RUNDOWN ON PROCESSES

A lecture given on
19 February 1963

Here we are. This is the what? What's the date.?

Male voice: 19th.

February 19th, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, one lecture.

I have a little bit of news for you tonight. Of course, there's nothing but good news pouring in here from all sides now. And amongst these good newses, we found a goal in Z Unit today. Now, that goal, by the way, was really found in Australia, but nobody has been able to get it to fire, so nobody would do anything with it. And it wasn't until all the tone arm action came out of the goal list that the goal itself started to fire. And I think that's the way it was. And then they got the goal firing and proved it up and so he's away.

And one goal was found Sunday. Not necessarily germane to the course at large to give you a lot of data about staff clearing. You wouldn't care about that, you see. Because, after all, that's just Instructors and people of that sort. But in actual fact they're making very good headway.

As of right this minute, we have one, two, three, four, five - I think it is something on the order of five goals found out of which, I think, three are actually listing. And only about three more people on the staff to go. So you see, that's coming up close to a clean sweep for the staff on clearing. This staff probably will be Clear within six weeks or something like that - first-goal Clears. Starts happening fast, doesn't it?

Now, in the Z Unit - I haven't got the actual statistics in front of me, but in Z Unit we have quite a few goals being listed on out to Clear and all those are moving very well indeed, except one that made a colossal blunder. The auditor bought a sell. The pc said something like this: "A tremendously intelligent, brave, good - looking wonderful person." That was, I think, was the first item up or something like this. So the pc said, "Oh, that's me! Ho - ho - ho - ho! That's me. Ho - ho - ho - ho! You know, that's me, ha - ha!" And the auditor says, "Of course that's you," and immediately lists it as a terminal, the knucklehead. And that GPM just is not running well. It's all out of gear and so forth, because of course the thing is an oppterm.

The first item up, if it is a very high - toned item is an oppterm, always. That's the first one you find. Always an oppterm, if it's a high - toned item. If it's a low - toned item, it's the pc. Because that's the state his goal has gone down into. In other words, you're looking at the dwindling spiral of the goal.

And if you don't pay attention to that, you're going to get in trouble, because pcs go on a big sell. See, they say, "Ha - ha! A marvelous, philanthropic, cherished individual. Oh, yes, that's me, you see." The hell it is, ever. Never. It's never. Never. Never. Never. Never. That's the oppterm. The pc's goal is "a dirty little funking rat." See, something like that. That's his terminal, rather. And his goal is "to be a good guy," see. Well, the first one up, if it's "dirty little rat," see, something like that, that's going to be the terminal. And "a wonderful, sterling, beautiful, adored, saintly person" - that's going to be an oppterm. You get that? Don't let any pc sell you otherwise.

Now, you can't use this significance as your final test. It's whether or not it turns on more mass if it's said wrong. If it's said right, it turns on less mass. Sometimes the pc can't tell very well, but you say the terminal to the pc, "Consider committing overts against. . ." "Consider it committing overts." Either way. Say it about three times one way and three times the other way, one of them will turn on more mass than the other and that one is wrong.

So watch this. In other words, the only ball - up we've got in Z Unit is somebody who went straight through his knucklehead and bought a big sell on the part of the pc and listed the first item found wrong way to. And of course, four items later they suddenly run out of items, nothing is going right, lists dead end, the item comes up in the wrong places. All kinds of things happen, all of them very difficult to handle and so forth, and it's all traced back to that original blunder of listing something wrong way to.

Oddly enough, those goals in Z Unit which we have had checked out very carefully, and those items which have been checked out very carefully by Instructors, all of those goals are running very well. But just before this we had a period when we weren't checking out the items. And do you know that hardly any of those are running well. They're running raggedly compared to those whose items were checked out.

So that tells us that auditors have been buying, occasionally occasionally would fake up the fact that a read was there. The pc says, "Oh, well this is my item," something like that. Well, to show you how tough we're getting these days, an auditor in Z Unit ran a list, and only went twenty - four items beyond the last R/S or RR, see, on 3M - only went twenty - four. Didn't go twenty - five - got a five - hundred - word infraction sheet. That's the way it is.

