QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: FLOWS

A lecture given on
19 October 1961

How are you today? What is this, the 19th? Guess it is. The 19th.

Okay. 19 October AD 11, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill. And today I have nearly one and all who is busy wrestling with the gruesome problems of problems.

If you're having trouble doing a Problems Intensive, then I could say offhand that you're simply Q-and-Aing with the title of it. And if you're having too much trouble with a Problems Intensive, why, call it the "Solution Intensive" or something.

I could absolutely count on labeling something "Difficult Procedure" and then have the comm lines jam. It isn't quite that bad. I'm in a snide and sarcastic mood today. Mean.

All right. Now, it is unfair to release a new procedure without giving you an opportunity to ask intelligent questions concerning its application. So this is your opportunity to let us all in on the fact that you haven't quite surrounded this one. If you have any question about a Problems Intensive, its administration, its expected result or anything else, speak up. Yes.

Male voice: There used to be a process, "Spot a change in your life." And when you um . . told us to list changes, I was reminded of that. Is there anything we can do wrong to a pc by sort of having their kind of Change Process unflat as it were. A sort of change list . . .

Is there anything wrong with . . . There's an old process, "Spot a change in your life," and is there anything that we might be doing wrong by doing the assessment which then leaves an unflat process.

Male voice: Yes.

No. Don't worry about it because, in the first place, if you are doing your assessment properly, it will come out at the other end as simply a list, such as a terminals list or a goals list. And it'd be no more restimulative than making somebody go over the goals. You see, there used to be an old process called, "Recall a goal you've had," or something like that. There was an old process like that. And that could be completely unflat and we would still be able to get the same Goals Assessment that we got before.

No, I wouldn't say in any way. The only reason changes have been difficult for the individual lies squarely on the fact that there is one that has a tremendous problem behind it. The changes were never the difficulty.

That would not, by the way, be a very good process. It wasn't a very good process. It was abandoned a long time ago. And the reason it isn't a very good process is it turns out in this particular case that it changes a solution. That's a wild one, isn't it? The change is a solution and therefore, in this particular instance, you're running solutions because you're only asking for self-determined changes. And if you ask for self-determined changes, you're asking for the same thing as, "How many times have you solved problems in your life by changing your activities?" That would have to be the auditing command.

"What change have you brought about in your life in order to resolve your activities?" That is really . . if you're going to run a process on the thing, that would be the process you were running Okay? Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Yes, that does, thank you.

All right. Yes, Reg.

Male voice: on assessing for change, should that be done in session? As it does come under section O which we were told to do out of session . . out of Model Session.

Yeah, well, it's out of session.

Male voice: You assess out of session, then.

Yes. That's . . there's no . . there is no particular reason to do any part of the Preclear Assessment Form up through and including O in session. There's no particular reason to do it.

I don't know how some people manage to miss goals and terminals with the rudiments out, but evidently rudiments out, they miss goals and terminals. It might work out that with rudiments very far out in doing this out of session, it might work out that the individual is unable to give you the number of self-determined changes that he might, he might not be able to find the change. But if that condition ever occurred, why, you should let me know about it. But in case of doubt and where you feel absolutely the pc is insufficiently in-session to give you a proper list, well, it's your pc; go ahead and do it in Model Session. Okay? Right.

Yes.

Male voice: Ron, in doing the command, "What is unknown about the problem?"

What is unknown . . doing the command, "What is unknown about the problem?"

Male voice: Right. The pc scans the whole track when he's doing this. Is that correct?

The pc scans the whole track when he is doing it.

Male voice: or can do this.

Well, he doesn't scan it. That's an old technical term.

Male voice: I mean, he's . . he's . . he's . . looking at the whole track.

Well, he picks up pieces of the whole track. That is absolutely right. You want that answered?

Male voice: Well, what I want to know is what . . what's the . . what's happening here? I mean, with a problem that's reoccurring many, many times.

What is happening here with a problem reoccurring many, many times?

Male voice: That's right.

You mean how much track are you running on this pc.

Male voice: This is true, I don't. . .

All right. Well, you get this . . I'll try to straighten it out for you. you get an auditing command, any auditing command . . any . . which is a statement that the pc is to do something; unless you modify the command itself, there can be no understood about it. In other words, everything in an auditing command is implicit in the auditing command. If you want something in the auditing command, you have to put it in the auditing command. We cannot arrange before we run the auditing command that the pc is only to recall that particular zone or instance of his life while we are running this process, see.

We'd go back to this and we would say, "Well . . . " here's . . this is dead wrong. "All right. Now, you and I understand that we're only running this lifetime. Is that correct? So none of your auditing replies are to be outside of this lifetime. Fine." You see, that violates the rule of the understood auditing command.

Because then he is always running the first command you gave him. And of course, you've set up a problem in the session. And you won't get very much result in the running of it.

Every time you have the pc understanding something about an auditing command which is not stated in the auditing command, you are running the pc on a perpetual problem. He has to come back to the beginning of the session every time and remember this, you see. And then he does the auditing command. You're actually processing on a time via.

So that you get this rule, this inexorable auditing rule, that everything you want the pc to do must be implicit in the auditing command. You must say so every time.

All right. The reason I'm going into that is one has to cover these points now and then, not that you don't know it Bob, but here's what it amounts to.

This particular problem that the pc has is located by you as prior to a change the pc has had. And, therefore, must have come immediately after a confusion the pc has had. And we are apparently, at first glance, only addressing this small section of track.

Well now, if we wanted him to stay in that section of track, we'd have to give him a command like this: "What is unknown about that problem you had in 1955 . . . ?" (something like that). "About your father and mother and wanting to leave them?" See, now it would have to be terribly implicit. It'd not only have to date, it'd have to have the substance of the command, it'd have to have everything in it.

All right. Now if you ran that just that way, you would get an interesting result. You would get the problem out of that section of track. You would get it out of that section of track.

But there's the old rule about basic-basics, that the first time something occurred has more weight and is more easily run than any other time it occurred. That's the basic-basic on the chain. Any similar circumstance repetitive through a person's whole track has a first time it occurred. And that first time that it occurred we called basic-basic, you see. That's a basic-basic on this chain of occurrences.

We have no guarantee this is the first time he thought of this problem, so it is perfectly . . not only feasible, but it is best that the pc wander all over the track on that problem, because we will actually go picking it up anywhere and everywhere. It not only is riding back then but is riding up in present.

There's another reason for this. He will get the illusion of wandering all over the track, because problems are timeless. And if you tried to run a problem with an imposition of time on top of it, you would have trouble. So it basically resolves down to this: That it doesn't much matter whether it's best that he stay in 1955, the moment of the problem or not. Your ability to make him do so is almost . . well, you just couldn't do it, that's all. So you'd have to let him do it. He would do it inevitably because this problem probably isn't resident in 1955, but has been coasting on forward now since 1720.

And although you're apparently running a change of 1955, you find yourself suddenly running 1720. And you've already run into this. Well, he will try . . tend to wander to the beginning of the chain. He will tend to go backwards on the beginning of the chain and the only reason we're running it is to knock the chain out. Now we want to get the chain out so that when you get the confusion out of that particular zone and area immediately before it, the problem isn't hanging up.

So what we're actually doing is running the problem so as to get him all over the track so we can get the prior confusion. But we only want the prior confusion of 1955. If we didn't run the problem off, we would have no chance of getting only the prior 1955 confusion. He's going to go all over the track while you're doing a Sec Check. And you don't want him going all over the track. You want to know what he did do to his schoolmates or whoever it is that's in that zone.

So by running the problem permissively and letting him wander all over the track with the problem which he has stated, you then are able more or less to keep him in that space of time immediately before that first time he says the problem occurred. Because the problem always occurred earlier. Okay?

