the front gates and making some iron monger a lot of work.

And we've got a lot of these . . . a lot of these in the works, and we do this quite a bit. It's the only way it could be done, don't you see. you can't cure, as man has been doing it, without consequence because it's rigged the other way.

So here is a universe . . . well, I'll give you an example of the rigging of the universe. You know, ministers can marry, but they cannot divorce; and you look around you and you'll find everywhere in this

universe there's mechanisms of that character. No prohibition about getting in; every prohibition about getting out.

Take the armed services. You walk up there. My golly! The recruiting sergeant is nice, man. Next day they've fed you cold beans, and you say, "Well, the devil with this." You've run into a subaltern or something and you turn around and you go back to the same recruiting sergeant, and you say, "Give me my papers back," and by golly, he won't do it.

And then you've got a universe that . . . and a civilization, and all of its customs are more or less tailor-made in this particular direction.

Well, we even do it ourselves to some slight degree. We have some Book Auditor out someplace, and he's just found out that music processing is the various thing that's in now. In North Fernando Valley or something, why, he has eight pcs sit down, and they all raise their shirts and contemplate their navels, and they play Bach. And he says, "If you've done this now for 289 hours, why, you will be Clear as near beer. And you're all set." you know? And he's just a Book Auditor. And we say, "Oh, well, for God's sakes," you know. And that's the limit of action.

But the guy is a professional auditor. Oh, hell, man, the sirens go, and the police cars start wheeling, see. "What the hell are you doing?" See? It's all on the basis of "You know better than that." This is always quite astonishing, you see.

Because the universe is so thoroughly rigged this way, why, it happens to be the only method by which you could ever make any progress out of it is to approximate some of the progresses in and that happens to be one of them.

If you're a professional auditor - if you're a professional auditor and you know better, well then, don't do it. And if you're a Book Auditor and you don't know any better, well, so what? You got the idea?

I mean, some professional auditor is expected to go over and say, you know, "If you . . . instead of having them raise their shirts, have them sit in chairs like this, facing each other and then run TR 0 on them for a while."

But that, you see, is even present to that degree in the administrative lines of Scientology, much to my shame. But there's other mechanisms that are survivals of this sort of thing

Apparently all resistance is to prevent oneself from going any further down. The resistance is to go down. It's quite amazing the difficulty you have, actually, in worsening somebody's mental state. It's fantastic what you would have to do to worsen somebody's mental state. Really and how anybody would achieve this, actually, it's to the utter shame of psychology and psychiatry that they're really not able to. They temporarily do it in one lifetime or something like this. I suppose if they gave the guy enough motivators, why maybe it would even run out some of his overts. You could look at it in some kind of a reverse mechanism. I think that's the mechanism on which they must operate.

But most of the resistance is to getting worse and you stop pressing against the resistance to getting worse or if you resolve the resistance toward getting worse, just that, the guy will get better which is one of the goofier things. You see? That's goofy.

You don't try to make the fellow well. you just stop him resisting getting worse. He has terrific resistance to getting any lower down than he is, and there's practically no resistance to getting any better, which make one look at an auditor who isn't getting results wondering what on earth he must be doing, you see, because it actually is a very easy one to reverse this because there's practically springs back of it. The fellow's mainly concentrated on keeping himself from getting any worse. That's how his mind is rigged.

He's preventing deterioration or something like this. And he could get it all . . . all sorts of complications where his prevention of deterioration looks like he's trying to deteriorate. And that's really true, too, but it's nevertheless rigged as a resistance toward degradation. And all an auditor has to . . . has to do is convince a pc that he is not trying to degrade him, is not trying to make him any worse, is actually not

trying to cure him . . because he might have resistance to being cured, too, because he knows how much worse you can get when you're cured. The cures for broken arms which they rebreak two or three times you know, can be quite heroic.

And all you'd have to do actually is to convince a pc that you weren't trying to push him further down on the thing and just had a heart-to-heart talk with him about whether you were or weren't and all of a sudden, he'd get better. Because the fact that he's resisting getting worse is pinning him into wetting worse. See, that what he . . which he resists he becomes, see. There's a Lot of goofy little mechanisms here that operate on the side of the auditor. You really have to get pretty wild to violate all of them and not get a case to improve at all. Okay?

