# QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: PREHAV, SEC CHECKS, ARC BREAK PROCESS

A lecture given on
19 September 1961

Thank you. How you doing today, huh?

Audience: Good.

Okay. Now, the state of affairs today is that you have now decided that there was something you needed to know about Scientology, and questions are in order. The date is what? The 19th, or....

Audience member: The 19th of September.

19 September AD 11. All right. And I am in the way of questions. Questions. One, two. Yes.

Audience member: How much of an Assessment by Elimination do you do on the Prehav Scale?

How much of an Assessment by Elimination do you do on a Prehav Scale? This became a burning question back in July. So burning that there is at least one person who has scars. You do a repeater technique on the Prehav Scale and you have a pc in more trouble than could ordinarily be gotten into by the Income Tax Bureau. Now, that's a lot of trouble.

Now, he's all messed up. you know, all of the data we have actually answers these questions from away back. If you knew the progress of data, and your subjective reality and your validity of the data's good, you can work these things out, normally. But there's an old rule from about 1950 that you can ask an auditing question two or three times. You can ask it two or three times and then skip it. you can do it. Three, well, that's borderline. Two, sometimes you wish you hadn't. One, certainly. One, always.

Now, when you're asking these questions on an assessment on the Prehav Scale, you're running straight up against this old rule. How often can you repeat a level without running a process? Now, that is the question which leaps up there. How often can you read a level to the pc without then being guilty of auditing him? Do you understand?

Now, if you do a repeater technique or you do too many readings of levels, you of course have audited the whole Prehav Scale on the preclear and of course he's in a mess. So, the governing factor is a simple one: is how do you get an accurate assessment on the Prehav Scale without actually auditing the Prehav Scale on the preclear? Now, that is the question. And the way you do it is a very precise way. And this is the way I do it, and I have always gotten away with it and . . auditing, you know, is what you get away with . . and I've never had any difficulty with this. But other approaches have

brought about difficulty, uniformly and routinely, have brought about difficulty, and therefore, this is the one I recommend which is probably the first one and the earliest one of these things. I have great confidence in this method of assessment.

You take the whole Prehav Scale, the Primary Scale, and you start at the bottom of the scale, the original one. I . . by the way, I will give you the very, very original one just to start off with. This is not the one, but this is the way I used to do it. And I never got in trouble with this one either. I'll give you the earliest, shall I? I just remembered there was another one.

You started at the bottom of the scale and you read up scale to the pc until you got a rising needle, and then you quit, and went back down the scale again. And you just took the one which reacted the most going up and reacted the most coming back, and if it was the same level, why, you had it made. And if that wasn't it, then you separated out with just a brief read of the one, read of the other one, found out which was the most, and that's the one you took. That is the original, by the way. I remember that. That was Johannesburg

All right. Now, auditors had trouble with that one, and when the Prehav Scale became very expanded, we ran into the first method of assessment for the new, expanded Prehav Scale . . Primary Levels. And that's . . this is the proper one. And this is the one I'm going to give you now, and this is the way you do it. Now, you won't get into any trouble if you master this particular method of doing it.

You start at the bottom, and you just read the levels up the scale all the way to the top. And wherever you get a needle reaction, an instant reaction of the E-Meter needle, you make a dot at that level.

Now, in view of the fact that you're going to use the mimeographed sheet several times, sometimes you make crosses, sometimes you make circles, sometimes you make dots, you know. But use one symbol for one assessment so you'll be able to differentiate it. And every time you get a reaction just on one read, you put down your symbol. And when you've gotten all the way to the top, you will find that you have gotten several levels reacting. Several levels reacted.

Now, this has an added advantage and at this time you could count and find out how many levels were active on this preclear the last time you assessed him for a level. And if you now have more, you know that you're in trouble. And you had better assess the goal and assess the terminal and check these things out. And particularly the terminal because you may not have a proper Terminal Assessment. You may not have a proper Goals Assessment. So that is a very close watch you have to keep, the first three or four assessments on the Prehav Scale, because that tells you whether or not your Goals or Terminals Assessment was right. That's the way you check it out. That's aside from exactly how you do it routinely, assuming you had the proper one.

You have now reached the top. Now, you go back down and you don't hit every level of the Prehav Scale. You don't read it all the way back down from the top. you simply read those levels that you made a mark on. And you read those on down to the bottom.

And now you go back up, and now you only read those that have two marks after them. And at that time, unless your rudiments are out, and everything is nutty and going wrong, you've got your level. There's only one reacting. There will only be one that accumulates three. There'd be something quite wrong if you got three or four accumulating three. But it sometimes happens that on the last read up, you will get two levels that have three marks after them.

Now, what you do is read . . do the same system. You read the one, you read the other one. And you'll notice one dropped out. And it'll drop out right now. And when I say read it, I mean just repeat it once to the pc. Now, there is a complete assessment on a Prehav Scale. The length of time which this takes is very, very short. There is practically no time involved in it at all. This actually is a totality of about six or seven minutes at the absolute outside. And somebody that tells me they are taking fifteen minutes to assess on the Prehav Scale, I know they are doing something wrong.

And if somebody that takes a session to assess on the Prehav Scale, boy, I know they're wrong. I have no doubt about that.

But let me now tell you the numerous errors which auditors make in doing this. Number one, they expect the preclear to answer, so they wait after every read, see? And they say this, "Would a king have faith?" Now, they wait for the preclear to answer and the preclear has nothing to do with the assessment. We care not for the preclear's opinions of assessments. We care not for the preclear's opinions of the rightness and wrongness of anything. Assessments, whether they're goals, terminals or level, are totally between the auditor and the E-Meter. They are not anything to do . . the preclear had nothing to do with this. He might as well be on a long distance lead and in the next county. That's just if you just figure it just to that degree. You do not have to be in good communication with him. Nothing has to be there. You just read them. And you get an instant reaction. He does not have to say anything. You don't tell him to say anything. You don't ask him for his opinion. Nothing These are all methods of wasting time. How fast can you read these things? You can read these things almost as fast as you can talk.

How fast can you read the scale from the bottom to the top? Without any pauses. The funny part of it is that you would get the same reading because it's only going to require a tenth of a second for that level to

react. If it's going to react, it's going to react and that is it. And if you were very, very sharp and you were very close, you could actually catch the reaction while catching your breath to say the next word. See, that's how close together that thing could be. But that's an extremity, and that looks like it's too much strain, and it isn't a good auditor presence to do that, so you rather easily read them, you see.

That's the first and foremost. They expect the pc to say something, and the pc shouldn't say anything. To hell with it. I mean that's nonsense.

Now, the next error which they make is to get a one-way flow started, you see? "Would a king (blank)? Would a king (blank)? Would a king (blank)? Would a king (blank)? Would a king (blank)?"

Now, what are they doing They got a one-way flow, and halfway up the scale they're going to get a stuck. A very tricky way of doing this, and by the way this is just trickiness and this is not a pat method of doing it . . this is not a fixed method, this little thing I'm about to give you here which is just a way to do it . . is you read "Would a king (blank)? Would you a king?" "Would a king (blank)? Would you a king?" You got the idea? "Would you have faith in a king?" You see, for one level. So it's back and forth, back and forth, so you got a two-way flow established as you go up the thing. You got the idea? So you don't get him on a stuck flow anyplace.

In other words, pc to the terminal, terminal to the pc, pc to the terminal, terminal to the pc. you see, you just . . you get how that is?

Somebody got a Prehav Scale? I'll show you what I mean. There will be no slightest doubt. I felt a little doubt, a little dark cloud of doubt went up over your heads at that moment.

All right. "Would a king have faith in you?" You see, that's one flow. King to you. "What would you cause a king?" Bum auditing command. "Would a king prevent you from knowing? How would you have no effect on a king?" See? "How could a king affect you? Would you run an obsessive can't-have on a king Would a king make something of you? How would you create a king" Get the flip-flop, back and forth? All right, that prevents a stuck flow from happening as you assess this thing. Using "how," you will find uniformly as you do this, is much more easily done.