Actually, the thing dogged out. If he'd put about one more item on there it probably would have rocket read.

Another auditor had a slight drift up of the TA during the last twenty-five, didn't note it on the report, said that it was flat on the report: five hundred word infraction for a false auditor's report.

This is the way things are these days. You just have to face up to it. United States has gone tyrannical, Russia's gone tyrannical, the world has gone tyrannical, so S - B - the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course has got to keep up the pace. That's the way it is. The difference is, is they're trying to ruin people and we're trying to clear them. There's a slight difference of polarity in what's going on here. And if we win they lose providing they don't join us. And we're no longer trying to join governments; we're trying to keep the governments sensible enough so that they can eventually join us. This is our spirit on the matter. We're being nice.

The truth of the matter is, everything else in the world is looking very fine. I've given you an overlong report on how goals are going here at Saint Hill, but I thought you would be tremendously interested. I know I am. And I've got my eye on all of these cases. And I don't know what you people are doing dogging around down there in the X and the Y and the 0 and the B Units. I don't know, I think we've got somebody that's that far away from getting into the Z Unit.

And some of you, a very few of you, have been here much longer than you should have been here in these lower units, and you want to get up there into that Z Unit and get your goal whistled up and so forth. You won't get anyplace playing around in these lower units. I mean, we ran ARC Straightwire on you a long time ago and we didn't win, so we're not going to get anyplace till you get in the Z Unit. Just make up your mind to it.

Two - twelve original, for source lists, is the way it's going these days. All of you expected to have that wiped off your checksheets. No, I'm afraid we're going backwards now. We're going back to 2-12. And the 2-12 original issue is the right way to do it. 2-12A simply tells you how you list down better from an RI, that's all. But how you find items: the original issue of 2-12.

So you haven't even got the satisfaction of saying, "Well, new checksheets," you see? "New checksheets." No, no. We want YOU back on the old checksheets, see. It's the old checksheets. Two - twelve is what you need to crack the uncrackable case. And that's what

it's for, and that takes a rock slammer out of circulation, does a lot of other beneficial things. So it's a very valid technique, but its use is relegated, 100 percent, to just that minor role.

You can't run this person on 3M, so you do 2-12. And this person is a rock slammer, you can't keep him in - session at all, you run him on the original version of 2-12 and you will find out that they will take off.

In other words, if - you can't readily find somebody's goal, put them on 2-12. 2-12A was a refinement in listing from RIs and that is still with us. Everything you have learned is now valid. This is the first time this has ever happened on the Saint Hill Briefing Course - it's the first time. Everything on your checksheets you need; the checksheets don't need any changing. I'm going to give you a few more lectures and bulletins and so forth and consolidations on this sort of thing.

But it, in actual fact - it is merely consolidating information and replacing existing tapes and bulletins. And I'm afraid that's all that's going to happen that is very dramatic. We're in for the long haul here, you've got a lot of time to learn this, you understand. Some people will still be learning this a hundred years from now. I can tell you that with accuracy. But it needn't be you here on the Saint Hill Briefing Course. So, get busy with your - get busy with your checksheets and let's get away and at least get up into the W Unit, huh? All right.

Now, I've already given you a considerable amount of data here concerning 2-12, and so on, and 3M. But what I think I ought to talk to you about is the interrelationship of processes: what processes are for and what they do and all that sort of thing.

There's a new scale of processes out in a recent bulletin that tells you the valid processes which are done and taught in Academies. Now, there isn't any reason for me to have a list of these things in front of me because I know these things too well. And I'm going to go into these various processes and just tick them off one after the other. This is not necessarily in their order as given, but these are the valid processes which you ought to have a very, very good grip on, because you will need every single one of them. And first and foremost amongst these - listed, by the way, first, not because it's the easiest thing to run, but because it's the lowest grade of case will respond to it - is the CCHs.