I want you to remember that particular process though as a . . as a good patch-up process. You're just sick and tired of hearing about this burning flight ear. He knows he will get better because his ear will stop burning.

"Well, did you make any goals during this session?"

And a moment of comm lag ensues and then he says very brightly, "Well, no, not really."

And if you don't follow through immediately afterwards and say, Well, what didn't happen?" You sometimes will miss the hidden standard. "Well, what didn't happen?"

"Well," the fellow says, "of course, my gall bladder isn't burning. When I get better, my gall bladder always burns, so I know I haven't gotten any better." We haven't run out that particular somatic. Ha, ha, ha. Here we've got it, see? We've got a hidden standard here.

There are ways and means of smoking these hidden standards into view. Of course, they're idiotic. You didn't have anything to do with a gall bladder. You weren't . . you weren't even processing him on anything that would have helped his gall bladder, and yet his whole test of whether or not he met his goals in the session is whether or not his gall bladder had altered. Or got worse. Gall bladder didn't get worse, so he didn't improve. You got a fellow in an interesting condition of being in a games condition with his own gall bladder or something. See? You can! You can have a fellow in an interesting games condition with his stomach. You know, he's trying to get even with his stomach. Auditing isn't working . . his stomach didn't get worse.

All kinds of crisscrosses here. The reactive mind . . the reactive mind, of course, is not sensible, so you get all kinds of unsensible responses where it comes down home close. Okay?

All right. Any other questions? Oh, I'm glad the rest of you are caught up to it. I'm glad the rest of you are right up there on the ball. Yep. Yes?

Female voice: we were working on the purpose of our job which, as you know, is a good squeeze and you notice an improvement. That's a good thing When you have a sensitivity that's very easy and then a reading that's not easy, where . . where you don't get drops, you're just sort of diagnosing on change of characteristic . . .

Uh-huh.

Female voice: . . . as the sensitivity is very free and . . and practically hits the pin . . .

Yeah . . .

Female voice: . . . the actual needle action on the . . .

Is very slight.

Female voice: . . . assessment is . . is very stuck.

All right. Here it is, Bobby. You'll run into this rather constantly. Its . . . your needle . . . using a sensitivity knob for diagnosis, and your sensitivity knob has a low setting for a third-of-a-dial drop, and yet you're not getting much needle action. Well, that is why an E-Meter can never have its sensitivity knob adjusted to read low. There . . . a sensitivity knob can only be set as it is set on the Mark IV. That's about as good as you can do. Because if you start setting the sensitivity knob lower for less drops, then the drop that would be observed will drop out. Do you understand what I'm talking about? You will no longer be able to see any drop. you got it?

So the person that you're discussing is actually getting up into . . . well or in . . . they're a Release and haven't found it out yet and they're getting a tremendous drop on zero setting practically of the sensitivity knob . . . terrific action . . . and then when you try to assess something, why, horror of horrors, that needle doesn't move very much. Here's a very loose can-squeeze test and not much of a motion in the needle.

All right. Now, let's look over the characteristic of an E-Meter. An E-Meter is registering amount of charge or disagreement. Charge and disagreement could be said to be synonymous and to make charge more understandable, use the word disagreement. If you're getting a bad fall, you can always get your fastest cognition on the part of your pc by asking, "What are you in disagreement with?" This doesn't fit in well for most of your questions, and so on, but you could always bend it around so that you can use it.

This pc, "Do you have an ARC break? Do you have . . . do you have this or that or anything of the sort?" You finally say to this person, "Well, do you have a disagreement with anything?"

And all of a sudden you'll observe this fall that you have observed so fleetingly, because it is the fundamental reaction is caused by disagreement.

Now, as a person gets up toward Clear . . . they're getting closer and closer in this particular direction . . . of course, their wild disagreements, aberrational disagreements with existence, are much less so there's actually much less charge on the case. And the needle will only register to the degree of the charge remaining on the case. And so you have the oddity of the closer a person gets toward Clear, the looser is the needle and the less is the actual reaction on questions. And you will get to a point . . . It's a good thing for you to bring up because it's a good diagnostic point.