Now, I'll give you how I would actually ask the pc these things. I would ask a pc these things. I would have him on the meter. Let me give you the next error. The next error is to be looking at the pc or the list when you're saying the word. Because an instant reaction occurs before you can shift your eyes from the list or the pc back to the meter. So you have a little drill which you should develop in yourselves that runs like this.

You look at the list to get the level. You look at the meter and you say the list. you speak while looking at the meter. Got that? Now, actually that's just a little bit tricky. You'll find . . some of you will find that's just a little bit tricky to do at the first few trials, and you'll find it sort of seems odd to you. See? You're not reading the paper. You're apparently reading the meter and you've actually had to put the list over here on the meter. You know? It's like this.

All right. I'll give you an example of it. We've got to form this up in our minds, you see. "Would you have faith in a king" See? But actually you don't do it that way. you look at the list. you say, "Would you have faith in a king" "Thank you." "What would a king cause?" "Thank you." "How would you prevent a king knowing" "Thank you." Got the idea? Paper, meter, pc. Paper, meter, pc. Paper, meter, pc. Got the idea?

Now, reading it at about that speed permits the pc to keep up with you . . so he analytically can keep up with you. His reactive mind is keeping up with you the whole way. you see that? That's just about that speed. You just go paper, meter, pc. Paper, meter, pc. Paper, meter, pc. Read it off the paper mentally, say it while looking at the meter, and then look at and acknowledge the pc, and then come back with your pencil and make the dot. So you've made a little circle each time you do this. A little circle. And you keep doing that, and all of a sudden it gets very natural. There's nothing much to it.

Now, I punch these things. All right. "Would you have faith in a king" "Thank you." "What would a king cause?" "Thank you." Got the idea? Cause. Well, we don't care about kings. When you're assessing something, hit it with your voice.

Now, that's a little circular trick on how to do an assessment. When you get that thing down, grooved totally, you find out your assessments become much more positive and reliable. Why? Well, you're doing it on a positive, reliable basis.

Of course, we don't expect anybody in this course to look at the meter fixedly for quite some time. Be sure you look at the meter for some time first. It makes the meter calmer. And if you look at the meter . . you look at the meter, and then you look at the list and you'd say, "Well, have you got faith?"

"Well, wasn't any reaction on that, was there?"

Just avoid the E-Meter. Never confront the E-Meter and you'll have messy auditing the whole way.

Now, it's very easy for a human being to confront a human being. They're fixated on bodies anyhow, so they all too often will be fixated on a body. And they all too often get their TR 0 about half flat and it leads them into a fix, you see? And there they are auditing TR 0, you see, while they're doing an assessment. And actually, any Scientologist can be knocked totally out of session by suddenly noticing that at no time has the auditor ever looked at the meter while he was asking the question. And he immediately . . his own training gets in his road. He doesn't like to duplicate a bad auditing activity, so he's liable to call the auditor's attention to the fact. "You didn't look at the meter. How do you know whether that is right or wrong?" Now, of course, this has never happened in this unit. But you see how that would go.

All right. Now, that's about all there is to know about one of these assessments. Anything else about one of these assessments is pure "additity." And some people do have an addectivity . . an addictivity to additity. Additity, that's right. So don't do it. Don't put a lot of other things on this assessment because that is the way you do one, and your assessment will always be right.

By the way, on general assessments of goals and terminals, do you realize that Mary Sue catches you out something on the order of 50 percent of the time? Wrong goal. Wrong terminal. Did you realize that was happening? That's something to be worried about because there's only one way you can louse up a pc and that's to have the wrong goal and the wrong terminal.

Everything is a negative gain. Not only is all auditing from that point wasted, but it actually worsens the pc to audit the wrong terminal. Okay?

So you got to be sharp on this. You've got to be very good on this. And you've got to be very good. You've got to know how to get the right goal. You've got to know how to get the right terminal. You've got to know whether or not they're right. And you've got to know what to do when you find out they're wrong.

Now, those things are paramount in importance. They're paramount. I just couldn't emphasize them enough. This you must learn how to do here if you learn nothing else. For heaven's sake, learn how to assess. And as I say, Mary Sue is finding you out about 50 percent of the time. That's too many, man, that's too much. And has never found a perfect set of rudiments, I don't think, to date. And never found all rudiments in on the pc to date when checking and doing a cross-check on a terminal. That's a commentary. It's not a good one.

So get all of your rudiments in, keep them in. And after you have found the person's goal, run your end rudiments, check the person's goal before you get somebody else to check it. Same way with terminals. Do identically the same thing with terminals. And you won't be making so many misses.

It's quite ordinary for somebody's (quote) goal to be found (unquote) or terminal to be found (unquote), and then come down to get it checked, and for two or one rudiment to be out; the goal or the terminal, whatever's being found, not just slightly incorrect but totally incorrect. And for the goal or terminal to be found which had already been null . . (quote) (unquote) "nulled" . . that was just liver than a pistol. But

there is something else that is happening which is of considerable interest and that is you are not inquisitive enough. You are not inquisitive enough. You must be more inquisitive. You are afraid of ARC breaking the pc by asking the pc enough questions. That tendency is everywhere manifest. You must ask the pc more questions. Now, I'll give you an example.

A student's goal and terminal had caused a week or so of auditing, fruitless auditing . . search, search, search, search, search . . and Mary Sue checked

it out only to find that a previous auditor had ARC broke the goal so that it was not now registering. And the second that the ARC break was taken off, that goal went liver than a pistol, and it took her only in a matter of maybe an hour or an hour and a quarter to do the whole job. Now, that meant that the auditor, who just found that goal and terminal, that meant that that person was not at all inquisitive. Had spent a whole week grinding on a goals list without ever asking the pc, "How did your last Goals Assessment go? Did anything peculiar happen in your last Goals Assessment? How do you feel on your last auditor's attempt to find your goal?" No question of that sort was asked. But a whole week an auditor could sit there and try to find a goal and terminal, knowing from the auditor reports which were all in the folder that the pc had been assessed previously for goal and terminal unsuccessfully.

Ah, but the auditor before that had found the goal, and the pc had blown session instantly saying, "No, no, I don't want that goal. I want nothing to do with it at all," or some paraphrase thereof And apparently this auditor must have said, "Well, she doesn't want anything to do with that so it must not be her goal," and went on with the remaining list. And then another auditor came along and assessed for a week without ever discovering this other incident. All you have to do is ask questions and your E-Meters react.

Now, there's another thing about assessment that you must know . . all of this is slightly a prelude to it . . and that is that when a pc has been badly audited on levels but the right terminal, you have to take off the auditing in order to get any assessment at all. It's part of getting the rudiments in.

So before you do an assessment, you must get the rudiments in. And particularly you must ask . . if the pc has had a previous auditor auditing on the Prehav Scale or has had any auditing on the Prehav Scale whatsoever . . find out if there's ever been anything wrong or anything ARC broke or anything upset about any former assessment, and clean that up, slick as a bunny, and you'll always have a bang, bang, bang assessment.

You can always do easy auditing if you set the pc up to be audited. And you can always do hard, impossible auditing by not setting the pc up to be audited. So the first rule, in answer to your question, is get all of your rudiments in by which we also mean get inquisitive about any earlier or former assessment or what the pc has felt about assessments of the type we are about to do. And get the ARC breaks off of that. And whether you're doing a Goals, Terminal or Prehav Assessment, you will always get a reliable assessment 100 percent of the time. you see? All right. That answer it?

Male voice: That answers it.

All right. Okay. Is there another question? Yes?

Male voice: Yeah. Does this three-way cycle of paper, meter, pc present the establishment of the one-way flow that you mentioned ?