Now, the CCHs, done the way they were being done in 1962 - okaying people's physical origins, you know, acknowledging physical origins; running these things not as a grind, but up to a flat point of about three and changing off to the next process and so forth - those are the CCHs. And they're CCHs 1, 2, 3, 4.

But there are also some variations to these CCHs that you would find very, very valuable. And you're going to find these extremely valuable someday. You realize that as you run "Spot the wall," and so on, on people and your meter there is - got a lot of tone arm action, see - you realize, don't you, that this person is so unaccustomed to the physical universe that they have an awful hard time trying to follow a direction.

Now, if you had a great deal of trouble with a case - now, I mean a great deal of trouble, you just - nothing can happen and so forth - you've got the CCHs. And what you do in essence, even though you don't run the CCHs on a meter, is run the tone arm action out of the CCHs. Now, you can do that by checking the pc from time to time on a tone arm to get his tone arm read.

What you're doing there is hauling this fellow up to a point where he's enough in present time that he can follow an auditing direction. Now, this in essence takes care of the case who cannot follow an auditing direction. And you as auditors are far, far too prone to underestimate the ability of a case to run. Now, I know this, because I've from time to time picked up cases that have been pronounced absolutely unrunnable; there's nothing can happen with these cases, you see? And I remember a psychotic girl, she was pronounced

psychotic by one and all. Everybody was unanimous on this particular subject. And in actual fact she would comply with every auditing command I gave her. Now, that is all you want.

Here is not a condition of whether people are crazy or not crazy. We're not in that business. We're not in the business of whether people are crazy or not crazy. It's just a method of calling dirty names anyway. The psychiatrists have no idea who's crazy and who's sane, and so forth. It's just a matter of saying, "This fellow's no good, and the US government wants to get him out of the way so he's crazy." It's just a matter of expediency. It says en masse, "We don't agree with this particular person. He sees spiders on the ceiling and we don't. Therefore he's crazy." Has nothing to do with anything we are doing. Nothing. Nothing. Nothing. Just forget those classifications.

We don't care how potty this guy's ideas of the physical universe are, you know, he just might have come down here from the Martian scout command or something like this, and they probably have very, very odd ideas, you see? The quality, the significance of the fellow's ideas are no business of the auditor's. I couldn't try to give you a better rundown on it. I mean, I couldn't say it sufficiently emphatically. It's just no business of the auditor's. Fellow walks down the street saying, "Gibber - gibber - gibber - gibber - gibber - gibber - gibber," and talking to somebody that's over on his right. Well, yes, everybody agrees there's something very eccentric about this person's conduct. But actually the auditor has no business with that at all.

The whole test is whether or not this person will sit across the table from you and answer an auditing command that is asked him. That is the whole thing. Now, there isn't even any wiggles on this. There's no getting away from this. You understand? Don't refine that one down! You see? You realize I'm talk. 9 rather incoherently because I myself have had difficulty getting this point across for many, many years. And it's an old point I'm trying to get across.

You know, they say, "Well, he says it to himself, and then he repeats a circuit which says it to him, and therefore he's not following the auditing command."

No, no, no, no. We say to this fellow, "Put your hand on the table," and the fellow puts his hand on the table. We don't care if it took him a while to do it, but he will put his hand on the table. We ask this person - we say to this person, "Who don't you like?" And the person thinks for a moment, we don't care much how long he thinks, or how clearly he says it, but he's on the subject, don't you see? And he says, "Oooh, uh - wuhwuhwuhwuh ... My brother George. I don't like him."

All right. Now, that's an answer to the auditing command. We don't care if he goes this way all the time he's doing it or picks bugs off of himself while he's doing it or if he acts with perfect sanity while he's doing it or says in a beautiful, mellifluous tone of voice while he answers it. No. He can actually answer that.

We say to him, "Who else don't you like?"