You're eventually going to have to raise the sensitivity knob up for a person who gets toward Clear just as you had to do for somebody who's way down at the bottom so that you could read the needle at all; and this becomes very difficult. The can squeeze test makes the needle go over, bang! And it hits one pin and comes back and hits the other pin. And it's crash! You see? And you say, "Well. All right. Now, do you have a present time problem?" The fellow looks like he has a present time problem or something like this, you know. To get a read, you have to actually increase that sensitivity knob, in spite of the wildness and violence of that can drop.

So your can-squeeze test ceases to be valid from Release on up. When you can no longer retard the sensitivity knob on a Mark IV British Meter to vet a third-of-a-dial drop, from there on . . . this is something that is not in the text . . . you had better be suspicious that you are going to miss falls. And you'd better start advancing the sensitivity knob. Do you see that? It's . . . there's something to know there. Now, that's quite . . . quite amazing. You'd say, well . . . but you see all aberration is a mockery of Clear and you've got down into the lower scale mockeries of Clear. Of course, you'd have to keep a highly advanced sensitivity knob to get any reading at all. The case is actually below having charge on it.

Now, as the case gets better, you get a third-of-a-dial drop, which is somewhat the average case. Now you've got a pretty good charge, see. Your charge is quite heavy. And you get nice readings and everything is fine; and one day you're auditing the fellow and you say, "All right, now, squeeze the cans," and it goes over and hits the pin at the other side. And you retreat with that sensitivity knob reading. You say, "Give the cans a squeeze," and it goes over and hits the pin. And you've got the sensitivity knob down, and you just can't turn it down any further. And you say, "Well I ought to fix this meter." And I actually sell for this myself some time ago . . . ought to get these meters fixed, you understand, so that they can be turned down to a third-of-a-dial drop.

No, when that condition begins to exist, then you, to find charge, had better start advancing the sensitivity knob. And you'd better start advancing the sensitivity knob to magnify these little remaining disagreements that don't amount to a hill of beans. Well, the difference is that when the fellow originally, to get a third-of-a-dial drop, had to have his sensitivity knob well advanced, well, he was below disagreeing.

Now, he comes up to a point where he can disagree with things fundamentally, and you of course are getting terrific reads with the thing down here at the sensitivity knob reading at its lowest set. you get big reads and everything is Mime. And then you process the fellow a little bit further along the line, you're going to see a change of characteristic here. At zero set, you're going to get more than a third-of-a-dial drop. Well, from that time on, you had better start advancing the sensitivity knob to get your reads. Not for the rudiments, but for Security Checks and goals. You can do it with Goals Assessments, too. Actually, rudiments and Goals Assessments are a cousin in the way they're read.

Security Check . . you'd better start really revving that thing up because you're not going to find much on it. The fellow just isn't reacting. He isn't as reactive anymore, so the needle isn't reacting. But that is your fundamental test of whether or not the case is going Clear. And when you see this first start to occur . . of your third-of-a-dial drop squeeze . . that's . . that's a gone dog as a test. That's no good as a test anymore. You got Release . . that's good enough to just check out a Release right there.

And after you get up to a point where you just cannot retard it and it just hits pins and caroms back and forth and flies all over the place, and you have to . . in order to get a read . . have to advance it up to 3 or 4 on the sensitivity knob setting. You know, "You got a present time problem?" The fellow says, "No," nothing happens. So you advance it to 3 or 4. "Have you got a present time problem?" you know. Bang! You get a terrific read of about two divisions, you know.

Now, the test . . cross-test is that it blows that fast. Guy's got a present time problem, he tells you about it. Now, you can't find it again. Gone. See, the thing's blowing. When this condition completely disappears and advances to a point where you just can't . . well, the can-squeeze test is just all over the place and 16, you can't get anything falling. You can't even do an assessment anymore, something like that. You'd better bring yourself up with a . . with a sharp halt. You've probably been looking at a Clear for the last few hours and haven't noticed it. That is the gradient scale of Clear test. It's unmistakable when it happens to you. Unmistakable.