You get two types of run out of this thing It's quite interesting. You get a whole track run and then you get a present lifetime run. And it wasn't basically . . I won't pretend a bunch of knowingness here. It wasn't basically designed this way. I just knew you had to get the problem out of the road. And then in running it, it's obvious that people go all over the track to run the problem and that's fine. And if you find if you try to get the Security Check done before you get the problem run, I think you'll find you're going to have trouble. And the reason why is the problem is prior to the zone of confusion. See, it's going way back. So you wouldn't have much of a chance getting out the zone of confusion.

Apparently, from what fragmentary data is to hand, it is much, much harder on the pc to run the zone of prior confusion if the problem isn't well run.

Something that's quite interesting. I don't know if you've noticed this. You haven't . . maybe you haven't tried to do the prior confusion. Oh, yes, you have. Yes, some of you have done the prior confusion. You had a hard time slugging at it. Well, if you had any hard time getting the prior confusion, that was because there was this lousy problem hidden in there, see? And the problem wasn't about to surrender. Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Yes, yes, it does.

All right. There's another point I've got to make here about problems. There is something else. There's always something else. But you have a permissive type of auditing command on the problem run in a Problems Intensive is sometimes not feasible on a pc who is poorly, who is rather introverted on the subject. If the pc is too introverted on a subject in general or if it's an apathetic sort of a problem or if it is a problem which seems to take in or could easily take in many people, a one-command Problems Process is not good enough.

I'll give you a direct idea. This has turned up several times here. But a problem something on the order of "What am I going to do with myself?"

This is not . . this is not a strange problem, you see. "What am I going to do with myself?" This has turned up.

Well, "You . . what don't you know about doing something with yourself?" or some such command as that comes out of it. And the pc has been so introverted on the subject that it is not a permissive command . . "What is unknown about doing something with yourself?"

And he just runs it from his side. He just says, "I . . I . . I . . I," and the next thing you know he's in a stuck flow. He never thinks of it being unknown to anybody else. His ideas never extend into that zone and he already has spent years of saying to himself, "What am I going to do? What am I going to do? What am I going to do? What am I going to do?" And he's on a stuck flow of "I," don't you see? Here's your stuck flow. Here are flows lifting their ugly heads.

And it just never occurs to him that when you ask him the problems question, "What is unknown about doing something with your life?" to say, "Well, it was unknown to my father." See, he never says that. He always says, "It was unknown to me. It was unknown to me. It was unknown to me. It was unknown to me." And he's just going on running the stuck flow.

It's already stuck. Now all he's got to have to do is invent a couple there and he's really in bad shape promptly. See, he's got a stuck flow and you're compounding the stuck flow.

So in such a case, it is actually necessary to put a second leg on the auditing command. "What didn't you know about doing something with your life?" Or "What was unknown to you about doing something your . . with your life?" "What was unknown to others about doing something with your life?" Not a terrifically model command, but it gives you the idea, you see. "What didn't you know about doing something with your life?" "What didn't others know about doing something with your life?"

And if this is an introvertive type thing, such as that particular type of problem, you'll rip up an automaticity on "What did others know?"

All right. We . . give you an example. Here's this girl and she wanted to be a painter. And her parents said, "Well, that is just fine. And the thing which you really ought to be in life is a housekeeper. And we're going to teach you to be a housekeeper."

And she says, "I really want to be a painter."

And they say, "Housekeeper. Housekeeper. Housekeeper. Housekeeper."

So she finally says, "Well, all right. Housekeeper."

And then they say, "Well, dear, we have been very, very mean to you and you wanted to go into the field of the arts so we will let you study millinery."

And she said, "Well, uh . . all right. Uh . . uh . . all right. Yes, yes, I'll study millinery," and so forth.

Well, so she goes ahead and she goes and gets a book on millinery and she's all set and she's getting herself briefed up and then her mother says to her, "Well, you know, there's a nice opening over here someplace. There's a nice opening over here on a drill press operator and I really think you ought to study drill press operating" And what it is actually . . ask yourself this: What would happen to a pc that every time he gave you a goal on an assessment, you said, "Oh, no. Here is a much nicer one"?

If you did it in the most pleasant tone of voice, there would be a small splash heard and that would be the pc going into the soup.

Well now, a person who is . . has one of these occupational, particularly, problems . . you see, "What am I going to do with my life?" something like that . . has really only got a problem because other people had an opinion and their idea of what they should do with their lives was directly contrary to the mores that other people were expressing. And the other people, of course, being many and not . . it wasn't their life, gave them varied things to do and all kinds of alternates and lots of contradictions. And it made a ridge, see.

Here was a ridge. Pc wants to go that way; the other people all sort of want to go another way, don't you see? So we ask this pc the question, "What didn't others know about doing something with your life?" And he gets up brrrrrrt.

And he thinks, "Oh, yeah." And he thinks of one person, he thinks of another person. He thinks of another person. And they all had different ideas. Or maybe none of them had any idea at all. So any time he tried to get any answer to this, "What to do something with your life?" he ran into "I don't know." "Well, you just make up your own mind about it." And of course, they could surround some youngster with that and you would get the immediate result of nobody knowing what to do with his life.

He'd not know what to do with his life. And others wouldn't know what to do with his life. And anything to do with his life was unknown to others and was unknown to him. You'd get the same result if you had fifteen other people with fifteen other ideas about what he should do with his life, all of them in contradistinction to what he wanted to do with his life and you see what kind of a nonsense you're building up.

One, is you're asking him to go into a valence of other people's unknowingness (they didn't know what to do with his life) and two, you're asking a terrific conflict to occur which would build up a ridge. It's a ridge of disagreement. You see what I'm talking about?

So you get a two-sided auditing command then and it dispels this. Any auditing command may have inherent in it . . I will make it very plain and state it for the ten thousandth time . . has inherent in it flows. There's a potentiality of flows.

You run a girl on the subject of jewelry. And, well, let's say that she's been successful on the stage or something, was always getting jewelry presents, you see. Jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry

presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents. And you know, one day she can't have any jewelry?

If you ask her to hand you a ring for its inspection also, she's liable to start screaming. You see, the jewelry has only gone in one way. See, there's a one-way flow of jewelry from out there to in here. you got the idea? And it's always gone from out there to in here. And it's never gone from in here to out there.

She'll eventually wind up with boxes of jewelry under her pillow and she won't be able to separate herself from jewelry and she also won't be able to wear jewelry. A lot of rich women have tremendous quantities of jewelry all locked up in a safe.

And you say, "Well, why don't you wear it to a party?" or something of this sort.

"Oh, no." They never think of wearing it. you know? But they've got jewelry, but it has to be hidden. Well, it's some kind of a stuck flow. Now, to resolve that you'd have to say, "Recall being given some jewelry" and "How far away from you could you move a piece of jewelry?"

This . . it wouldn't matter . . . You wouldn't ask them "How could you give away some jewelry?" You see, this is a . . this is an antisurvival action to them. It's counter to games condition which is why it won't run. And you'll start an avalanche of jewelry. You start asking this and you'll unlock the ridge on which it's held up on. And you'll get a brrrrrrrt. And all of a sudden, jewelry just starts flying in from everyplace.

You'd have to be a pretty clever auditor to get one of these avalanches triggered. But you can sometimes trigger an avalanche. And it'll be an avalanche of jewelry or an avalanche of cars or an avalanche of mountains or an avalanche of something The person's had too much of it, don't you see. And they have . . it's been a stuck flow and it's kept coming in. And then pretty soon it just stacked up and when you start to run it again, why all the facsimiles of the inflow all turn on on automatic. And you have avalanches. And that's what an avalanche is.

You can also get an out-avalanche on some item. Well, take a person is lecturing If he's lecturing and he's pretty aberrated and so forth, why, you just, "Get the idea of lecturing Get the idea of lecturing. Get the idea of lecturing," and all of a sudden he gets visual manifestations of words pouring away from him toward others. You get the idea? But because it's across games condition, you wouldn't audit it.

Flows. Flows are part and parcel of every auditing command. And if the pc is running an auditing command up from A to B and the next time he answers it, the flow is from A to B. And the next time he answers it, the flow is from A to B. And the next time he answers it, the flow is from A to B. All of a sudden, he can go into a black occlusion.