And he thinks for a moment and he says, "Well, my wife. I don't - I don't like my wife." And so on. That's all, see. That is our total requisite. It's not whether or not the fellow can hold the cans. Some fellows get shaky hands and so forth. If they get too shaky, why take his shoes off and strap them to the soles of his feet. We don't care about that either, you understand? It's can this fellow answer an auditing question?

Now, if he can answer a listing auditing question and if he can tell you what his goals are in life and we come right down the line on his goals in life, and we can get those and we can somehow or another read those on the meter, we actually have no business running anything but 3M on that fellow. You understand? That's the only honest thing to do, you understand? If we can get his goal - get his goal, list it, get it to fire, so forth. Make a Clear. You get that? There isn1 any point doing anything else. If he can do it, you can do it.

Well now, let's take this fellow at the other end of the line. And we say to this fellow, "Now, who don't you like?"

And he says, "Gob, gob, gobble, gob - du - da - da - do - whoo, whooo."

And we say, "Well, is that somebody you don't like?"

"Oh, ga - ga, woo - woo."

You say, "Well, do you talk American? Or English? Or French? Or something like that?"

And he says, "Yes, yes, yeah, well, no, yeah. Who? Where?"

He's not answering the auditing question. You get the brutality with which I'm defining this thing?

Yeah, a lot of pcs sit there and say, "Let's see, who or what would 'to be a catfish' oppose? Let me see. Maybe it - maybe it's 'oppose a catfish.' Maybe it is - so on. Maybe I better answer it for a while, 'to oppose a catfish.' Let's see how that works out. Havingness is getting down. I think I better run a little Havingness."

People do that sort of thing when they're being audited by some auditor who is low on control. That character is perfectly auditable. Go ahead and clear him, get him in a brace, make him do it.

But we're talking now about this other fellow, and he says, "Who don't you like?"

And he says, "Gob - gob, gaa, ya, ya, ya." What are you going to do? You're going to do the CCHs. You got that? That's what it takes.

Now, also, there's another side test on this thing. If the individual, in giving you items or goals and so forth, just continuously doesn't get any tone arm action, you understand, and there is no way we can get tone arm action, we can't get our rudiments in or anything like that, and yet by making him spot the walls we can get a lot of tone arm action, you have another excuse for another type of process which is a CCH sort of process - and that's rudiments and Havingness. You get that? This fellow - he'll answer your auditing questions, but he never gets any tone arm action on a list and you can't really find anything and it's all very tough. You've got another class of process-rudiments and Havingness.

Now, let's go back to CCHs for a moment. That goes down into unconsciousness. You can find somebody in one of these states of coma that they talk about in the hospitals and we cure those or do something with them. I mustn't use the word cure because the American Medical Association objects to anybody curing anything. It has become illegal to cure anything. I hope you appreciate that. Because they can't, it's now illegal to do so. I don't mean to be bitter about these people, you understand. I'm just being factual. In fact I'm being rather kind.

Anyway, they've got this hospital nailed down, you see, and there's somebody there in a coma. Do you know that you can actually ... By the way, never make a rash promise to a person like this, like, "I'll come back and see you tomorrow," when you don't know you can. Because do you know that if you don't come back and see them tomorrow they're liable to kick the bucket. It's happened. Get ahold of their hand. And you can actually get into complete communication with them. You say, "Squeeze my hand once for yes; twice for no." That's a good gag. You ought to try it sometime on an unconscious person. They can't talk, they're in a coma, they're an accident victim, something like this. You say, "Squeeze my hand once for yes; twice for no." And then ask them two or three" simple questions. "Are you in pain?" You see, and they'll go - give you a signal, yes or no, or something like this, and

you can go on in a rather interesting communication line. That's with somebody who is incurably gone. Which is quite interesting to me.

You can get into communication with these people. They can't talk. In other words, they've lost control of their vocal chords, but they can get some kind of a muscular response going. It takes you a little while to get into communication with them sometimes, but they will get more and more in communication with them - with you, and you can go on from there.