If a case is not changing in characteristic of can squeeze as it goes along, it isn't making any advance . . and that would be checked out, by the way, by giving them continuous profile tests. It's not making any advance. The can squeeze test is not varying from one session to the next, see.

They still have to be here at sensitivity knob setting 2 to get a third-of-a-dial drop. Next session, sensitivity knob setting 2, to get a third-of-a-dial drop. Next session, sensitivity knob setting is on 2. You say, what's going on here? PTP, ARC break, withhold. There's a rudiment out, man. See, rudiments are out.

The speed with which you can detect this, is sufficiently good that if your processing is advancing with all of your rudiments in . . this is an important thing to know . . if your processing is advancing with all rudiments squared away, see, rudiments all in, everything's all straight, you should be able actually to detect, from session to session, a difference in the can-squeeze test. Gives you some index of how far rudiments are probably out on most cases that are being processed.

Now, as the case goes to Release and from that point on, your mid-session break ought to find a difference. See, the difference between your . . your first part of the session and your second part of the session when you start the session again, you ought to see a difference in the can squeeze test.

Minute, but detectable. And they should advance that rapidly.

You can tell, very quickly and very immediately, that a case is not advancing because this phenomenon that you've just brought up is not taking place; and if that phenomenon does not come into being on a case in some finite period of time and you can't set the sensitivity knob back, you see, far enough, you still get

too much drop no matter what you do with the sensitivity knob; and then your detection of Security Check questions becomes very difficult because you're not getting much needle action.

Well, if that doesn't take place, you just better take a case practically apart, you know. What's wrong with these rudiments? What's the hidden standard? What's missing here? What's holding up the show? What are you doing out of session? You know? What's going on here? Got the idea? Just really chew into the ground on it. Your processing will advance as fast as that happens. Thank you for bringing it up. It's a point which happens to be missing. Okay? Does that answer your question?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Any other question? Yes.

Female voice: Would you tell me the commands on CCH 4?

What did you say now?

Female voice: Would you tell me the commands on CCH 4?

Commands on CCH 4. Oh, I don't think I have to tell you those. In the first place, your verbalization is not your process, and you may be getting much too precise. I'm not going to tell you those. I think they're in your bulletins and that sort of thing No point in it. Okay?

Female voice: That's just the . . .

Hm?

Female voice: . . . that's just the book motion process.

That's just the book motion process.

Female voice: I couldn't find a bulletin that did have the commands in it,
so . . .

Male voice: Never was one. Never was a separate one . . .

Never was one.

Female voice: Okay.

All right. Issue one, Suzie.

Female voice: All right.

All right. Okay, Virginia, it's actually . . if you want to know the commands of any of the CCHs, get your minimum effective statements to get the motion done.

Female voice: Mm-mm.

That answers the question. Command verbalization is tremendously important in every other routine than the CCHs. That's why I'm not going to give you a set of auditing commands right here and nail them down in brass, because there have been, I think, a dozen versions.

Anything you want to say to the pc, more or less repetitively, which shows him that you're going to do this and you expect him to do it just like it right afterwards, and then that demonstrates that you are interested in knowing whether or not that he's satisfied that he did it, would be the commands of CCH 4. Got it?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Any other questions? Yes.

Female voice: In a longish sentence on Form 6 . . .

In the . . .

Female voice: In a long sentence on forms . . Security (check Form 6, a long sentence . .

Mm-hm.

Female voice: . . . and check on sensitivity 16, and that needle wiggles while the sentence is still spoken .
. should it stand quite . . quite null during the whole sentence?

Yes, ma'am.

Female voice: Yes.

Yes, ma'am. Quite null during the whole . . .

Female voice: . . . whole sentence.

. . . sentence. On a Security Check question or any question you're asking a pc on an E-Meter, you have this liability. That there are sections of the question . . .

Female voice: Yes.

. . . and each section may fall . . .

Female voice: Yes.

. . . so if you've got a long section, you have no option but to clear every part of the question.