Everything will turn black. His pictures turn off. All kinds of odd things can occur simply by having this one-way flow. And that's why we call it a stuck flow.

Now, if you have him answer the auditing command from B to A, B to A, B to A, all of a sudden the occlusion goes off and he isn't occluded now, suddenly. It's quite mysterious. Stuck flows. You'll see these things register on your E-Meter. A stuck flow starts sticking the needle. In fact, all needle sticks are stuck flows. When your needle sticks up, why, you've got a stuck flow.

Now, you'll see this in a fellow's withhold. This individual is withholding. He's got something He's done something minor. He's shot the king of France or something. And he's withholding it. Well, that is a nonpermitted flow. So of course, everything that goes in against it sticks because there must be no backflow on it of any kind whatsoever. He regrets the backflow. He should not have ever backflowed the bullet in the first place, so he's withholding it now. So he holds this fact in.

Now, everything you offer him about the king of France flows in, and . . but nothing can come out on the subject of the king of France, don't you see? And you'll see that needle go up. Stick. You'll see the tone arm rise and not go back down again. He's got a withhold he won't . . you know?

And the more you make him conscious of it, the more he becomes conscious that he had better withhold it. So the more you flow in any question toward him, why, the more he holds the question in, see. And he keeps packing himself up finally and he's squashing. And you can just see it register right over here on the tone arm. He just squashes himself with the withhold. Got the idea?

Now all of a sudden he says . . gives up because you're clever and you ask the right questions and you say suddenly . . you say, "Well, did you ever murder a king"

"Oooo-ooooh-ho-ooh." He can't withhold it, see. you triggered it. "And well um . . . " And you say, "What's that?" you know, in an authoritative voice. "Oh, that has to do something about . . which king was it?"

"Oh, well, I murdered the king of France." And you'll see him go down . . see the tone arm go down. Well, you've reversed the flow. That is why you see that manifestation occur. The most that an E-Meter registers is stuck flows.

Now, an oscilloscope . . stuck flows or not stuck flows. An oscilloscope properly rigged up on somebody shows the direction of flow. This is really weird. You can set up an oscilloscope . . a one-hand electrode . . and you can set up an oscilloscope and you can ask this fellow to "Get the idea of getting . . of receiving some candy. Thank you. Receiving some candy. Get the idea of receiving some candy. Thank you. Get the idea of receiving some candy. Thank you. Get the idea of receiving some candy. Thank you." And you'll see the oscilloscope start moving in one direction. Zzz-zz-zz-zz, zzz-zz-zz-zz. You'll see the sine wave move, move, move, you see, from left to right, left to right, left to right, left to right, left to right, left to right. And you say, "Get the idea of receiving some candy. Good. Get the idea of receiving some candy." And the oscilloscope is moving over from left to right, left to right, left to right and then slower as you keep asking to get this idea and slower and slower. And stick. And the sine wave will be right there on stuck. And it won't move in any direction. And you say, "Get the idea of receiving some candy." And it just kind of gets a little more rigid.

Now you say to him, "Now, get the idea of throwing away some candy." And you'll see this thing still stuck. "Get the idea of throwing away some candy." Still stuck.

"Get the idea of throwing away some candy." Tremble, see, on your oscilloscope.

"All right. Now get the idea of throwing away some candy," and you'll see the sine wave start drifting from right to left, the opposite direction and you'll see it going from right to left. Very slowly.

"Get the idea of throwing away some candy. Okay." And then it'll speed up and the sine wave will go from right over to left faster and faster and faster and faster. And finally it's just whizzing.

And then as you keep asking, "Get the idea of throwing away some candy," it will slow down and it will stick.

And now, you have to say to him, "Get the idea of receiving some candy." And now you'll get it going from left to right again. And that is a stuck flow. And it's one of the weirdest things you ever cared to watch.

The reason we don't use an oscilloscope: (1) they're terribly expensive and (2) they register, all those formed up so far. . . Reg was good enough to get me some experimental scopes and we had a lot of work done in this particular direction. But they register terrific body phenomena. The pc wiggles his nose and oh, the oscilloscope just goes crazy, you see. And somebody four feet away from the pc moves his shoulder and the oscilloscope moves, you see.

But you can have the pc's case right in your lap, you know. you can say, ah . . you could . . big withhold is the fact that just yesterday you robbed a bank or something And you could say, "Well, ah . . did you ever rob a bank?" And you get the tiniest, faintest, tremble, see it's very, very faint, it's extremely faint. But the pc just wiggling his ears causes the thing to go mad.

The E-Meter's quite valuable. It doesn't do this. It registers the mind before it registered body motion. Body motion is registered much less than the mental reaction on the way this E-Meter is built. But on an oscilloscope . . those that we have so far worked with . . why, the body reaction, the movement of the pc's finger or anything of this character registers wildly on the scope. And yeah, nobody could read it. I can read it but with a microscope, you know. I mean, what are these little vibrations. That's the difficulty.

But you'd set up an oscilloscope anyway, in spite of these limitations (and tell the pc not to breathe anymore than necessary) and you can watch these flow phenomena. Now, you don't see them on the E-Meter. An E-Meter goes up whether the pc is flowing in or flowing out. The stick occurs, the E-Meter does not tell you the direction of flow, whether it is in or out. Now, if you draw a map around a pc, you will figure out how many kinds of flow there could be. How many directions of flow could there be? Oh, you get lots then don't you? You get not only in and out and . . to another, in and out from another . . you get all these various patterns. But you'd also get up and down and back of you and away from you and on your right side and away from you and to you and on your left side and away from you and to you.

You get all these things and if you were putting up mock-ups you would use these things. But the basic 5 bracket that you use is the most common and the most important flow directions. And that's why you use that 5-way bracket. That's what's known as a bracket. It's a 5-way flow pattern. It's from the pc out to somebody else, from the somebody else in to the pc.

Now, there's another little one of the other person's flow pattern is more important to the bank, you see, than many other directions there could be around the pc. It's important to the bank that the pc flows in and out. This is most important. But next in importance is another person's outflow and inflow. And then, next to that is somebody else's outflow and inflow to the other person. And then there's, of course, the internal flows and ridges inside the person the pc is confronting and then the flows and ridges internally inside the pc.

So you've got these various patterns. You could work them out. They're the most important patterns. And if you only run two-ways of a flow you could sooner or later run into one of these . . the third one. you go too long on the thing, such as you run on a long Prehav run, you can start running into the third one. You'll see the interchange in flows around the person the pc is confronting in the bank. And that person's flows can jam and you will get a jammed E-Meter. In other words, if you don't run enough flows and directions, you'll get a stuck up meter.

Now, this applies, of course, in running any process. But what do you care, doing a limited process? Very limited. You are only going to run it for a few minutes. Something like this. you can't get anybody in very serious trouble.

But is there anything that you could get somebody in trouble with? Yes, you can overrun a flow. And now you get a stick and a kind of a . . of a break-up that is known as a blowdown. You can run a flow too long in one direction and eventually it'll blow up. Something will happen. It's not necessarily good for the pc. But you can overrun a flow. And that's why I say when you're running a Prehav level you're overrunning all flows. You know, you can run them too long. There's nothing left there to run and therefore your tone arm is no longer moving And you know you better come off of it, because the more you run it the more stuck it's going to get and you're not now doing the fellow any good. All flows are exhausted out of a certain zone or area or on a certain subject, so therefore, you get off of it.