Does this cycle here of paper, meter, pc prevent a one-way flow from occurring? No. No, no. You've got one-ways and two-way flows mixed up there. I'm sorry, but you've got a wrong idea of a two-way flow. I would recommend that you read Scientology 8-80. You go ahead and get that book. I think that's the one that covers it, isn't it?

Female voice: Yes, it is.

Scientology 8-80. And it tells you all about flows. There are flows, and they are bank flows. And this flow has nothing whatsoever to do with anything but the terminal that you are assessing and the pc, and

the interrelationship between the terminal and the pc. And that is the stuck flow we are talking about. Has nothing to do with the auditor's relationship to the pc.

Has only to do with the terminal's relationship to the pc. And that is the flow that can get stuck.

You cannot run on a terminal "Would a king cause anything? Thank you." "Would a king cause anything? Thank you." "Would a king cause anything? Thank you." "Would a king cause anything? Thank you." Now, all of a sudden, this odd phenomenon will suddenly disclose itself. The needle will stick. And it'll just get stickier and stickier and stickier and stickier. And all of a sudden go stuck. And your tone arm will get stickier and stickier and stickier and stick. And you'll say that's it. That's it. The level is flat.

No, it isn't flat. That is a stuck flow. And somebody else comes along and say, "Well, what could you cause king What could you cause a king? What could you cause a king? What could you cause a king?"

All of a sudden, the thing gets loose, the needle gets loose, the tone arm gets loose, everything is loose, everything is flying around beautifully, and you'd say, "All right. What could you cause a king? Thank you. What could you cause a king Thank you. What could you cause a king?" And it'd start to get stick, and "What could you cause a thing . . king? Thank you." And all of a sudden it gets stuck, stuck, stucker, stucker, frozen-y, and the tone arm will freeze. Now, that's a one-way flow, don't you see?

You've got to think of commands in terms of flows from the person to the terminal, from the terminal to others, you see? And you've got to get what a pattern of flows is, because if you stick any leg of that flow, you don't flatten the command, but you simply freeze the meter. And this is not the same as flattening a level, you see, that's a different one. So you can run an unbalanced command and make a level look like it's flat, but it isn't. You understand what I mean?

Male voice: All right. I do.

Yeah.

Male voice: Come back to establishment of a one-way flow while assessing I got the impression just now that you didn't tell us to flip-flop on this, saying "Would a king cause. . . Would you cause a king? Would you run an obsessive can't-have on a king?" I got the impression that you didn't tell us to do it that way. you only told us that as something fancy in auditing

No, no.

Male voice: oh, you didn't? All right. Well, do you want us to do it that way?

I think you ought to listen to that tape played back. I said that is not a vital necessity . . .

Male voice: Ah!

. . . to do this kind of a thing. But you will cause a stuck flow if you don't do something like that.

Male voice: Okay.

See, there are other ways you could prevent a stuck flow. you could read a whole five-way bracket. But now we are getting above the auditor's ability to keep track. You see, you could read a whole five-way bracket. You could say, "Would you have faith in a king?" "Would a king cause anything to happen to you?" "Would a king prevent another from knowing?" "Would another prevent . . would another have no effect on a king?" And "Would a king have an effect on himself?" You see, now there's a five-way bracket, isn't there? All right. You try to audit a pc and keep track of a five-way bracket and five different commands. Now, do I make that clear? Do I understand what you are asking now? That's the main point.

Male voice: Yeah. I've got it now.

All right.

Male voice: That we do have to do something on the line of changing it back and forth.

That's right. You can also assess this way. That's why I say this isn't vital. I just say you have to do something about it. This is a point you have to take up.

You can also do this. Now, "What do you think of faith in regard to a king?" You see. "How does cause relate to a king?" That's not a particularly good one. Not a particularly good one, but it does get around this because it can flip-flop. You see, cause-king. But you're not saying king causing anything. It's just cause in relationship to a king, and he will turn the command around one way or the other or some type of permissive command like that might get over the whole problem. That's why I say that that exact method, which I gave you, is not the only method by which this is done. But the fact of a stuck flow is always present during a Prehav Assessment. It can always happen on an assessment.

And all of a sudden, you haven't got an assessment, have you? You see, here would be the way you would cause a stuck flow. "Would you have faith in a king? Would you cause something to happen to a king? Would you prevent a king from knowing? Would you have no effect on a king? Would you have an effect on a king?" See, you-king, you-king, you-king, you-king, and you've done this sixty-five auditing commands. Although there it's an assessment, they still operate as auditing commands, and you've done it sixty-five times; you're going to get a stuck flow. See? That's for sure. See, that's an awful lot of times to say you-king, you-king, you-king, you-king. Outflow from you to the king.

I think you really ought to look over flows. I think you ought to look over flows. I think all of you should pay some attention to this, because otherwise why you put a five-way bracket together would be complete mystery to you. You can do this, you know. Just draw little arrows. You see, you're trying to break the valence, which you have already found in the pc, off of the pc. You're trying to individu . . to knock off the individuations and other phenomena with relationship to the pc and this valence.

Well, that is done by flows because the pc is already stuck on the valence by some type of stuck flow. Sergeant orders troops. Sergeant orders troops. Sergeant orders troops. Sergeant orders troops. Sergeant orders troops. Nobody ever orders the sergeant. Get the idea?

Eventually, he either gets stuck into being a private, you see, or he snaps terminals in some way with troops, or he can't leave camp, and nobody can figure out why is that sergeant never leave camp? You got the idea? He's just on a flow from sergeant to troops. Sergeant to troops. Sergeant to troops. Sergeant to troops. Sergeant to troops, see? And he'll eventually snap on that flow. you cannot continue something flowing that long in one way. If you do, you get into all kinds of weird troubles.

Now, you eventually would find this sergeant had an officer, and the officer would come along, and he would say . . well, let's take it the way officers would normally handle a sergeant . . they'd say, "Well, sergeant, what do you think? Sergeant, don't you think it's a good idea? Don't you think we shouldn't uh . . ."

And we get a different kind of officer one day. And he said, "Sergeant, stand there. Hand me that. Write up the orders. Drill the men."

Right away the sergeant can't take a single order, see? He'd said, "Blublublulalala. No. I just . . ." Actually can't even hear this officer. See? Positive orders, a stuck flow. So anything that flows the other way runs into a jammed stuck flow coming in, and he can't actually accept an order from an officer. And he goes around nattering about it. He goes around being very upset about it, and so forth. We would-say, "Well, there's something very wrong here." Yeah. The only thing very wrong is we have . . we've connected with the phenomena of stuck flows in life. Now, oddly enough, with this officer around long enough doing that, he would remedy the flow.

Three years . . after three years of service, you would have this sergeant saying something like this: "Well, I certainly hated Captain Jinks when he first reported to this post. But there's one thing you can say about him. He knows what he's doing." Something like a year and a half ago, Captain Jinks finally ran out the stuck flow, you see?

All right. Five years later we find the sergeant wearing his hat. See, we now don't have any troops. The government has interfered and decided that in view of the fact that we're getting rid of all the territories and turn the country over to the Ban the Bombers or something like this . . in view of that, we don't have any troops anymore, you see? We just have a skeletal force and the sergeant doesn't have any troops, but he's still got Captain Jinks. And this has been going on for about two years. And Captain Jinks says, "Sergeant, stand there," and the sergeant goes off and wears his hat exactly in the same position and carries his stick in exactly the same position as Captain Jinks. He's got a stuck flow in exactly the opposite direction. He's snapped terminals in now to Captain Jinks. You got the idea?

Just like you had these troops, who themselves never gave any orders, eventually all looking like the sergeant. So now you'd get the sergeant looking like Captain Jinks.

Now, we're talking about the valence closure mechanisms when we're talking about flows. These are the mechanisms by which a person becomes somebody else. There isn't anything odd about it. It's this stuck flow mechanism. You run a body. you run a body. you run a body. you run a body. you run a body. you run a body. Body never runs you. So you're in a body.