Female voice: Yes. Thank you.

This is so poorly understood at large that it has actually let Scientology in for some brickbats. Because you can ask almost anybody anything. You can ask a girl, "Are you a virgin?" If she's a virgin, the needle falls, see. And, "Are you a virgin?" And the girl, "Oh." There's just charge on this word "virgin." Hasn't anything to do with whether she's a virgin or not. It's "virgin" that's falling. It's not "Are you a virgin?"

And you can get led very far astray with this with an E-Meter if you don't take them apart. So the basic rule is that you would ordinarily, to begin with, take that long question to pieces, so eventually having taken it to pieces and gotten it all straightened out with the pc, you eventually would be able to read the whole question from beginning to end without any reaction.

Female voice: Good. Thank you.

All right. Okay.

Female voice: on that particular thing, you wouldn't suddenly . . you're reading it to him for the first time, you wouldn't suddenly stop.

No, no, no, no, no. . .

Female voice: You'd read it to him.

. . . no, no, no. you just read it to him. Don't even look at your E-Meter. Find out what they said. And they said, "No." All right. Read it to them again Looking at your E-Meter. And they say, "No." So you read it by sections to them again looking at your E-Meter, questioning each section. And get all sections clear. It's sort of like clearing the auditing command. And then read the whole thing again now that you've got all sections clear and you get a fall and they say, "No." I guess your work's cut out along about that time. Okay. Any other questions?

All right. You seem to be well genned in today. Well genned in. As a matter of fact, you're changing... I'll pull a California gag on you . . your auras are changing color. It's only stated in two places in the world: in Chelsea and Los Angeles.

Anyway, we've stepped up the velocity. Have you noticed this? Oh, you've noticed this? And there's something goes along with this which I had better remark to you about since I haven't put a bulletin out on it.

It's expected that at the end of thirty days you will have completed your checksheet. I just thought in view of the fact that you were stall taking it easy I had better add that. At the end of thirty days, you should have completed your checksheet. That's pretty grim, isn't it?

Female voice: Yes.

Mmmm. But I will say this. We won't instantly and immediately hire skywriters in your home town to fly overhead and paint a sign in the sky that you have not gotten a course completion at Saint Hill. That is, within thirty days we won't do that.

Yes?

Male mice: Ron, I came up against something recently on CCH 4 which might be useful. I found that auditors were using sort of . . sort of a standard command on "I want you to make a . . I'm going to make a motion with this book, and I want you to copy it mirror-imagewise." And then they were using this check question, 'Are you satisfied with that duplication,' or something of that nature after every command.

Hm.

Male voice: And I found that this was causing an invalidation on the preclear when the auditor wasn't satisfied with it and then went on with the same command.

Oh, yes. It will. It will. you have to be very smooth.

Male voice: so I told them they should only use that satisfied check question when they themselves as auditor were satisfied and were prepared to leave it.

Well, this . . this can cause quite a bit of randomness. The original reason "Are you satisfied . . ?" was used has to be researched. And that was because invalidation was occurring . . here you've got . . occurring. Here you've got the cure-problem phenomenon, you see. And the cure is now causing difficulty. But the tendency of the auditor to critically do the command again caused tremendous ARC breaks and would actually cause the process to be totally inoperative. So, "Are you satisfied with the auditing command . . that you did that?" rather, was introduced in order to cure this particular situation.

Now, it is not necessary for the auditor to duplicate the exact command they just did. It is not necessary that they do this. After all, they're not trying to duplicate, duplicate, duplicate because it's not particularly duplicative. It's duplicative enough that the auditor does it and then the pc does it. So what they do is they find the pc is very weak on a circular motion. So they just go on making varieties of circular motions. And they just put him over the jumps on circular motions. But they're not always the same circular motion, don't you see, and this prevents the thing. Now, that's another cure, and that undoubtedly will produce its own problem in the future. Your point's well taken, Vic. Right.

Okay. Any other questions?

Have you been doing anything in your processing lately that you didn't think you really ought to be doing but were only doing it because you had been told? Come on, let's see if anybody's brave enough to say anything to this. Yes, Virginia.