So, all flows can run out and leave something else there. Well, you're running a, "mean to a mother." See? And you're saying, "Now, when have you been mean to a mother?" "When has a mother been mean to you?" "When have you been mean to yourself?" "When has a mother been mean to herself?" "When has somebody else been mean to a mother?" "When has a mother been mean to somebody else?" See, you're just . . here's lots of flows, don't you see? "When has a mother been mean to others?" "When have others been mean to Mother?" You see? It can go on and on out . . oh, I don't know, you can get it up to thirty-two commands without half trying

And then you could make all these positive and negative. You can really get complicated. "When have you been mean to Mother?" "When have you not been mean to Mother?" "When has Mother been mean to you?" "When have . . when has Mother not been mean to you?" Get the idea? "When has Mother not been

mean to somebody else?" "When has Mother been mean to somebody else?" "When has another been mean to Mother?" "When has another not been mean to Mother?" Well, you get what we're doing here, you see. You're getting the negative flow and the positive flow at the same time and you're getting all available flows that might stick up the case at the same time.

And you can just get. . . Well, it's something like the Ensign goes out and he takes his sextant, you see and he takes the eyepiece of the sextant and he polishes it all up with a dirty handkerchief . . he can't see through it, you know . . and ruins the glass on that, you see. And then he takes the shades that go across it and he sees there are about ten shades in this particular sextant. So he pulls them all down across the eyepiece, you see, so that you can't see anything through it. And then he takes the thing and he adjusts it to . . on the backwards limb of the sun, you see, so he's got to shoot over his head toward the sun, you know. And then as he's fishing around . . it's evening, you see, so he can see the horizon and the sun and the stars. Sun's going down, you know and all this sort of thing.

The sun is too low on the horizon. He finds that's very difficult but there is some position that he can get into that he can see it very, very well. And he gets a beautiful shot. And he marks it all down. And he reads the vernier with a magnifying glass, you see, reads it down to the last second. He takes his time . . Greenwich Mean Time . . he takes it on the finest stopwatch you ever heard. He takes that down to the chronometer, you see. Compares it exactly. Then he starts looking up in his mathematical tables, you know. And he gets dozens and dozens of figures. And then he crosscorrects these things and he figures everything down absolutely perfectly. He scorns the air almanac because it's too crude. He's got to have the nautical almanac, you see, with everything. And he figures it out down to the last second of the day, the exact geographical position. Puts all these figures down; he's filled up the whole table full of figures, you see. And he's all set, you see and he takes . . he takes a very sharp pencil, you see and he takes it and puts it right down exactly on the chart and he says, "We are exactly right there." And he says, "Well, that's a job well done," and pats himself on the back. And the only difficulty was, he didn't shoot the sun, he shot the truck light.

Now, you can very easily do that, you see. you can very easily do something beyond the necessity to do it, you see or beyond the need of the situation. You can figure out the mathematics of it, you see. And you could figure out the mathematics of these flows down to a thirty-two command flows. See, thirty-two flows, thirty-two commands and then positive and negative on each one of these flow lines, you see. And that would give you sixty-four consecutive commands that you would have to give before you go around the next time. you get the idea?

Well, that's just opening up book after book and figuring out the nautical almanac, you see and getting it all figured, tight, tight and all perfect, you see. And you spend so much time doing this, you don't notice the pc has long since been out of session and has forgotten what the terminal was and has no longer any interest in it and so forth.

You get the idea. The . . you see, the mind is actually capable of a considerable resurgence and you cash in on that all the time. you give the mind a free look at present time. The mind is free in present time. That is to say the person hasn't got a present time problem out in the society someplace, he hasn't got an ARC break with the auditor, he's freed up as far as present time is concerned, his auditing room is okay and he's being audited. All right, he gets with that freedom an ability to as-is. He does have a certain ability, don't you see. And this takes care of a tremendous number of rough spots. He can take care of a lot of omitted lines. For instance, you can run a 5-way bracket and you wind up just fine. He'll get all of it. See, it will all come loose. You get the level as flat as is necessary in order to resolve his case. you get the present time problem resolved, you see, sufficiently, so that he can be in-session. All of these things are sufficiencies, they're not absolutes.

And auditing is not an absolute practice. If it were an absolute practice you would really be in the soup. Well, if every bad experience he had ever had in the last two hundred trillion years had to be audited out as an engram, it would take you the next two hundred trillion years, of course. Because a fifteen minute engram, quite ordinarily, if it's not on the goals-terminal line takes 4 or 5 hours to audit. So you get your multiple. So if you want to audit him two hundred trillion years, then assume that it has to be the absolute of everything ever . . bad that has ever happened to him has to be audited out. Well, this makes an impossible look, don't you see. So auditing becomes impractical.

But nearly everything bad that has ever happened to him is going to blow if you pull out certain pins. Well now, that is the cushion on which you're operating, you see, that if we get this and this and this adjusted with the mind, then the mind is capable of readjusting And it's the capability of the mind to resurge which is your biggest stock in trade. And the mind resurges to the degree that the rudiments are in and that the pc is in-session. In other words, you get somebody who is not quite in-session and you will notice that he won't as-is things easily. You grind and grind and grind and grind and grind and grind and grind and he just doesn't seem to be running anything and nothing seems much to be happening and so forth. Well, that's because you actually aren't operating now with the ability of the mind to resurge. This has been cut down to nothing By what? Well, by some present time problem and so on.

The reason you're running a Problems Intensive is to make the mind resurge sufficiently so that when you run the goals chain, you will . . you will do ten times as much work in the same amount of auditing ordinarily. You see, you save time by freeing the mind up so that it can do these things. You got the idea?

I notice some of you looking a little blank about this. But flows . . flows are pretty hard to get across to an auditor. I'll tell you that this has not been easy to do. So I give a talk on it every once in awhile. But it's usually not too well telegraphed.

Best thing you can do is go out and play with a garden hose for a while. You know, have somebody squirt it on you and you squirt it on somebody else and then have them squirt it on a tree and . . . You'll eventually get the idea. Then you'll be hung up on this one probably: "Well, what is it that is flowing?" Well, the reason you're having a hard time with it is you don't realize the mind is full of particles. You think the mind is full of thoughts. Well, if there was anything wrong with the thoughts of the mind there would be nothing wrong with the mind. How do you think these thoughts ever connect up with anything?

Well, the thought gets connected with the particles and the particles get connected with solids. And the pc tries to think and runs into solids. And you audit him and you run into particles. And if you think there's nothing in the mind, put away your copy of Mary Baker Eddy and start studying Scientology. You're actually, noth . . there's nothing wrong with the pc's thinkingness. There's nothing wrong with his thoughts. It's the fact that his thinkingness gets joined up with the creation of energy, space, time manifestations. And these things get all mixed up with thinkingness, so that he can't think a thought without getting a mass. Or he can't think of a mass without getting a particle. And he can't think of a time without getting a space.

These things are all mixed up and he cannot differentiate amongst these things. He can't differentiate amongst most of the dynamics, when he gets to thinking in the reactive bank. And the reactive bank, of course, is all dynamics associated with or identified with all dynamics and the sixth dynamic in particular identified with all dynamics and the seventh dynamic then identified with all of the reactive mind. And if you wanted to draw a map of the reactive mind, that would be the identifications in it.

You see, thinkingness only goes haywire when an individual is no longer able to differentiate where he should or associate where he should. He's no longer in control of differentiation or association. He gets identification. "Mama is monster. House is jail. Horses . . beds."

And then he'll get up into verbal identification. You'll find out there are a lot of people around who still have these semantic identifications that Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health was built on. Had so many of them around that I specialized on it. Semantics of it are quite interesting "He rowed a boat. He r-o-a-d a boat. He r-o-d-e a boat. What did he dod with the boat." These are identifications.

And he . . we found an airline pilot one time. .. You can do some interesting things with semantics. But they are either not very lasting or very, very pervasive. But they are terribly interesting and you can produce very fast phenomena with semantics. Over here in England, if we'd specialized more with semantics than we have, HASI London would do better. But HASI London has to suffer along because it's compared with the rest of the world, don't you see? And you find more semantic identification, probably, in HASI London than elsewhere.