And then one day you get a reaction from a body. So you succumb. Because the stuck flow has now snapped. It is looking for some excuse for the body to run you in some particular way because you've run the body too long, don't you see?

Now, you have most of the drivers out here on the road being driven by their cars. If you ran a questionnaire, they would answer it quite broadly. "Where should a car take you?" They would all answer that. They wouldn't even think twice about it. And yet the essence of all excellent driving is taking the car somewhere.

I taught somebody to drive a Jaguar by taking the Jaguar down the road, and it almost killed the person. I made the person take the Jaguar down the road, turn the Jaguar around all corners. You see, do everything, think everything, and do everything to the Jaguar that they were supposed to do. Very interesting. Almost killed the person for a while, but I made him do it consciously and so made him discharge this stuck flow by running it consciously.

In other words, 8-C on a Jaguar. If you in driving start doing this, watch out, because you're liable to have almost anything happen. You all of a sudden lose your ability to drive right in the middle of a long straightaway or something, you know. you say what's going on? What you've run into is a stuck flow. What you've done is take over analytically the stuck flow mechanism. If you start consciously driving a car that you've been so carefully driving unconsciously. Because in driving a car unconsciously, you have already succumbed to a stuck flow.

We have at this particular time the idea that all skills must become unconscious. Well, isn't that a fascinating idea, a skill is unconscious! See, a footballer, for instance . . all of his actions with a football must be into some kind of a reactive groove so that he never even has to think. He just always makes the perfect goal, you see. He never has to think. He . . that's the modus operandi of the day. If you wanted to improve his football, you would go out there and bring it all up to the surface. Now all of a sudden, he never would miss. But before, it was all unconscious but he missed occasionally. But that was just the fortunes of the day, you see. The automaticity doesn't always work. Leaves us all on the subject of stuck flows. And this is a very, very, important mechanism. Because it is the mechanism which you're trying to cure with Routine 3.

You're finding out what thing it is that the person has total stuck flows on in all directions and has been submerged into and has become. And then you are separating this thing out, and you are separating it out usually running with a five-way bracket, which runs all flows and all conditions with regard to this terminal. And when you have flattened all flows and all these conditions of the Primary Scale, and whatever else you had to do, and incidents, you will find out that you have discharged the compulsion to be interiorized into it or to run it or to command it or to be unconscious about it. When you've discharged these things, you, of course, have gotten rid of most of the person's case. you follow that? Did you know all that?

Male voice: No.

Female voice: Ron, how does this affect you? Always instructing students.

What's the question? Huh?

Female voice: The stuck flow. You're an Instructor, always instructing the student.

How does this affect me?

Female voice: Yes.

A stuck flow? Oh, I got a long way . . I got a long way to go before this gets to be a stuck flow. I remember one space academy, I think the curriculum was two thousand years, I was a student there.

Female voice: All right.

Remember something about Scientology. Scientology is the only thing which undoes its own spells. Scientology is actually the only science on Earth today which undoes all of its own rules. It's a very peculiar thing. That is the only reason we have any business doing anything with it. Anything we do in Scientology can be run out.

Do you know the only overt that you can pull with Scientology lies in the field of instruction. To fail to pass along the materials accurately becomes an overt. Bad auditing isn't much of an overt. Not on the long run, on the long run. But bad dissemination is an overt because this makes it impossible for Mr. Jinks that was badly audited to get it run out a couple of lifetimes later. See, there's always some hope for Mr. Jinks as long as there was good dissemination.

No, but that's a . . it's a joke with regard to me. Actually, I've had a great deal of trouble with schools. Schools are always teaching me, oh, things like my own subjects, and so forth. And I've had to learn my own speeches. And they're . . the difficulty is they're wrong. And there's one whole series of speeches that are commonly taught in schools and they're all wrong. They've got now the wrong place names and the wrong people, and they don't make sense, but they're good oratory. And this is crazy, you know.

But you get a goofiness on the subject after a while. And about the only thing that you find difficult about instruction is being taught principles that are contrary to truth. And when somebody's pushing principles which are contrary to truth or contrary to fact, or which are just made up out of thin air or something like this, then you have . . will encounter a great deal of difficulty. Both the Instructor and the student will eventually get in trouble because of this. And as Suzie will attest, I've been laughing, and you, of course, have heard me in lectures laughing about certain subject matter that is taught on Earth today as incorrect.

We didn't realize that every physics textbook in England at the elementary level has rule after rule and law after law incorrectly stated or that is totally incorrect.

There was a scientist, who has made a hobby of this, has been checking up all of the English textbooks and was on "Tonight" last night, and he had wondered how much we had held back British science by teaching Newton's laws backwards and things like this, and they were all in the textbooks, and the textbooks keep on getting reprinted and issued, and so forth.

Well, now, that's an overt. And an Instructor would suffer from that. But now you, for instance, start teaching a student correctly somewhere; because, well, there isn't one of you who won't teach somebody sometime or another something about Scientology, you see, whether in a broad mass or single individuals. You couldn't escape it. But let's say you were pushing a bunch of misconcepts. That would then add up to an overt, wouldn't it?

All right. Now, the overt act-motivator phenomena has to be part and parcel to this stuck flow phenomena. See, you have to get an individuation, there has to be an unease, there'd have to be an

unconscious reaction, there has to be something unknown, there has to be something hidden. All of these things have to occur in order to make the stuck flow phenomena come about.

For instance, the sergeant is telling the troops that they're actually going to go on a picnic, and they get out there and they find out that the picnic baskets happen to be baskets for dirt. And they're actually supposed to build a fortification in the burning sun, you see. There's always this kind of thing going on in the army.

So you've always got people snapping into people and valence closures, and so forth. But they must all be accompanied by lies or prevarications.

And right on that subject, there's only one thing that becomes an overt with regard to the instruction done here: is when I tell you clearly, with exclamation points and underline it and underscore it, that you must read an E-Meter, and then you proceed to read the pc's shoes . . well, I get some overt thoughts. And in the field and region of those overt thoughts, I suppose I could get into a stuck flow situation.

But every now and then, I run out my overts and unkind thoughts about you, so you're safe. Okay. Right. Any other questions? Yes?

Male voice: on this withhold, on the new rudiments commands, you hare "To whom wasn't that known" and "To whom shouldn't that be known?" How does that apply if you ask the pc flare you withholding anything?"

Give me that . . give me that bulletin right there. Instead of answering that question, why don't I give you a brief rundown on the new rudiments. On what you can get away with and what you can't get away with, with regard to it, huh?

Male voice: Good.

And that'd answer it in the process. Ask your question once more though, however.

Male voice: When you ask a pc blare you withholding anything?" and you get a tick, how do you apply that question there "To whom wasn't that known?" How does . . this doesn't even make sense to me.

All right. All right. Let's take up the whole thing. Number one, Room: that is very, very easy. These are the new rudiments. Room: TR 10 or pc's havingness process. If you have found the pc's havingness process in the list of thirty-six Precessions, you naturally use that to orient him with regard to the room, and he will be able to find out and differentiate why he doesn't like to be audited in that room. He will pick it up. Now, you've . . the safest thing is to have the pc's Havingness Process. That is the safest thing. That's the best thing.

But to break down at that point when you're clearing rudiments to find the pc's Havingness Process would be a very clumsy way to go about it. So just sooner or later when auditing a pc, you should find the pc's Havingness and Confront Processes. It doesn't take very long to do, and all the materials and how it is done have all been made available this long time. It's a rather simple action.

Now, I have something to say about this, this is why I wanted to go over all of the rudiments. I have something to say about this auditor process.