Female voice: Well, for a while, when I was doing the one about . . . I can't even remember the command, but anyway it was a five or six-way bracket on . . . Well, my goodness, I sure did lose it. I didn't like doing it because it was . . . oh, 'where you wouldn't, or somebody wouldn't do it,' and 'you shouldn't do it' or something like that. Well . . . oh Confront! That's the one it was.

Female voice: Well, I . . . I could think of the . . . that they might not do it or when I could see that they wouldn't do it, well, I wouldn't be so sure about that because if I could say, "Well, you wouldn't polish my shoes. But, if I ask you to do it and you were confronted with the problem, you might at least confront it."

Well, you were running a command that you hadn't any agreement with as an auditor. You thought the command could have been . . .

Female voice: I was the preclear.

You were the preclear

Female voice: Yes. I didn't like it. Well, I just kept on doing it because I was the preclear, and that's what we had been told by . . .

Yeah. All right.

Female voice: . . . but I didn't like it at all.

All right.

Female voice: Because I kept running up against that same sort of thing. Well, practically everybody I know when asked . . . If I asked them specifically, or they knew about it, I think that they would be willing to confront it. They probably wouldn't be willing to do something about it, but they'd be willing to take a look. Be interested.

All right. Did you clear it with your auditor?

Female voice: Well, I told her about it, and now I'm not running that process anymore, so. . .

All right. Okay. Okay. All right.

Now, is . . . anything you've been auditing that you felt you were . . . shouldn't really have been auditing. Anything you've been auditing you felt you shouldn't have been auditing. Why, it'd take a brave auditor to answer that question. You look back on most of the processes you're auditing are laid down by me very specifically.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: I have one question, Ron. In answer to your last question about doing something you didn't particularly want to do. I felt that, giving withholds up on a Security Check as an auditor, running each withhold down was irrelevant. I thought the nature of the withhold was irrelevant and it took up time.

Mm-hm.

Male voice: I feel that also it rather tends to cut down in two-way comm with the pc.

How would it do that? Because he feels that his withhold will be further exposed or something like that?

Male voice: No. I think it rather . . . it sort of takes time writing the thing down . . .

I see. All right.

Now, let me . . . let me clarify this. Let me clarify this. Your point's very well taken there. And it's never intended that everybody should write down every withhold that the pc ran across because you would run into the . . . you'd run into the British Museum Library every time. But something that was very difficult to clear . . . something that literally took you an hour or more to clear or something of this nature. It took you a half an hour to finally get down to it . . . what was it? Now, that appearing on a Security Check as what the nature of withhold would be . . . that would be this rough to try to clear . . . would be of value, only to me on research.

And eventually I'd be able to go over a tremendous pack of written Security Checks, don't you see and be able to establish the type of withhold which was most closely pressed to the bosom, and perhaps adjudicate something out of this that would get us along a little bit further. So your resistance toward that is quite proper because writing down every line of the pc . . . every withhold he had, writing it down on a Security Check . . . that would be a poor show. But those that are very resistive would be of great interest to me. Not as a character index on the person but just as a general run.

"The human race most closely withholds the following: . . ." And then you just make some great long column of the types of withholds. You get the common denominators in these withholds, you'd probably find a hidden button that we didn't know much about before. Okay? That's the only . . . only thing I want, and if you'd write that sort of thing down, you really had to struggle for this one, you know. you got in there and you ask him, "Well, have you ever raped a cat?" you know, or whatever the security question is, and you go on and on and on and on and on and on and on; and you just cannot get any clearance on the thing at all, and then you find out that it's something . . . some odd shading of the command or something like this, or of the question, that was really holding it up. Well, for heaven's sake, write it down.

Female voice: oh, he's complaining about that because I asked them to write it down. And the reason I do is because we have different auditors giving Sec Checks from the different auditors who were processing them and the auditor wants to know whether his preclear's case is improving, whether apart from running, more withholds are coming off

Well, you mark the fact that you've got . . .