But you get some kind of a situation like this. An airline pilot came in . . I think he was National or American Airlines . . came in, we audited him for a little while. All we did was look for the phrase that gave him a compulsion to have accidents or why he was flying. And this is what finally turned up, is a statement of his mother's. Well, actually, he had run a garage and he'd failed and he'd run this and he'd failed and he'd run that and he'd failed and he'd finally gone back to flying and he hated it. And he just couldn't figure out any part of this. But it was one phrase of his mother and the phrase was identified with many things, you see . . with pain and so forth. But it then became identified with all things and the phrase was "He was no Earthly good." So reactively this worked out that he ought to fly.

We cured a case that had leukemia one time. It was just one phrase in the bank that was causing the leukemia. Just one phrase was all that was identified. And that is "It would turn your blood to water." He was a little kid, sick and his mother just said this all the time. And the auditor heard the mother saying this sort of thing and simply got the kid to repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it. That was the end of the leukemia. Blood was water and that is leukemia.

But you could make some interesting stunts this way. old semantic auditing; identifications of words with words . . there . . these things are very, very interesting. But an auditor has to be very clever and he very often isn't successful and he fails many times and some people . . just impossible to drill into their heads and find out what it is that is associated.

If you could run engrams on everybody, with semantic association, we'd probably still be doing it, but you can't so we'd have to look for more basic things. You see, Dianetics ends right about there; doesn't go much further than that. It has to do with the engram, identifications that are associated with the engram and an understanding of semantics. And then it takes off from there and the first real departure is the discovery of overt acts, 1950, end of 51 . . that everybody was running motivators, motivators, motivators and the only thing that made it come free was getting the overt off. That's as early as 1951. I don't know if you knew it was quite that old.

But just exactly how to apply all that and how to get it simple and how much importance it had in the mind and so forth . . it took many years to level this thing out so that it was functional.

But this flow situation can be overdone by the auditor. You see: positive-negative. Thirty-two directions of flow. "Get the idea of giving something to somebody behind you." "Get the idea of somebody behind you giving something to you." you know. There . . well that's a flow line. "Get the idea of not giving something to somebody behind you." "Get the idea of somebody behind you not giving something to you." "Get the idea of somebody under you giving you something." "Get the idea of you giving you somethi . . giving something to somebody under you."

Well, we're just getting . . it's getting ridiculous, you see. We've over . . we've over enumerated the whole problem, you see. The mind is more capable than that. The mind could actually take care of many of these things. If you get the pins straightened up somewhat, the rest of them will straighten up, don't you see? So, you can use a 5-way bracket and get there.

Well, the only real mistake you can make, of course, then is having so many flows that you really never get a chance to get down to the root of the problem. It's all goes into the mechanics and then you'll find you've shot the truck light, the pc isn't even in-session.

And you can make a mistake the other way. And that is to undercut, that is to under number the flows. You find the pc always runs something from out there in, always runs something from out there in, always runs something from out there in. Your E-Meter is going to start getting a sticky needle. Your tone arm is going to start going up. you won't know what in the name of common sense is happening

Now, of course, he has withholds. So, crudely, you could get off a withhold and stop him from doing this. But you should understand why the E-Meter acted that way. The E-Meter acted that way because he was running everything as a motivator, everything as a motivator, everything as a motivator.

"Oh, well, yes. Yes, I did have trouble with my family." You'll find in the Problems Intensive. "Yes, they beat me and they beat me and . . then. . . My mother beat me a great deal and when she got tired, my

father would beat me. Then they would both beat me and then my older sister beat me and then they all beat me. And that was . . that was times, of course, when they weren't swearing at me. They used to swear at me awful badly. And uh . . and uh . . then I had an Uncle George and he kicked me; he kicked me."

Well, after a long sad dissertation somewhere down along this line, you're going to find this E-Meter will keep going up, tone arm keeps going up, the needle starts getting sticky and so on. Well, he's just going motivator-motivator-motivator-motivator-motivator. Well, of course, that's just one flow. Them out there was hitting in toward him here, you got the idea? And you've got an inflow, an inflow, an inflow, an inflow, an inflow. Well, he's been going on like this for years. It's not just in the auditing session. You're just going on letting him do what he has been doing for years and years and years. He's told everybody about how they beat him and how they kicked him. And of course, this is just more in, more in, more in.

Well, in view of the fact they didn't do half of these things or didn't do them at all, he's not going to run anything out that really isn't there because, in the first place, what's holding it pinned is the fact there's never any flow going the other way. There's no reverse flow of any kind. He never mentions what he did. Well, he did . . he did outflow. In fact, the outflow is basic on the chain.

So until you trigger this outflow, none of the inflow will release. It's quite mysterious. You trigger . . it looks to him like, well, it was what he did and he really should have been guilty in the first place or something It looks . . it looks moral to him. But in actual fact it is not moral. It's the fact that he started an outflow along a certain Tone Scale level, you see? He decided to be mean and nasty and he gave out a heck of a lot of overts. And he opened the gates wide open, because he made a line on which an interchange could occur. And having made this line on which an interchange could occur, now he can be inflowed upon on misemotional levels. Well, for some reason or other, every time he starts to get off his outflow line, the inflow line attracts his attention and he can only pay attention to the motivators. So he says motivator-motivator-motivator-motivator-motivator and he never gets well.

Now, you say, "What did you do? What did you do?"

And he says, "Well, not very much. In fact, I've never done anything." And your needle gets a little higher and it gets a little stickier. And you finally . . say, "Well, at one time, the actual fact is, when my father was beating me . . he had me down on the floor and he was beating me with a two-inchthick stick. And he was beating me very hard. And I did, I had an overt: I frowned slightly." And we . . and we move upstairs on that gradient and we eventually get his overts off and the beatings disappear, which is all quite mysterious.

And that is simply based on this one horrible fact that a thetan was never inflowed on, until he himself had outflowed. That is a basic rule. A thetan was never inflowed on until he himself had outflowed. And that, you can mark your stars, is right.

I'll give you an example. Well, you come along to this new planet. Now, how is anybody going to know how to shoot at you? Figure it out. How is anybody going to know how to shoot at you? They don't even know you're there till you outflow. See, you're totally invisible till you outflow. So you have to outflow in order to get an inflow. So basic on the chain is always the outflow. You aren't visible until you outflow.

Therefore, you get an awful lot of social codes of the best and safest thing to do: Never say anything and never be anywhere. That's safe. See, that's good and safe. Of course, you never do anything and you'll never see anything and nothing will ever happen. That's true too; nothing will ever happen. Nothing ever! Not for millions of years, nothing will ever happen. You see how it would be? You would at . . never at any time outflow in any direction.

Well, the police, evidently, in many areas think this is just the thing. Because the only two things that are ever punished in this universe is communicating and being there. If you will be there or communicate, these things can be punished. If you want to evade punishment, and if there mustn't ever be any

punishment of any character, of course, obviously if those are the two things that are punished . . just never communicate and never be there. You won't live either, but that's all right.

Many people solve it this way. Somebody that you think of as being in apathy simply has solved the thing that way. He's got life solved. It's all taped; it's all taped. He'll get along just fine if he's never there and he never speaks. And he goes around and he gets a reputation for being a good listener. And he gets a reputation for this and he gets a reputation for that. And after a while they know he's there. And then they find out that he's inoffensive. And he's very easy to inflow on. So they kick him! And that invalidates his solution.

His solution only applied to while he was out here in space someplace, you see. But where he adopts this as a halfhearted modus operandi for existence it won't work. yet you'll see it taught as a social code. You'll see in schools they're always teaching some young boy, or they're teaching some young girl. Lot of girls wandering around have this down pat: "All you have to do is listen to a man and not quite be there and never really be on time for appointments, you know. Be a little . . a little bit late; joggle it somehow." That keeps a man anxious. They have ways and means of explaining why they do this, you see. There's lots of rationale about it.

Actually, all they're doing is solving life by not communicating and not being there. And then one day, somebody gets mad at them and knocks their head off. Well, why does somebody get mad at them. Well, they get mad at them because they're not there and they're not communicating, of course.