Now, there's a type of CCH which is like 8 - C, only you monitor the person's hand. And you can monitor it around on the bed, you know. You can put it up here on the pillow and on the sheet and on the blanket and on the side table, and so on. You say, "Touch the side table," and they touch the side table. You're monitoring their hand. And oddly enough it'll give them an orientation which will bring them out of their coma.

Don't go changing processes. It's a rather heartbreaking affair. Go along on the same process until you have stabilized a bit of a change, take the other hand, perhaps. You're playing it off the cuff, you understand? - You're making up your own CCHs. Because this person is unconscious in bed and you can't contact them vocally and you can't check up on your auditing command, vocally; you've got to be smart.

So how many CCHs can you work out? Well, you can... The way to work out how you would do it is to do something like this: Take a doll and put it down on a bed and the doll isn't going to respond either and you're going to - how many CCHs can you run on this doll that's lying in the bed?

Now, there is a level above that. There's a person who cannot talk, who's totally inarticulate, who can't get around in life, you know, workaday world and that sort of thing. These are heartbreakers. They're spastics, people of this particular character, idiots. Very, very rough to do. I wouldn't kid you on this level; they're very, very tough to handle. You do regular CCHs with these people and just carry on, acknowledging them real well and so forth. But above all, never lose your temper, never become impatient and flatten what you start and don't run things that are flat too long, and you'll have some wonderful success with these cases. But you have to stay in communication with them.

Now, remember this: The worse off a case is, the easier it is to have an adverse effect upon the case. The old Effect Scale, see. Now, that's very important because that tells you that an unconscious person may very well - who is in a coma, let us say, for two weeks or something - expire on the breaking of one auditor promise. It has happened.

I'll give you an idea. This girl said, "I'll come back and see you every day at this hour. And also I'll come back and see you tomorrow. And I'll stay with this with you until you've recovered." And the medicos - well, I don't know if they had medicos or monkeys in charge of this hospital; there's not much difference. And the medicos wouldn't let this auditor back into the hospital the next day. The patient was recovering although still in coma. The coma got much lighter. Much lighter. And the person was beginning to heal, beginning to straighten out and the medicos barred the person out. The auditor had promised to be back the next day. Wasn't permitted to go into the room and the person lingered around for a day or so and died. The person was recovering, and died. A broken promise. That's all it amounted to. I have other evidence on that, not just that.

Now, that's how little it takes to have an adverse effect upon an unconscious person. Now, how about a spastic? Or a person who is classified as a moron? The common concept of these people is they don't know anything. Ah! But the thing which you do every day out here in auditing - just that moment of, you know, something on the order of the guy says no the session hasn't started for him and you say, "Oh, well, we'll take it up in the rudiments." Something like that. Look, that's too steep for a moron. You'd just blow him to pieces.

Now, it isn't that a case is bad off who is blown to pieces by this, but this would really, really ruin him. An auditor's frown, a tiny impatience - you just have worked and worked and worked and worked to get this guy to lift his hand, you know, and put it in yours, and so forth, and he looks a little petulant for a moment. And you yourself become impatient and you say, "Oh, damn it, give me that hand!" You've ruined him. Bye - bye case! You understand? The worse off a case is, the easier it is to affect them adversely. If you run by that rule, you will also see that at those times when a normal, usual, run - of - the - mill pc is being a bit bzzh - and they all go bzzh at one time or another in session - at that moment, when he apparently is able to stand up to anything because he's maybe being cross with the auditor, he's being nasty or he's being this, remember that at that moment he is the most easily affected - in the most easily affected state. That effect is very heavy. Extremely heavy.

All you have to do is frown at him and he practically spins in. Well, you've got a reality on that. Well, it works similarly. The worse off, the more introverted, the more upset the case is, the more careful and cautious the auditor has to be about maintaining a good, even, friendly discipline toward the pc.