Female voice: They also want to check to see if his withholds . . . if the preclear's withholding anything from him, the auditor, that he's told another . . . the Sec Check auditor, but hasn't told the auditor. You see what I mean? His real auditor. So, I mean for all purposes of this course is that I think they should jot down . . . they don't have to write down every word the preclear said, but they can at least note it, you know, "stole apple," they just write down "apple," you know.

Hm-mm.

Female voice: so . . .

All right. I've given you my requirements . . . what I'd like to see on a Security Check. That applies very broadly whether you're doing them in Northumbria or any other unlikely place, and so on. Now, Mary Sue, to facilitate running the course . . . which would probably then apply to facilitate running an HGC . . . wants a shorthanded notation of the withhold that was there and was given up, like "stole apple" and she puts down "apple" and somebody then checking back across this thing . . . he's looking through this on rudiments or that sort of thing, he finds out that he's got a whole chain of withholds that doesn't . . . that hasn't been given up to Security Check or something of that sort. Don't you see? Nobody expects you to make any stenographic heroics or become very heroic stenographically along this line. Okay? Does that answer it, Robin?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: In the bulletin instruction about sending all Sec Checks . . forwarding them in to you . . .

This applies . . .

Male voice: Does this apply to all auditors?

No, this applies . . this applies to Sec Checks on Scientologists, and is an old regulation and has been thrown pretty much adrift whether or not Sec checks when completed should be sent in to me. This has gone adrift. That was the old security program of getting up a policy of Scientology and clean hands, don't you see.

Male voice: Yes.

And this was actually a preventer. It wasn't that I wanted to know these things. It was that there was some feeling about, when this was first begun, that such data might be used for blackmail or something like this. And of course, if the actual Security Check is sent through and it's already resident in a safe someplace in the world, it's . . couldn't so operate, ever. you got the idea?

Male voice: Yeah.

So that was its basic thing. Now, there is another check, purely organizational in character which is just now being worked up. We got the Joburg, and the Joburg passed immediately over into processing. Now, it had left a need for an actual Security Check which some HCO Area Sec or a D of T or somebody like that could give rapidly, or the Assoc Sec Sec could give for employment or for a course admission that didn't take seventeen hours of auditing or something like that to deliver. And it must be at the absolute outside, about thirty questions. That would be the absolute limit that the thing could possibly tolerate. You see? Preferably less.

All right, so let us say that a person has been accepted for employment in a Central Organization, then I would expect to see their employment check sent on through with the record and fact that they had been employed. You got the idea?

Male voice: Yes.

Now, that would also then keep Central Organizations from bypassing this particular step because you would notice that there was a lot of personnel there that you had no employment application form for of any kind and that would mean the security had dropped in some particular area; and if you want trouble in an area, drop its security, I can guarantee you'll get trouble in the area.

All right. Now, if a field auditor wished to do this, and the field auditor were giving this Short Form Security Check to people that were operating in some area or something like that, and they wanted to send it in to me, why, they should do so. It isn't a required proposition, however.

A Clean Hands Check has now become so difficult to do, because the Security Check so rapidly changes its character under processing and so many security factors emerge which were totally unreal before, that a Clean Hands Certificate or seal on a certificate is now only going to be issued as a result of being audited on these routines which have repetitive Security Checks mixed up in them.

Now, therefore, it . . you could not do what was originally intended which is you simply drop in on an HCO and get a Security Check and they give you R Clean Hands stamp, and that's that. That's not possible. But you could forward the evidence of having been audited all the way up the line on a routine, you see, with consequent Security Check, with copies of the Security Checks either in an HGC or in the field. Hand those over to HCO and a Clean Hands seal could be then administered. But it would now be

as a result of auditing . . auditing on the routines. It would not be as a result of simply a Security Check in an HCO.

Male voice: How much auditing on the routine?

How much?

Male voice: Yes, Sir.

Well, I don't see that there's much reason to drop below the level of Release.

Male voice: Thank you.

I'd say auditing to Release and that's about the only thing that'd make it safe and secure. Washington's all excited right now. They're going around in small circles and being very proud and that sort of thing. They just committed an administrative blunder. They left the D of P on a pc and that mustn't happen. Ds of Ps, even acting Ds of Ps must not be given a pc, you see.