All right. Well, I just wanted to go over this with flows, because here you are going into Problems Intensives and all of a sudden you're having to put together auditing commands and you find that these auditing commands are somewhat dependent on the subject of flows. And being so dependent, you must pay some attention to it. This is something an auditor should always pay some attention to when he's putting together an auditing command. One is clear the auditing command. Make it . . sure that the pc understands it. Make sure that the pc can answer it or get the thing squared around or spoken or worded so that it can be answered so that it can be understood. That's clearing the auditing command.

The next is registering the auditing command on the meter, which is almost clearing the auditing command, but not quite. Let's make sure that this is something that makes the needle move. Let's not just dream up some oddball version of an auditing command then never inspect it on a meter. You should always look over your meter with regard to an auditing command you're going to run.

And the next thing is, is every time you give a command get it answered. Now, those are the things to know about commands, basically: That you've got to get it answered, get it understood, get it runnable, make sure that it registers and make sure that when you speak the command, finally, it is all set, all squared away, you know what's going to happen. And when you speak the command, you do get that question answered.

Yeah, it's a pretty hard one. But part of putting together the auditing command is making sure that you don't set up a stuck flow situation. You're not going to run a thing like, "Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you." After a while, the tone arm is going to rise, the needle is going to stick. And you're going to say, "Well, that's flat." Yeah, well, far as it went, it's flat. It's flat into a ridge, that's what it is. You've made a ridge. He's out, out, out, out, out, out. The games condition of it is violated, of course, because beating your wife actually is giving her something. It really is you know.

You'd be surprised. That's why war is degrading: soldiers are always giving each other things. You start to run it and you test it out and you'll find out that it'll run just that way. "Be nice to the enemy, give them some bullets." Now, if you could run a war . . if you could run a war so that it was a total inflow war . . that is to say . . that probably wouldn't work either. But so that you never gave the enemy anything . . if you could run a war so that you never gave the enemy anything; never any bullets, never any mock-ups, never any signs of soldiers or anything like that, why, that'd be fine. That'd probably work out all right. But you'd have to . . it'd be a peculiar kind of a war you'd have to figure out in order to make that come about.

But otherwise, there sits the machine gunner. Holy cats! You ever figure out the amount of weight of a belt of machine gun bullets. Well, he's just handed them gratuitously to the enemy. He's giving them away and eventually will feel degraded. Then he explains it all to himself on a religious basis. He says, "Well, actually, thou shalt not kill and here I am out killing and therefore, because I'm doing that and these actually are this and so on and that. . . " and figures it all out. And, actually, it's . . the most fundamental of it is, is he's giving something away while in a games condition. So he must be losing if he is giving away. And he figures it out that he's losing the war if he's fighting the war, if he fires any bullets during the war . . 'cause, it's total nonsense, but that's the kind of the way this flow thing figures out.

Then he'll have thoughts about it and it is contrary to certain mores and then that gives him efforts to withhold so he is firing bullets while trying to withhold them. And then he's got a lot of things explained to himself as to why he's fighting the war and they have nothing to do with him. So he's fighting the whole war on an irresponsibility. If he kills any man, that's not his fault, it's the war, you see.

All of these things start adding up and you get so many lies and so many curves and so many vias that the whole thing becomes quite degrading after a while.

But the . . an auditor shouldn't run a counter-games-condition process if he can possibly avoid it. If it's all give, it's contrary game conditions. You can have it all receive and not be contrary games condition, but it's contrary to flows. So these things you have to keep in mind in putting an auditing command together. So you want to get some kind of a grasp of exactly what they are and put the auditing command together so that flows will balance and the pc can understand it and 80 that when you finally haul back and let go with the auditing command, it can be answered, it will be answered and you are going to see that it's answered and that's it. And then don't wind up at the end of the session finding out that only 25 percent of your auditing commands were answered. You gave twenty-five questions, you must have twenty-five answers.

If a question is missed, you could even go back on this basis. This is important enough so that you can ask a pc . . you know, the out . . the end rudiments are out, see . . and, "During this session, is there one auditing command you failed to answer?" Almost important enough, you see, to be an end rudiment. "Is there one auditing command or more that you failed to answer to your satisfaction," and so forth "in this session?"

And all of a sudden he tells you, "Yes, there was. Yes, there was," and your end rudiments go in. you see, it's as magical as that. But we count on the auditor making sure that those auditing questions are answered, so we haven't added it into the end rudiments yet. But it's actually important enough that if I were recomposing end rudiments I would probably put it in there.

All right, well, I've talked a lot here. Tried to give you some answering of that, you woke up something. But I've had to hand out a couple of two-way flows on problems, already . . two-way flows. You know, I had to have a double question for the problem because the problem was so gauged that the pc never would have reached the other side of a flow. It never would have balanced itself up in the run. you see, you can use an auditing command wording that the pc will run all sides of the auditing command. Like "What was happening during that period?" Well, you've now asked him . . any flow that comes up, he will tell you about, don't you see? "What was happening, during that period." But now you say, "What were people doing during that period," you've probably got him out of it, see. So you've deleted it down. So if you said, "What were people doing" you'd also have to say, "What are you doing?" See, "What were you doing during that period?" you know. You'd have to balance it up.

But there are wordings of auditing commands which go as a total. You get a wording of the auditing command so that it will take up any flow that comes up. And there are quite a few of them. "What is happening?" Well, or "What was happening?" "What was unknown?" should be one of them, if it isn't such an introvertive problem.

Also, I should mention to you, before I forget it, that O/W also runs that problem. You know, you could . . you could assess it out for some people and run O/W on the people, you'd still run the problem. You

could say, "What part of that problem were you responsible for?" or " . . . have you been responsible for?" That would run that problem. Any one of the old Problems Processes would run on the Problems Intensive problem. We're just running the best one which is "unknown," you see.

Pc couldn't get an idea of "unknown," you always have "forget." That's the lower harmonic of "unknown." "What has been forgotten about that problem?" "What have others forgotten? What have you forgotten?" if you wanted to broaden it out. "Forgotten" is always the lower harmonic of "unknown." "What didn't you know? What didn't others know?" "What shouldn't have been known about that?"

You . . any . . there's lots of versions. You remember all the versions I gave you on how to run an engram with "not-know?" There's a lot of them. There's all the versions of "unknown," "not-know," "forgotten," "they forgot," "shouldn't have known" . . all of these things. All these types of wordings actually could be run on that problem, in trying to clear it with a pc, you see and the pc can't get the idea of unknown. Well, you have other choices. It isn't good enough to just leave the problem unrun. You've got other choices. There are many types of wordings and flows and so forth you could run a problem with.

Because I pointed out that in a Problems Intensive, your basic goal is to run the problem . . not to word it; your basic goal is to run it, you see. And the reason you have that goal is you wish to clear it. So, therefore, if you're going to run the problem, you should run it in such a way that it will clear. And if you run it on a stuck flow, of course it won't. And if you run it with the pc unable to do anything about it, you won't.

Yes.

Female voice: on this running a problem, do you use the terminal . . .

Hm?

. . . or the terminal's name?

Oh, you use the terminal, terminal's name. When you get a problem now, in that particular bracket, you aren't doing an assessment. You shouldn't be assessing for any terminal or terminal's name in the problem. But if there is a terminal inherent in the problem, you just use that. The whole question of getting the problem in a Problems Intensive is getting the pc's statement of the problem. It's a rather limited run. you get the pc's statement of the problem. Now try to make an auditing command out of it as close to it as you possibly can that is an intelligible auditing command. It's very simple. What evades you is the simplicity of it. That is what will evade you.

Female voice: He wanted to please a person.

Hm?

Female voice: He wanted . . the problem was how to please a person . . a particular person.

Well, what did he say? How to please, I wa . . . ?

Female voice: How to please . . .

"How to please Joe."

Female voice: Yeah.

All right. But now, the way you would apply this. The person gave you the problem "How to please Joe." All right. Now, the way you apply this rule is the simplicity. Always go in the direction of the simplicity. "What was unknown about pleasing Joe?" But we make sure that the pc understands that, that it registers on the meter, that it is answerable and that it doesn't violate too much of two-way flow.