You realize, of course, that a beingness is in the middle of a confusion. And that a beingness is pinned into a confusion, so this is one of these limited processes. "What are you willing to be? What are you unwilling to be," of course, is picking the stable datum out of the confusion which is reverse auditing. And it's very good, run on a very limited basis. But if you wanted to run a case with this, you would have to run much more broadly, and you would have to run your 1A processes as part of the auditing command . . you'd have to introduce 1A. You'd have to bring it right in on the heels of this thing.

This one for a long run now, not just for two dozen commands to settle the pc into session. You see, you can get rid of . . you can get away with it, you know, for just a rudiments process for a little while. You

can get away with it, usually. But remember, to run it broadly, you would have to introduce the whole idea of 1A and get the problems out of the road. Because he obviously has problems, and the beingnesses are the middle of confusions about problems.

So you'd say . . have to say, "What would you be willing to be? What would you rather not be?" "What would another be willing to be? What would another rather not be?" "What confusion could you confront? What confusion could another confront?"

Now, the best way to sort that out would be to sort out problem, motion and confusion. And use the word that reacted the most on the pc for those two confronts. Now, that is quite legitimate and is one of these dynamite processes.

Now, if you wanted to run a whole case with this, you would have to add two more commands. "What confusion . . ," you've sorted it out whether it's confusion, problem or motion . . "would you rather not confront? What (confusion, problem, motion) would another rather not confront?" You'd have to have the plus and the minus confusion. Now, I suppose a whole case would run with that. I suppose a whole case would run Clear with that without an assessment. Well, after all, you've picked up the beingness which is the stable datum. And you're handling the ability to confront a confusion. And you're handling these various elements that create a reactive bank anyhow. And maybe if you ran a case with that for a thousand hours, the case would go Clear. You got the idea? But it's one of these long, arduous propositions without much differentiation.

But running it just "What would you be willing to be? What would you rather not be?" All right. Now, let's just sit down and run that for two hours. Well, all right. Well, all right.

And then next session, let's sit down and run it for . . start to run it for two hours. I don't think you'll make it. The pc's going to be right splang in the middle of an engram. Because that runs pcs into engrams if run very long Otherwise, it's a very limited process, and you must know that about it. But it's a nice one to settle the pc into auditing session. Oh, you'd run it a couple of dozen times, you know. you say, "Well, what would you be willing to be?"

"I wouldn't . . wouldn't . . ." And all of a sudden he'd "Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. I'm not willing to be a pc."

"Oh, all right. So you're not willing to be a pc. All right. Now, what would you be willing to be?"

"So-and-so."

"What would you rather not be?"

"So-and-so."

"What would you be willing to be?"

"Oh, I'm willing to be a pc."

"All right. I'm going to audit this . . ask you this question two more times and end this process if that's all right with you. Thank you." And you're out.

In other words, it will do that job. But going much further than that, you're going to get into trouble with the process, so you might as well know that. I wouldn't give you a process that you could get into trouble with, without that.

Now, if you do get into trouble with it, add "another" and "beingness," "another" and "not beingness." Just in the commands I just gave you. And if you're going to sit down and clean this thing up till A to Izzard, you're going to have to run "confusion-confront," "confusion-rather not confront" for self and for the other, too, making this whole number of package of commands. It's going to be one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight commands. It's an eight command process to run the thing all the way out.

But the way to get yourself out of trouble on it, you would only have to add the two confusion commands, see. "What confusion can you confront? What confusion could another confront?" That would get you out of trouble without getting elaborate. You get how this would be done? Pc says, "Oh, I'm going into an engram," and so forth. Well, you haven't got his terminal. You haven't . . you're not running him on the Prehav Scale. You just made a booboo. So on. Just add the command "confusion-confront," and he will come right on out of it just as nice as you please, okay?

So you've got the command; you've got the remedy. All right.

Let's take up the next level which is the one you're asking about. "What is unknown about that problem with Joe?"

This is perfectly all right. It's perfectly all right. Now, what did you find wrong with that?

Male voice: No. It's the withhold. The next one. I must be confused a bit.

Oh, you got that was . . what's marked with a question mark. Oh, I guess what you're talking about.

All right. "What is unknown about that problem with (blank)?" Now, that is good enough to clean a present time problem because you've located the fact that he had a problem with (blank) . . his boss.

Well, you ask him, "Do you have a present time problem," and the meter goes clang! And the blue smoke starts coming out of the corner. We going to put a little smoke hole there. And oh, he says, "I don't want anything to do with the problem, because I want to get on with the session," and so forth. Well, that's not a good enough question. I mean . . you'd better audit it. And the best way to get rid of it, and the fastest way to get rid of it is just ask him the plainest version of it all, which is "What is unknown about that problem with your boss? What is unknown about the problem with your boss? What is unknown about that problem with your boss?" Just repetitive command. Nothing fancy. Nothing further about it. That makes it. That makes it. All of a sudden, the guy go abloom! And you only run that, you see, long enough so that you get no reaction on the meter. And you say, "How do you feel with the problem of your boss?"

"Well, I think I ought to do something about it!" That isn't long enough. The test of a PT problem, if it's flat, the pc doesn't have to do anything about it. That's the primary test of a PT problem. That's an old saw in auditing pc feels he still has to do something about it, it's not flat. I've had an auditor tell me, "Well, I've got the PT problem flat because she said right after the session she would go out and phone up her husband and make peace with him."

And you say, "Yes, but you didn't get any gain in this intensive."

"Oh, well, it couldn't have had anything to do with that!"

Yes, it had everything to do with that. He didn't apply the basic test of a present time problem. She still wanted to do something about this problem with her husband. Therefore, the present time problem was not flat and didn't answer the required rudiments. The pc has to take care of something in present time. The pc has to move in present time toward a certain target. Well, if the pc has to move in present time toward a certain target that has nothing to do with session targets, the pc is out of session. Simple as that. So if the pc has to do something about this, you still have not flattened it. And you just run this until the meter goes flat on that present time problem. And then you ask him if he has a present time problem about anything else, being very specific about anything else, meaning we're through with that one.

And if he's got one on that, then you clean that one up. And then you ask him, "Do you have . . now have a present time problem?" You get no reaction on the meter, carry on and go to your next rudiment.

And we run to withholds. "To whom wasn't that known? To whom shouldn't that be known?"

Well, that is about the nastiest withhold process anybody ever dreamed up.

Now, the question . . I don't know quite how the question comes up now. How . . repeat the question again.

Male voice: Well, the question is when you ask the pc, "Are you withholding anything?"

Yeah.

Male voice: And you get a tick, and you ask him, "What was that?" He says, "I don't know." Then how do you apply that uh . . .

I get you.

Male voice: . . . end ?

I get you. I see. And the pc doesn't know?

Male voice: That's right.

Ah, this is a special case. This is a special case. Well, let me see, I have to kind of pick it up here somehow or another, because I can't imagine a pc saying that to me without my following straight on through. .. You know, these . . the Germans developed dachshunds, you know, to go down small holes.

Well, I don't know. Let's see, you're asking me to clear this up with a command. I would clear this up differently. If I ran into that and I said, "Well, what isn't . . are you withholding anything?" and the pc got a tick. And you say, "All right, what was that?"

And he says, "Well, I don't know. I haven't got a clue."

I wouldn't run a process. I would say, "Well, before session . . ." or just any kind of thing, you know, the who, when, what type of questioning.

"Well, before session was there something that came up that you thought you ought to tell me?" Don't accuse him of withholding, you see?

He'd say, "Oh, yes. Oh, yes, yes, I did want to tell you that actually last night I had quite a headache after that session."

And you say, "Well, all right. Thank you. Now, are you withholding anything?" And you very often will find the tick disappears. That's as easy as it is to clean them, see? So that's a two-way comm clean. Any question about what, when, where. That classifies as two-way comm. You're supposed to try to clear a withhold with two-way comm. "What was it? When was it? Was there any time when you thought of withholding anything from me? What sort of thing would it be that you would find it very difficult to tell me?" That's a very nice one. Run it into classes.