Now, on an assist, all this applies. Now, there are various kinds of assists. There are as many kinds of assists as there are Dianetic auditing and everything else. You ought to have seen an HDA running a child's somatic out here a few weeks ago - of course I'm t 4 - out Mary Sue. Diana's nanny got a little bit enthusiastic and shoved Diana around and actually chipped a tooth. Now, Mary Sue was quite worried about this, as you can see, since it was a permanent tooth, and she used about four or five varieties of assist and finally blew the somatic. Finally blew it 100 percent. She decided that she'd better blow it 100 percent so that the tooth could grow back a bit of enamel, see?

Well, how many - how many assists were there? Well, the first thing, was she withholding anything about it. And then touch it, touch it, touch it, touch it and oh, I don't know, any one of the infinite variety of contact and communication assists. And next day, second session, took the child down to the exact place that it happened, made the child touch the tooth to the porcelain bathtub where it had been cracked, see. Oh, boy, that kid was very gingery. Took her to the actual spot, see. All of a sudden, blew the thing high, wide and handsome.

Oh, yes, and another sequence of it - she made the child scan through the whole incident. Lock scanning, of all things! And got through the incident a lot of times - through and through and through and through and through and through and through. And then contact on the bathtub, and then pow! There goes the somatic.

Well, anyway, on assist almost anything goes. But this doesn't go: Sticking somebody in something wit ,h too great an enthusiasm when the person is in bad condition. Let's take an auto accident case, and this auto accident case is just about gone; he's in a comatose state and so forth. Now, trying to get too much done in too little time with that case will give you a lose. About the best thing you can do - about the best thing you can do is put the case in some sort of contact with the environment. And give the case a then - now. In other words, the automobile accident was then and you're now in now.

But even so, to lay a hard and fast rule down about this is difficult. Because I know of a case that was run through the engram of being hit and run over while riding a bicycle - car ran over a boy - a little boy, on a bicycle. His father stood there and while the child was unconscious, ran him through the engram over and over and over, and finally the kid that had a fractured skull and everything else opened his eyes and brightened up, and the father ran him through it a few more times and the kid was all right. That sounds adventurous, doesn't it? Well, it probably was adventurous. But remember, auditing in that way, is what you can get away with.

So there's any of these varieties of assists. But assist is something that directly attacks the condition in which the person is. Now, we know right away that attacking a specific

condition is, well, it's fraught with many perils. Let me put it that way. It's not always a smooth road.

This fellow has a cold. You say with great enthusiasm, "All right, I'll cure your cold." See? Well, all right, you use some system or method or something of the sort. Any of the old processes. And you just lay an egg, that's all. You just didn't get there. Cold is still on, he's snoring and having an awful time. A few days later you uncover another person, he's got a much worse cold and you do the same thing and the cold goes off just right now and doesn't reappear, see? Well, that's the liability of it. It's whether or not the GPM is keyed in to that thing. That's the whole thing. If it's keyed in on that cold you haven't got a prayer. In other words, you'd have to run a GPM item to get the cold off.

But I ran into a girl on TV one time - I told you this story before - and just with one question of Straightwire blew the cold, you see? And I think it was "Who's left you in the last few days?" or something like this, and "Oh, my boyfriend, George!" Ta - bang! and off went the cold, see. I'd noticed that when loved ones are parted they normally come down with colds. Missing terminal in front of them, you know.

Anyway, assist, assists - these are the - these are the wide, wild horizon. They normally consist of contact and getting a person out of something and into present time. And that's more or less the definition of an assist. It's something that uses some type of contact, whether contact with the bank or with the physical universe, or both, and it uses - or it uses the mechanism of time track, to try to get the person up to present time. Well, sometimes he comes right up to present time and the rest of it drops away and sometimes you have to hit the point where he's stuck and bring it up. But the more you hit a subjective process, the more you use subjective processes in an assist, the less successful you will be. You get that? The objective process, just on an assist level, is more productive, so that if you - now, you can split them up. You can use 75 percent objective and 25 percent subjective, you see?

Let's get - the fellow's, "Oh, I have an awful time. I've got my hand caught in the door, and here it is, it still hurts. And here it is, two days later and it still hurts."