Now, that doesn't necessarily violate because you haven't said, "What is unknown about you pleasing Joe?" You . . all you ask is, "What is unknown about pleasing Joe?" Well, the flows will come into it, but it'll still clear, probably. But you hear the pc say, "Giving him this. Giving him that. Giving him something else. Giving him something else. Giving him something else," and you know right away . . now what's going to happen here? His tone arm is going to go up, up, up, up and then the needle is going to stick. So, you're running . . actually running into a stuck flow in some fashion.

Now, you could simply stop the thing. You know, just casually . . just end the process momentarily, without upsetting the pc. I do that . . I do that very wordy. There's a . . there's a whole ritual that I use connected with this. I have a whole boxed-in ritual. It's very . . it's done with a surplice, you know. And you get this surplice on and you do this big ritual, see. And after you've burned the incense and everything else and interrupted the pc and gotten him out of session utterly, you go through this ritual. It has to do with wardrum chants and so forth.

Now, I say . . I say, "I'm now going to add another side to this," and give him the other command. And he usually never notices it, he just answers it. We're going along, "How would you please Joe? How would you please Joe?" "And, how . . . ? What's unknown about pleasing Joe? What's unknown about pleasing Joe?"

"I wouldn't know what to give him. I wouldn't know what to give him. I wouldn't know what to do to him. I wouldn't know what to do for him. I wouldn't know what . . . "

And you say, "Well if it's all right with you, now, what we're going to do is just add this other command." And, "What isn't known about Joe pleasing you?" And, "What isn't known about you pleasing Joe? Thank you. That's good." And the pc thinks it's all right and it goes along I did it so it must be all right. You don't get him out of session either.

I . . it curls my hair sometimes when somebody uses a piece of ritual to blast a pc out of session, get him totally disoriented, get his agreement on something new, clear a brand-new auditing command with the pc, use the next twenty minutes or so, something like that, getting it all straight (what pc? what session?), when all he had to do was just add the other leg of the command.

What in essence is he trying to do? He sees his tone arm is going up and the thing is going to go "stick." And he says, "Oh, oh yes, oh yes. The flows are out. Yeah, well..." And he just adds the other flow; says, "Well, I'm going to add this other command. All right. Here it is," and bang. Or something on the order, "It won't upset you now if I add another command." You know, subtle. You'd be surprised how often a pc settles right down when they know you mean business and you're getting auditing done.

If your intention is to get auditing done, not to follow a ritual or go into nonsense, boy, you'd be surprised what you can do with a pc. you just tell them, "This is the session. This is what we're trying to do man," and give them the auditing command and they stay right with it, bang, bang, bang.

And the pc tries to give you a bunch of this and he gives you a bunch of that and so forth and you go around and you run an ARC break and you go on and run another ARC break and then you give him another command and then you run another ARC break and you give him another command . . .

Well, if you're going that way with a pc sometimes, try this one. Try this one: You give him an auditing command and the pc has an ARC break, give him the next auditing command. The pc has an ARC break, give him the next auditing command, make sure it gets answered. And he has an ARC break and give him the next auditing command. Make sure that it gets answered. The pc says, "Well, all right," and goes on and runs it to the end of the session. You can hardly find a trace of it in the end rudiments. Because you're sitting there giving the pc a session. The pc is in-session, clank! He's in good solid control and the pc is really worried, because he doesn't think you're going to give him a session. That's really why he's worried. That's what worries him. And when you go . . plow straight on, giving the pc a session, the ARC breaks vanish under the realization that he's having a session.

That's always the better way to go about it. Pc blows session, leaps out of the chair . . if you're not smart enough to be between the door and the pc always, as standard practice, you should get different ideas

about pcs. If the pc is nearer the door than you are, what chance have you got of stopping a pc who blows session? None!

On several occasions pcs have blown session on me and have always found me between them and the door. They never, ever found me getting up. They never had a chance to get out of their chair, usually. If they did get out of their chair, I'd whirl them around, put them back in their chair and give them the next auditing command.

And they'd say, "Yow, yow, yow, yow, yow!"

And I'd say, "And the next auditing command is . . . Answer it!"

"Oh! Oh, well, if that's the way you're going to be about it." Bang! That was the end of that ARC break. And, by George, on the end rudiments you sometimes will look in vain for the incident. It's not buried, it's not occluded. It just didn't bother 'em.

But this would have bothered 'em: "Well, did you have an ARC break?" "What did I say that upset you there?" "What were you thinking of at the time you tried to blow?" Well, the pc will keep on blowing Why? Because the pc is short of auditing The pc has an ARC break because he is short of auditing. The pc is having difficulty having auditing. Anything that goes wrong to a pc in a session is registered on the basis of a scarcity of auditing Just mark that down.

I don't care how complicated you want to make the statement, it adds up to that . . and of course, is best remedied then by giving the pc auditing All protests by the pc are from the basis of not receiving auditing. He doesn't think he's receiving auditing

And you just think over the number of protests you've made as a pc, the number of protests that you've heard as an auditor and they all add up to this: "You're not auditing me," see. That's all they add up to. Or basically, more fundamentally on the raw public or something like that is, "You couldn't do me any good." In other words, you're not auditing me. Boy, scarcity of auditing is fantastic on people who don't know anything about it. But do you know it's just scarcity of auditing? That's what's odd. It's scarcity.

Some guy goes on and on and on about how terrible the Central Organization is and how awful it all is and how terrible the HGC is, and so forth and how the auditors never audit anybody. And he goes on and on and on and on and on and on and on and then he winds up and says, "Besides, they charge too much and I can't afford to have any auditing there." Interesting Fascinating

But there is your basic protest. And in handling all such commands or handling any auditing situation, the best answer is always to give auditing

Now, I lost your question in the run. I hope I did answer it in passing. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you, Ron.

All right.

Okay. We got time for one more question. I did want to talk to you about flows again and about commands, putting them together, because you're getting into this strata of the Problems Intensive and you're going to have to have some oddball commands, believe me.

You're trying to security check somebody and they never security check on doing anything "Doing something to Uncle Harry? Oh, no, I never did anything to Uncle Harry."

"Well, what did you do really to Uncle Harry?" or "What do you think you do?" or "What was a bad thing to do to Uncle Harry?" and so forth.

And you find out, "Well, I had an unkind thought about him." And that is a hell of an overt. And this is the pc's level of overt to Uncle Harry, so you have to, right that moment, start . . it's actually, you start a kind of an auditing question, "What unkind thought have you had about Uncle Harry?" You see?

And this will run and run and run. And all of a sudden you'll find out that this doesn't run anymore, although they have more unkind thoughts about Uncle Harry . . or what is this all about? And then you'll find the other side of it, is you've run into a stuck flow. You're running a stuck flow, see, unkind thought that he didn't tell, didn't tell, didn't tell, didn't tell, didn't tell. you get the idea, didn't tell, didn't say, didn't say. And you're just ripe for one . . "Did you ever do anything to Uncle Harry?"

"Oh, I never did anything to Uncle Harry. I just broke his golf clubs one time and stuffed mud down the barrel of his shotgun. And, of course, that was reasonable in view of all of the things he used to think about me. Oh, yes and uh . . . oh yes, and broke his razor and uh . . yes, as a matter of fact ran his car. . . oh, that one. Oh, well, wait a minute." Now we find it, see? They wrecked Uncle Harry's car. They ran it into a telegraph pole and that was it. And it wasn't even insured and he couldn't even buy another car. And it was a fantastic situation. This is all buried under the unkind thought.

But you could overrun one, don't you see. you could overrun an auditing flow line. And you have to pay some attention to that, because there's no ritual I can write up that'll get you over it. Because sometimes it runs and sometimes it doesn't run. Pc . . you can sit there on Black and White on a pc who has a field and if you run exactly the right flow the field will go white and then you reverse the flow, the field will go black. It's the most mysterious thing you ever saw. It's easy to do, you . . you should see some of these phenomena that associate themselves with flows. It all goes together with putting together auditing commands. You have to be doing it, that's it.