That's an old piece of policy because it skimps, then, auditing on all the rest of the pcs in the place. But they've got somebody going through to Clear. And this fellow was appointed acting D of P who was auditing somebody, and this person is just . . just flicking the edges of Clear, see. And Washington went into a panic because all of a sudden the Assoc Sec was transferred over on to a course, temporarily, and the D of P was transferred over on to a course and somebody in . . just as he went off post thought, "Well, this is a good auditor. He's had lots of good results, and so forth. We'll just make him acting D of P." without finding out how many weeks he had left on a pc or what state the pc was in.

Everybody takes a look at this and finds the pc busy . . almost Clear, you see, and going to Clear. And it just caused a fantastic amount of randomness, let me tell you. Because it was in effect, because of this erroneous appointment . . in effect, they had almost been told not to clear somebody. Got the idea? And boy, that put everybody in a sweat. That certainly couldn't work that way, but this is the first Clear of recent times they've made in the HGC. So that this activity was being stepped in the road of, of course had rockets going up in all directions, you know . . white lights, burning tar barrels, and flags flown upside down. Don't do this to us, you know! Of course, the fellow who did it to them is probably safely over on course now. Very interesting.

Australia and Washington are starting to boom and they are going at great guns. Their Academies are getting fuller and fuller, and their HGCs are fuller and fuller. London right now is getting in a desperate state. Some of its leading lights are here, and all of a sudden had . . didn't have to but did bust policy and take List One and Two, which is the Staff Staff Auditors, off staff and put them on outside pcs. Oh, oh. But when it had been found out that this had happened, it was already a day or so's auditing deep into the outside pcs, you see. All that means is, is that the Acting D of P denied sources for Staff Auditors, and so forth. Just was straight up against the wall, see. In view of the fact the temporary D of P London is down here right this minute, why of course this is all up in the air with a screaming Chunk.

There's two things that happen: you just mustn't have the Director of Processing auditing a pc and running all the pcs, too. That just doesn't work. You get no results anywhere.

And the other thing that mustn't happen these days is the staff mustn't lose its list auditors. It just mustn't. Because I think staffs of, say, all of Central Organizations and the HCOs have a right to be Clear. And they're all getting real on it, you know. They've gone along for years without having very much reality on clearing.

And we've been wading into them with seven-league boots as far as . . as doing it right and squaring it up. And their willingness is terrifically high, and they've been getting up to a high level of duplication, and so on. And all of a sudden their results are coming up, coming up, getting better and better. And they're moving up, and they're moving people easily now up into brackets of Release. And they're looking right ahead. And suddenly Clear is getting real to an awful lot of people in Scientology it was never real to before. I never thought it would take me eleven years.

But, give you an idea right now. The only reasons why clearing is not being done are scandalously huge. They are never minor errors. They're errors of such magnitude they would just stagger you, you know. Tremendous errors. The two people in Joburg who were hanging up on whom rout . . I posted the notice on your board in here. Did you read it? The two people there in Joburg who were hanging up, and cables were flying back and forth . . Routine 1 was not working on these people. All of a sudden they . . the Course Instructor waded in with all flags flying, and grabbed ahold of the pcs and put them on a meter. And they had screaming present time problems of long duration that should have been caught in the Security Check Model Sessions . . every session . . but had never had any attention paid to them. And she found the present time problems on these two people and they instantly broke into tears, both of them, you know. Just cracked right up, and so on. Boom!

And all of a sudden Routine 1 started to work like mad. That is what is called an error of magnitude: is running somebody with the rudiments out; and these things certainly must have been showing up on some rudiments.

No, it takes an error of magnitude, something like the auditor didn't come to the session for three weeks, and the fellow didn't get Clear, you know.

And this should start to be getting real to you. You've noticed when you came here you were probably pulling a lot of wild blunders of one character or another. Okay?

And you've noticed these things smoothing out? Right? All right.

And you've noticed that there was something to smooth out, didn't you? Understatement of today.

Your next lecture is Friday afternoon. Okay?

Thank you.