"What would I be most likely to get angry about?" You see? Never confronted that one before, you see. "You get angry about, let's see. Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho, yes. Ho-ho-ho-ho."

Of course, he's got you, the auditor, mixed up with somebody who's censuring him. So he'll get a whole type of class of withhold from you as an auditor. Got the trickiness with which this can be done?

Cleverness is speed when getting a withhold off of the pc. Cleverness is speed. Now, that doesn't mean there aren't other ways of doing it. And that doesn't mean you can't do it with a repetitive process.

The earliest repetitive process for a withhold was "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Is there anything you'd care to tell me about that? Oh?"

"No."

"Well, all right. Thank you."

"Well, think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Now, is there anything you would care to tell me?"

I was down in the Melbourne ACC, and I was giving a whole bunch of lectures on O/W and advising the auditor to run this sort of thing, so he went covert on the whole deal, you see. And he started running the pc, saying, "Think of something you've known. Think of something you've withheld. Now, is there anything you would care to tell me?"

See, well, the pc's already loosened it up and it's rattling around in his skull and it's about to come out through his eyeballs if he doesn't get rid of the thing.

Now, that's the earliest repetitive process which was directly leveled at getting withholds off of a pc, or beyond just the idea of getting withholds off of a pc.

Now, that's usable. That's a rudiments process. See. It's quite usable.

You say, "Well, are you withholding anything" Tick. "Well, what is that?" "I don't know."

And you say, "Well, is there anything that you thought you should tell me? Is there anything that you haven't told me in earlier sessions? Is there anything you think I would object to being told?" Any type of questioning And it's still going tick, see? He hasn't given you the gen.

Of course, you can go off into repetitive processes. And the earliest one of them is, "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld."

Now, a much more modern version or a much more modern process would be to search it out along some line and say, "What is unknown about my reactions? Thank you. What is unknown about my reactions? Thank you. What is unknown about my reactions? Thank you."

Uh-uh-uh-all of a sudden he, of course, uhhhhhh! He suddenly realizes you're going to get ragingly angry if he suddenly tells you something. See that? But that's sort of clearing the auditor so the auditor can be talked to by the pc. you get the indirect method? So there is a direct application of Unknown to that exact situation, which is a special situation.

This is a highly general situation. Now, this withhold in the rudiments . . it's up to you to get the rudiment off of him. Now, what you use to do that, we're not particular about. You can get the old "do, withhold" process. You can stir it up one way or the other, and so on. You're not trying to run a Security Check on this pc, however.

And if the pc is adamantly holding up the whole progress of the thing, yes, that's a special case and you can go in and run any process which you think will eventually get him to get loose and turn loose of that withhold.

He obviously has got a withhold from you because he's afraid of your reactions to the things, you might say, and as long as he's afraid of your reactions to the things he might say, he is not in two-way communication with you and so is not in-session. So this is an in-session type of withhold, not a Security Check type of withhold, that we are more interested in. So that makes it a little bit different, doesn't it?

Audience voice: Hmm.

Huh?

All right. Now, this is directed at this. Remember these are a list of processes to be run on something found which can't be cleared by two-way communication. That's what these Rudiments Processes are. So we say, "Are you withholding anything?"

And the pc says, "No," and we get a tick and we say, "What was that?" And the pc said, "Ooooh, well, oooooh, yes, oooooh, well."

And you, "Well, what was it?"

And the pc, "Oooooh."

"Well, what . . what . . what's this all about?"

"Well, last night down in the restaurant, three other students and I were discussing your auditing, and I don't want to have to tell you this, but we decided and so forth and so on, and I said, and that was an unkind thought."

You're not interested in what they thought. You're only interested in what he thought. And then you say, "Well, come on now, what did you say? And what did you think?" That's always the keynote of withholds. You can waste eighteen thousand years of auditing on running off other people's statements, and so forth, with regard to the withhold.

"Yes, I had an aunt once who drowned a puppy."

"Oh, Christ, all right. So you had an aunt that drowned a puppy. That has nothing to do with our auditing session. Did you help her drown the puppy?"

"No, I just heard about it."

"All right. What did you do and where did you drown a puppy?"

"Oh, do you suppose I could've?"

"Well, it says here something about it." Got the idea?

"Did you ever drown a puppy?"

"Well, no." Clang!

"Where did you drown the puppy?" Clang!

"Oh, I had forgotten all about it."

You see, that's a Security Check type of situation. Now, you saw into this Security Check situation. You clean this up and get this drowning of puppies so that it doesn't react. And this thing works the same way. If you were to run that on a Security Check withhold, you see, you would clean up the whole withhold. You wouldn't leave the guy stuck in some kind of a withhold.

Now, let's supposing that this was just an auditing session situation, see? And you said, "Well, what's this withhold?"

And he eventually said, "And I was down at the cafe and we were talking to three other auditors, and I said, and I thought, and so forth . . ."

And you say, "All right. Are you withholding anything?" You still get a clang You say, "Was it . . is it about that, that you are withholding?" And you still get another clang.

Well, there's no sense of sitting there for the next two and a half hours trying to beat to pieces something which is apparently an almost traumatic incident. See?

The thing for you to do is not to run responsibility on it or something like that. The thing for you to do is to run this one. "To whom wasn't that known?"

"Well, you, of course." You see?

"To whom shouldn't that be known?"

"You, of course."

"All right. To whom wasn't that known?"

"Well, it wasn't known to the other students."

"Well, to whom shouldn't that be known?"

"Well, it shouldn't be known to your preclears."

You get how this would be answered? And so it eventually cleans up that traumatic situation.

And all too often this is being run into by auditors. You say, "Are you withholding anything?"

And the pc says, "No," clank!

Then you say, "What was that?"

And "Well, I guess that was the . . . oh, yes."

And you say, "Are you withholding anything" you see. And you still get a reaction. You try to chase it out as an ARC break or something of this sort. Actually, it's the same withhold, but it didn't release.

Now, this is how you release a withhold and that is why it is a process. Does that make sense now?

Male voice: Yes, very much so.

Otherwise, the weapons by which you get the pc to give you the withhold, this is another story. All right? Does that answer it?

Male voice: Yes. Perfect.

All right. Now, this becomes . . next one is ARC break, and this is one of the most important developments that we have had for a long time. And this is a honey, this process.

"What didn't an auditor do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?" And that is a bitch kitty because that cleans up basic-basic on the ARC break chain, and that will smooth a pc into session faster than scat. There are variations of this command.

There is no variation of, "What weren't you able to tell an auditor?" That is nonvariable.

If you're cleaning it up for the session only, you, of course, say, "What weren't you able to tell me in this session?" That is not as good as, "What weren't you able to tell an auditor?" but would still keep him within the finite ranges of the session rather than run it all up and down the line and would clean him up for you. Just now.

Let's say you run into the end-of-session ARC break. Well, you're not going to sit there till midnight, for heaven's sakes, running this other process because this is going to be a longer process. You can clean it

up for the immediate session in which you are involved. And the immediate session in which you are involved is simply me, not an auditor. "What didn't I do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell me? When?"

That's a specialized use of it, and the specialized use of it is limited to trying to get on with the session, trying to get the pc out of session, and something ended; this gives you a very short run. But if you had to do something like this to keep the thing squared around . . of course, the pc is hot on the subject of an auditor.

But this is quite a remarkable development. And let me go into the background and the network of the development itself

You're seeing here the final, great, great, great, great, great, great, great grandson of the discovery that communication is the most important corner of the ARC triangle. See? Communication is the most important corner. And what do you know? As long as you run a recall, it is perfectly safe to say, "Weren't able to say?" That's perfectly safe as long as it's a recall. "What wouldn't you be able to say?" will wind the pc up in more soup. Why? Because it's saying, "What weren't you able to . . what aren't you able to go out of ARC with?" See, same thing. So it is quite a delicate thing and you should know this about this process, that that is very, very solidly and completely and only a Recall Process. It only works as a Recall Process and then does lots of good. And if used as a conditional process, you know, "What aren't you able to tell me?" "I'm not so sure," see? You've got to run that as a Recall.