Okay. Time for one more question. What is it?

Yes, Reg.

Male voice: What uh . . would be the criteria for the length of a Problems Inten . . of uh . . of this Problems Intensive?

The criterion of what now?

Male voice: of how long to run it.

How long to run a Problems Intensive?

Male voice: Yes.

That's total tone arm. Tone arm. Now, a tone arm going flat can go flat from two sources. That's why I'm being so insistent here about flows. A tone arm can stop moving because the flow is out. But if you're running a proper auditing command, getting it answered and so on, the tone arm will move normally and you just run it with the twenty minute test on the problem. It's a good thing to get that problem out of the road and to get that real good and flat before you go into your check. And how long to run it . . you run it exactly against the tone arm. Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Well, I was wondering, is there another problem going to come up when you flatten the first one?

Oh, but you never run the second problem.

Male voice: You don't run it.

Oh, no, no, no.

Male voice: You can't run the confusion uh . . with the . . with the uh . . change stuff

Well, you're going to run the one problem. You're going to run that flat on the tone arm. When the tone arm is no longer moving, then you're going to do an assessment of people in the confusion immediately prior to that situation. All right. Now, having done an assessment on all these people, you're going to wind up there with one person and you're going to run some Security Check on that person.

You're not going to admit of anything else happening Nothing else can happen. The pc thinks of eighty-five more problems, that's just tough. They're simply under the heading of cognitions. You say, "Fine." The pc says he has a problem with that person. You say, "Fine. That's dandy." And you just go ahead and run your Security Check on that person. As soon as that person no longer reacts on the needle, you run another assessment on that list and you run that person flat.

Be prepared about that time to find an unknown personnel suddenly leaping into view who is the central character of the whole ruddy lot. put that person down and that person assesses this time and run the Security Check against that person. And you'll wind up at the other end with this list here in a state where you can read off these names and you don't get wild needle reaction. In other words, it's not a charge situation now. It's not a charge situation. And so you just leave it; you just leave it.

And now, you go back, you take a . . you file that P section and you get another completely new P section. If you have done a very poor O section, which is to say the changes on O are not self-determined changes but other-determined changes, something like this . . and you just got a whole bunch of occurrences, operations and that sort of thing . . you have trouble getting a new assessment that will make any sense to you. So make sure that O section is okay. But then you just reassess the O section and do a brand-new P form right straight across. You only want one problem. You only want one set of people. You can add to that set of people, you can't add to the problem. Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Well, yes, Ron, except for there . . I am asking how it will be intensive. How will we keep running problems on this individual. Uh . . I've got the one incident run right through and . . .

All right. All right. How long do you want to run this?

Male voice: Yes.

Okay.

Male voice: What's the criterion there?

The criterion, far as it's concerned, is the pc has many difficulties. As you assess these one after the other and go down the line of his O section and you don't get anything in the way of an assessment, you're through. In other words, these things are no longer troubling the pc. These changes which you have assessed are no longer troubling the pc. Then you are through with that intensive. That's how long you would run it. Now, how many hours that would take to run would be too difficult an estimate.

I originally planned this as a twelve-and-a-half-hour run. That's how long it would take me to run one. I don't know what it's going to get into, because I've seen three sessions to do O . . an O list just done at the end of the third complete session . . all of which should have been done at the end of the first session, see. So I wouldn't say. I dare say that on a rather difficult pc an auditor auditing fairly rapidly . . I'd say twenty-five hours should cover it fairly well.

But that isn't the last you're going to see of this Problems Intensive, you see. you . . this isn't the last you're going to see of this. You're going to do . . after that you're going to run the Prehav level on the terminal and you're going to run those terminal . . the terminal on those levels and you're going to get some of those out of the road. You're going to straighten up some of the engrams that you run into. You're going to run some more levels and then you're going to do this thing on the whole track. It's almost identical with the form. And it's not much change. After you've opened the fellows track up one way or the other, you say, "Well now, what self-determined changes have you had in your lives?" And you do an O session . . section on that and so on. Probably have to be some other wrinkles connected with it. But that isn't the last you will see of that.

And it never pays to use up too much time on a person's present life. One, it doesn't pay actually to audit a pc too long who can only remember their present life and who has never seen a past track facsimile and so forth. Your Problems Intensive will actually blast that open. Get a goal, get a terminal, do a Problems Intensive and I guarantee you that he will be looking at the past track.

All right, now to open up that past track, level runs and then engram runs and some more levels. Now, you're going to have a lot of past track open and then you could do a much more effective Problems Intensive. You think this first one here is effective and produces "Wows!" on the pc. Well, wait till you do one of these whole track ones. Yeah, that's pretty wild.

For instance, I don't know, I ought to get somebody to do one of these present life Problems Intensives on me, see how it goes. Because, in the first place, I haven't been able to stay in that zone and area. I can't think of a single problem I've had in this lifetime. They all . . all are somewhere else. They're old friends, these problems. Does that answer your question Reg?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

You bet.

Yes.

Female voice: How does this new rundown affect the routines?

What new rundown here?

Female voice: This O and P. We're doing this on uh . . this time . . lifetime and we're going to do it on whole track as well.

What?

Female voice: This O and P section.

You mean, this new . . this Problems Intensive we're doing now?

Female voice: Yes.

Has nothing to do with whole track.

Female voice: Yes, you said we're going to do it against the whole track . . Problems Intensive.

Ahhh. You . . come on, come on, come on, twist your brains around here. Listen. "Eventually" means when a pc is ready for it, we will do a whole track Problems Intensive. But if a pc isn't ready for it and you're just at the beginning, we'll do a present life Problems Intensive. This doesn't mean that eventually we're going to change our minds and on all pcs we do whole track Problems Intensives. See, there's a difference here.

What we've got, essentially, is a progressive opening up of track. And you'll find that the pc somewhere on down the line, after you think he's going to go Clear and everything is very nice, will all of a sudden jam. Well, this mystery of his jamming is the fact he's run into a new problems chain of some kind or another and you have opened up a new circuit. And you're running through a new series of hidden standards. And therefore the pc doesn't go Clear. But I've been studying, here, the barriers to Clear. That doesn't influence it at all. Okay?

Female voice: Doesn't influence the Routines . . 1, 2 and 3 . . at all?

What routine?

Female voice: Routines 1, 2 and 3.

Another female voice: We're only doing Routine 3 and Problems Intensive now.

Female voice: Okay. Thank you, that answers it.

No. Routines are routines. This doesn't influence any of those routines. Routine 3 is exactly what it is, which is, actually, Goals and Terminal Assessment with Security Checking and Prehav level runs. That is exactly what Routine 3 is. It's never been anything else and it's not going to be. A Problems Intensive . . a Problems Intensive is actually a broad method of doing rudiments and Security Checks. And you shouldn't look at it as anything else but a method of doing broad rudiments and broad Security Checking and that's all it is. It looks like a brand-new package, but if you investigate it very carefully it gets the rudiments in and gets the Security Checking done where it'll do the most good. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you, Ron.

Okay. Now, by next Tuesday, I trust that some of you will have finished this Problems Intensive and you will have that all straightened out and that'll all be going on swimmingly and you'll be getting on to your Prehav level runs . . by next Tuesday.

I have a certain impatience about this and I have news for you: The number of problems a person has is in direct proportion to the slowness that he audits. The number of problems a person has tells you exactly how fast he will work in life. If he has quite a few problems he may get hectic and work hysterically fast, but then he will eventually slow down. He'll tire out. But the number of problems a person has, determines his speed of accomplishment. And if you want anybody to speed up in life in general just care . . take care of his problems, get his stuck problems out of the way and get those things all squared up and you will find that the individual speeds up in doingness in life. That works, by the way . . that's quite a handy thing to know. You see that a workman or an executive or something like that, just can't ever seem to accomplish anything. Well, he has problems.