And you say, "Well, I'm going to help you out on this. Do you remember the door?" and so forth, and get him, you know, into it. And then use a lot of "get him out of it." See? As much get - use about three to one, actually. A little bit of "get him into it" and a lot to "get him out of it." You see that? That characterizes the assist. And you'll have very successful assists if you do that.

You say, "Now, what door was it?"

"Oh, well, let's see, what door was it? My bedroom. No, it was the front - no, it was the bedroom - front - front door. Yes, it was the front door. The front door."

You say, "Good! Now, how's your hand?"

"Well," he says, "well, it hurts right across there."

You say, "All right. Now, take your other hand and touch the places it hurts. Now, that's good, touch that place and that place and that place and that place and that place. Good. Now. . ." You always balance assists. "Touch the other hand," see. Get that hand going. I'll bet you forgot that one, Mary Sue, on your - I'll bet you didn't take the tooth on the other side.

Female voice: Oh, yes. I did.

Oh, yes, she did, she did. Hah! Leave it to a Dianeticist! Anyway, so it's touch this hand and then touch that hand and touch this hand. "Now, what about that door? What about time of day was it, and when was it?"

"Well, it was Tuesday, I guess, about four o'clock ... Oh, no, Wednesday. Oh, no, it was Monday." See, they're lost on the time track. He finally says, "Yeah, it was Tuesday! It was Tuesday. About four o'clock in the afternoon."

And you say, "All right. Well, good. Touch that hand and touch that hand," and so forth. And, "Touch that hand," you know. "How you doing nowT1

"Well, just the little pains across there," so forth.

"Well, now, what - was there anybody around when that happened?"

"Oh, no, no, house was empty. There wasn't anybody present - except my wife. Well, yeah, my wife was present. She was standing right there as a matter of fact."

And you say, "All right. Well, thank you very much. All right. Touch that hand and touch that hand, touch that hand, and that . . ." you know. Give it - get the idea, see? Spring him and give him some Havingness.

And we get up to the next level, which is rudiments and Havingness. Now, what can - actually can you do with rudiments and Havingness? Well, I'm here to tell you, you better learn how to run rudiments and Havingness as a valuable process because you're going to need it on every raw meat process you ever do. Because the guy isn't in - is insufficiently educated to be processed at the time you pick him up. How's that? Oh, you're going to be good enough as an auditor to get somebody to reel off a list. But along about the time you've got him reeling off the list left and right, why, he isn't answering the auditing question and he thinks he's got to go home now and he gets up out of the chair and he leaves - that isn't a very safe way to go about it.

If you gave somebody a couple of rudiments and Havingness sessions - I'm not talking about you doing a private practice, in the HGC or something like that - give this person a couple of rudiments and Havingness sessions. Just any kind of rudiments. Doesn't much matter what. Things he actually could tell you. Clean up the problem rudiment for instance. You know? Just clean that up good. Then give him some Havingness. And then clean up the problems at the end of the game.

Well, that would do a lot for him, but actually you want this fellow to be able to run the mid ruds and you want him to be able to run Havingness. So, I'm talking now about what's therapeutic in rudiments and Havingness. Well, you clean up the problems rudiment, and give him some Havingness, and clean up the problems - rudiment and close the session. That'd be very valuable.

But you're trying to get this fellow drilled in so that he can be audited and so that he's getting used to it. In other words, most people aren't used to being audited, if you would ever notice this. And although they break into it rather easily and - most of you, being good auditors, have not ever had much trouble with this - the pc finds it rather strange. And a rudiments and Havingness session, one or two - when you're going on a long haul like clearing, breaks the pc into it. The pc's capable now of doing things that he was not - didn't think he could do before. He can remember something, can confront a problem. He can look at the walls. He can feel better. Do you see that? That's the practical use of the rudiments and Havingness.

You can always make somebody feel better if you use the one rudiment of problems and run his Havingness and then clean up his problems and then maybe run some more Havingness, and then close down the session. Something like that. I don't care what model you put this thing on. It rather runs the pattern of an assist when you're using it therapeutically. Don't discount it as a valuable process, because it is all by itself a valuable process.