Now, psychotics have gone sane on this single auditing command, in spite of the fact that it was a stuck flow command and everything else. "Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you. Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you. Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you. Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you. Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you." Run for twenty-five hours. And it's made some people go sane, see? I mean it's that powerful a process.

It could be refined. You could have said, "Think of somebody communicating with you. Think of you communicating with somebody." See? Something like that, and you would have had a considerable resurge on the part of a case. But it wasn't communication that aberrated anybody. It was, the not communication that aberrated them. So a recall on the not communications operates as a very powerful process, and it is extremely powerful just as a process itself.

We don't need it at the present moment. We don't have any real use for it at the present moment. It would have made a considerable splash four or five years ago, you see? Everybody would have thought this was marvelous. And you would have run it something on this order.

Fellow has trouble with his mama. Fellow always had trouble with his mama. All right.

"What weren't you able to tell your mother? When?"

Now, to round it out as a total valence process, you would have had to have said, "What wasn't your mother able to tell you? When?" Got the idea?

Now, that run, both ways would be a very rapid-fire valence splitter. And it'd split up valences like crazy. That's a real, real wild valence splitter. A marvelous one. So Prehav 13 you can lay aside and forget. If you're trying to clean up ARC breaks with a present time environment, just use this, and you've got a better, faster run than Prehav 13.

Only you do it like this. You'd write down everybody the person knew in present time and then you would assess the list and find out that Harry was real hot. So you'd say, "Well, what weren't you able to tell Harry?" and "What wasn't Harry able to tell you?" Now, that would be one version, see?

You could run it as a pure ARC break process and keep the flow going. And now we get a booster. A pc is in a position where he is expecting somebody to do something because he is dependent on somebody doing something. And if somebody doesn't do something at the right moments, he is left in the soup, so he is in a dependency situation.

So for a pc in auditing sessions, for the auditor not to have done anything, and for not to have been able to tell an auditor, picks up and runs out all the times the pc was audited when not in-session. And, of course, that blows the sessions. So what you're really doing is blowing the sessions. You're just cleaning up auditors and sessions here just like mad, when you're running this process. I don't know, I suppose you've used it in the last day or so, and you might have found it extremely valuable. Have you, any of you, used it? Worked good? Work fine?

Female voice: oh, yes.

All right.

Now, I'll tell you the additional steps which you would have to take to make a long run out of this. you would have to, to get this long, arduous line, you'd say, "What didn't an auditor do? When?" "What didn't you do? When?" Of course, this now broadens it out of session, doesn't it? "What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?" "What didn't an auditor tell you? When?" Get the idea? And that would make a well-balanced process. So your process would become quite well balanced and you would just be cleaning up sessions in all directions.

But this is enough to actually knock out auditing sessions because there isn't very much auditing track, so you don't need too complete a process to fix it up. And you'll find out that's quite workable just the way it is. "What didn't an auditor do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?" And you pick up the basic-basics on the ARC breaks which the pc is having with you right now.

Now, for short-term use, "What didn't I do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell me? When?" That would be a workable form unless you had had a long, personal acquaintance with the pc. If you'd had a long, personal acquaintance with the pc, like well, auditing your husband or something like that, you'd have to add in "In this session." See, to clean up the ARC break and get the session off you'd have to say, "What didn't I do in this session? When?" "What weren't you able to tell me in this session? When?" See? Now, that pinpoints it right on down the line, and you've run the session out. See, that's good enough. That's good enough. You'll find out that's broadly workable.

If you wanted the full dress parade of the process, you would run Doingness . . you would run Not Doingness and Not Communicatingness, both sides, in general or on a specific Prehav 13 type terminal.

Remember how we used to run Failed Help sometimes? Well, you could use this same thing with Failed Help. You could separate the guy's whole family off of him. Everybody in the family is certain he shouldn't have come into the HGC to be audited. And it's all we hear about, see? And we know that there's lots of stress and strain with regard to this.

Do you know it was an early discovery that a person who had a non-Scientologist on the other side of him raising hell with him because he was in Scientology, would ordinarily be expected to not quite be aboard the bandwagon and sort of squirrel. Well, he's listening all the time to a bunch of overts.

That is the source of a squirrel.

A fellow like, oh, let's take some real championship peanut-whistle squirrels, Van Vogt. Now, he never actually would have been a squirrel, Van never would have been a squirrel, if it hadn't have been for . . what the hell was her name? Mayne. Mayne. I think she's got connected up with an electric circuit someplace. But Mayne's also over there curling her moustache. And saying, "Natter, natter, natter, how bad it all is, how bad it all is," and actually, apparently aboard the bandwagon but actually just cutting everything to ribbons. You get that? I mean that, therefore, keeps the guy from not really being with us and not really being against us and being sort of in the center and not really knowing what he's doing. And he's going around in small circles all the time.

All right. That kind of a condition comes in. Or the whole family had decided that if he went to that place or went to see that person again, they were going to be through with him, and they mean through. See?

And what's really very interesting, he usually is the one in the family who controls the money and would be through with them. But he never does, see? Through, you see?

All right. You run into that kind of a situation, that's a whole series of developing ARC breaks and their incipient PT problems. So you just get rid of all your PT problems by assessing all of these people, finding the one that drops the most immediately, running this needle action out of this particular process on that person, see? You'd have to take Van Vogt. You'd have to take Mayne. You see, just substitute her for auditor, see?

All right. "What didn't Mayne do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell Mayne? When?" See? Obviously, the individual is in some sort of a subjective state with regard to the person, so the person has some sort of a supercontrol over them, and you'll just move the valence out that much so you'll let auditing happen.

Now, that's a sort of an interesting approach and an interesting use of this particular process. Fellow comes to you for auditing, and you are doing all this. See, you're making out his assessment sheet there at the beginning. You're getting his preclear assessment data, and, "You married?"

"Yes." And so on.

"How does your wife feel about Scientology?"

"Oh, well, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. As a matter of fact, I was going to have to ask you not to tell her I was being processed."

Oh, man! He's just set himself up for two hundred hours to no gain, you see? Because he's got a consistent withhold in present time. He's got a continuous present time problem. All of these sort of things. So you make it your business to find these things out.

Now, you assume then that there will be ARC breaks. So you assume then, if he's had that much trouble with this person, there have been ARC breaks with this person. All right. Your smart approach to this as you're starting him out as an HGC pc or a personal preclear, your smartest approach is to clean up all the people in his environment, just before you assess him or do anything with him at all. And it's perfectly safe to do it with this process, because you're not going to run very long on these people.

And you understand that it is a liability and that you are liable to run into danger by running anything but the pc's terminal, Routine 3 type terminal. You realize that's a dangerous thing to do. So don't run it very long. you should be able to clean up his wife or something like this. It takes a very fast process.

And there is a very fast process. And you're in and off of it in maybe twenty minutes, half an hour, something like this. And you've gotten a grief charge or you've got the traumatic situation, it's all gone, it's all smoothed out, and so forth. That's the . . you're through with that person. You stack . . unstack these persons off of the pc, spend a couple of sessions doing this, and then assess him, and you'll never have any trouble with the rest of your rudiments. But that is only, of course, for a preclear. That is only for a preclear, entirely, who is having this kind of trouble . . people who object to Scientology.

Not necessarily object to him, what the hell, there isn't a human being on Earth that isn't objected to one way or the other, see? But he's going to have trouble with this person about Scientology, you certainly should move over into that bracket. A D of P doing this as a system would get minimal blows, minimal upsets, minimal PT problems and maximal profile gains. You just clean up the pc's environment. And that's the process he would use or just any version thereof.

But remember that Not Communicate has to be a recall version. It can't be a conditional present time version. That I can't stress too hard because if you ran it as a conditional present time . . .

All right. Like, "What don't you have to communicate with? What aren't you able to communicate with now?" Oh, man, you've had it. Of course, you immediately say to somebody, "What aren't you able to communicate with?" Well, you've just asked him, "What part of your whole track is unknown to you?

How many populations, temples, airports, companies, regiments, families, parents have you had for the last two hundred trillion years? Thank you. Now, get the idea of not knowing anything about any of them. Thank you very much. Now, stay out of communication with them. Good."

Has to be a recall. Has to be a straight and direct recall. This discovery is basically hardly won, and it amounts to this: this is what the pc is actually objecting to on the subject of auditing; whatever else the pc says, those are the things which the pc objects to: The auditor didn't do something, and the pc was not able to tell the auditor. And these are all that the pc really is objecting to, whatever else he says.

Pc says, "Yap, yap, yap, and you should've, and I feel terrible, and I am all upset, and I don't want any auditing or anything else."

Immediate rejoinder is not, "Well, if it is all right with you I will now run a process on you." That is no time to be taking this up, let me assure you, you see?

That is the time that a pc says, "I don't want to be audited, nothing else, and so forth, and I've just had it, and you're going to run any more engrams on me today? And I . . ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. No thank you."

And you say, "Well, what weren't you able to tell me?" See, you haven't even started the session. "What weren't you able to tell me?"

"What wasn't I able to tell you? What was I able to tell you?"

"Well, what weren't you able to tell me?"

"Well . . oh, I see. You're auditing me."

"Well, yes, if you want to put it that way."

"Well, you haven't started the session yet."

"All right. Well, what weren't you able to tell me?"

"Well, that you haven't started the session yet."

"Well, what else weren't you able to tell me?"

"Well, you remember yesterday, I was right down there in the middle of this dang thing and this spaceship had just crashed, you know? And actually, I was hardly able to talk, and you keep on running the same flubbing, flipping process on and on and on, and there were no answers to it. And all I could do was palely nod my head, but I actually didn't feel like nodding my head at all! Now, that's what I wasn't able to tell you! There!"

"What didn't I do?"

"What didn't you do? Oh, God, you . . . That's easy," see? "You didn't ask the right auditing command, that's what you didn't do." And back and forth, flip-flop, and all of a sudden the pc's in-session.

Now, you should get back and put him on the E-Meter and actually say, "Now, if it is all right with you, I will begin this session . . ." That's what you should do, isn't it? Because the whole end of your last session must have been invalid. He's still in-session. What are you doing starting another one? You didn't end the last one.

Right? So what the hell, you don't monkey around with a bunch of forms. You know, "If you just swing that incense pot, you know, you swing that incense pot, and if the people down there in the choir box all say, 'Ohm, mani padme hum, mea culpa' at the right time, you know, you'll get Clears." Well, let me tell you, they've been swinging incense pots and saying "mea culpa" for two thousand years and we got . . haven't got Clears. We got something else. Right?

So you go putting ritual ahead of getting auditing done and you will always be wrong! Now, there are times to use good form, and that's when everything is sailing along fine. Anybody can use right form. But I will say something about my ancient familial lineage and my dear cousins, the British. They very often continue to use form when they ought to be doing something else. And this has been a failure, hasn't it? You look down the line. That's just a failure. They're going to do it this way when they ought to be doing something, right now, desperately. You got the idea?

Form can get in your road. Form gets . . got in the road of Roman administration. It's gotten so much in the road of American administration today that if the form of asking their wife that night isn't obeyed by the American diplomat attending the conference, of course . . he, of course, can't have anything to say in the next day's conference. You know, the dirty crack about Versailles that set up the Second World War to fire, was that all the wives were consulted every night by the diplomats and so they had a changed treaty state every day. Nobody else brought his wife but the Americans. And they blame that on the American woman.

Now, that's form. That's ritual. Ritual of some kind or another. It's not whether or not we do something now about Berlin. It's whether or not we have a ruddy, flipping conference about Berlin. You got the idea?

Audience voice: Yeah.

Now, what the hell is this conference? Well, the foreign ministers all have to get together, and then you have to set up dates, and you have to do this and that. you don't do anything like that!

If you're going to do something about a situation that is all flying off at all angles, and so forth, well, you do something about the situation. You don't do it by form.

The whole world of diplomacy, not just British diplomacy, but the whole world of diplomacy is just a bunch of form in lieu of doing something You see?

The safe thing to do is to adhere to ritual because then you are not responsible. And that is the whole basis of diplomacy. If you adhere to ritual, you can never be hanged.

It is brought up as a point of the late . . well, he's at least late . . Dag Hammarskjold that the man never made a statement because then he would have to be responsible for some of his commitments. If he had stated something, then he would be responsible for having to execute something, so Dag Hammarskjold made a business of never saying anything positive. And according to one of his best friends, would always take fifty minutes to tell you what he could have told you in five minutes in the first place because he was afraid of making a definite commitment.

Well, what did we see of all this? We saw a perfectly good idea go further and further adrift and more and more astray, and then we saw the Congo, and then we see this, and then all of a sudden we've got sabotage and everything going to hell in a balloon.

You know that the United Nations permitted its first soldier . . its first soldier . . to be killed? Did you know that? The Israel war. That's an interesting thing, isn't it? The first United Nations soldier that wore the white belt of the United Nations was killed in the Middle East without protest by the United Nations. And he was a few days later followed by the United Nations Chief Administrator in the Middle East. Do you remember that? After that do you think they could ever make anything stick? Well, they're just catching up with their own overt, which is not to back up their own authority.

Now, that's simply beside the point. I'm giving you a little bit of a roasting. And the roasting is this: That if you go around thinking form is going to get you out of trouble, but you should be getting out of trouble by wit, you're going to be wrong. Always put getting the job done ahead of doing it according to the rules. Because the rules will only fit the majority of cases. But remember the majority of cases leave a minority that the rules don't handle. Always the case.

You've always got to remember that no matter how much you know about auditing, how many rules you have learned about auditing, how disciplined you get, how you can finally get to a point of where you put the key in the chest and wind yourself up, and then run for two hours, that you're going to run into situations which that will not get you out of Because you are disciplined, because you are well trained, because you do know what you're doing, you can keep your wits about you when anybody else would have gone to hell in a balloon. But that you can do that, does not excuse you from using your noggin. It doesn't excuse you for a moment for not being clever, for not realizing and reading the handwriting on the wall.

There are many ways to handle human beings. Many, many, many ways to handle human beings. There are some right ways and there are some wrong ways. By the way, any trick that you use can always be done within the realm of the Auditor's Code. You don't have to go outside that. The pc is ARC broke. The pc does not want a session. The pc has to have a session. The pc is in trouble. The pc does not want to have you start the session. The pc is in a confusion.

Well, your job is to get a session going. Your job isn't to sit there and do it by the rules.

Oh, well, two hours later, the pc suddenly wakes up and realizes you never started the session. But if you've straightened it all out in those two hours it'd be "Ha-ha. That's one on me! You never started the session, did you?"

And you say, "Well, that's right, but not having started it, I'm now going to have to end it. Is that all right with you?"

Now, the pc's nattering around and saying this and that, and they walk out in the hall, and they won't even come into the auditing room or something like that, that is your time to blow in here with ARC breaks! Got the idea? That's your time to start sailing, not your time to say, "Well, do you want a session? How about my giving you a session?" That's all part of ritual.

This guy has just been struck down by a truck and he's lying there and he's half-conscious and he's bleeding Now, do you say to this person, "Is it all right with you if I give you a little auditing with Scientology?" See, it doesn't make sense when you put it in that category, does it?

All right.