But you wind up at the other end with an educated pc. He's educated just to this degree: He knows that he's got to sit there; he isn't wrestling with his own bank while he's finding out about auditing. Now, do I make my point?

He isn't - he isn't wondering, "What's this fellow going to do? What's this fellow going to do?" And at the same time you're asking him some of the most challenging, overwhelming questions you ever heard of. Well, the kind thing to do is just, you know, take up his problem and find out about it, not a chatty thing, see. We want this to be a disciplined session. Because what you're trying to teach him is discipline. And you want him to squeeze the cans and you want him to answer up, and when you say, "What's that?" You know?

He says, "What's what?"

And you say, "Well, I got a read right here. What's that problem you're thinking about?"

"Oh," he says to himself, "hey, what do you know! I think this, and he sees it on the meter there. What do you know! Probably pretty good, you know. Wow!"

You know, he's thinking all these things to himself Well, gosh, you know, if you're trying to check out somebody's goal or find an item or a 2-12 item or something like this, and this guy is all involved with the physical universe and he's all involved with his bank and at the same time he says, "What's the meter? I mean, what's he doing with the meter?" Two and a half hours, somebody reported, was taken to clean up the E - Meter in an end - session rudiments, some time ago, and the fellow came around and wanted to know what was an E - Meter. That was the main thing.

Now, in other words, familiarization. You can use rudiments and Havingness with familiarization, putting in the big mid ruds for a period of time. Put them in for "Since yesterday" or something like that, you see. And then run his Havingness and put in the big mid ruds again and close the session, something like that. This is also known as short - sessioning.

If you have got the idea that a session takes place per day, you're nuts. A session takes place during that period which elapses between start of session and end of session and that's the only thing there is to a session. That's how long a session is and that's what makes a session and that is actually the basic session. So that you can actually run a couple of sessions on somebody, or three or four sessions if you're doing an HGC. You can run two sessions in the morning and two sessions in the afternoon.

I myself, if I were just breaking in a new pc, would run two sessions in the morning, on rudiments and Havingness. As easy as that, you see. And in the afternoon, why, start listing something, like his goals. By this time he knows all about what I'm doing. And he's not going to be upset with me or the form of auditing. You see this value to rudiments and Havingness? Because it really exists as a value.

Now, Havingness processes are rather boiled - down lately. You can get almost any process - any pc there is on "Touch that object" or "Feel that object" or "Notice that object." Very few pcs fall outside this category of Havingness. There is just those three. It's very funny, but they seem to reach almost any pc pretty well. You ought to put those up to the front of your list as the first three tested and then get fancy with the other ones afterwards. And you normally will succeed with the first or second one. Makes it very easy.

But the point is, you want to get a result. You want to get a result with your rudiments and Havingness. The main result you want with raw meat is the person becomes disciplined to sitting there and receiving auditing. And it's pretty crazy, trying to give somebody a high - level process - as I think it was Motts over in New York mentioned this to me, from the New York organization. And he said something to the effect of you're laying the pearls of Ophir out in front of this pc and they don't know anything about it at all, you know. You're doing a

high - level process and they haven't even learned they're supposed to answer the auditing command. So that's very valuable in rudiments and Havingness. Very valuable to indoctrinate the pc a little bit with auditing and they also serve as a Problems Intensive varied over to where you only clear the problem. And don't just think that's a practice drill, because it isn't.

Now, there's another practice drill called ARC Straightwire. What's this ARC Straightwire? Well, it's the first time I ever turned off a neurosis - was with ARC Straightwire or some equivalent of it. It wasn't called ARC Straightwire then, but as time went on it became ARC Straightwire and I still was able to turn off a neurosis or two with it.

Now, we're talking carelessly when we're saying neurosis. What do we mean neurosis? Well, let's put it just this way. The fellow feels he's getting - he's going to get worse and worse and worse, and it's all going to get worse and worse and worse, and there's no bottom to it. You know, he's just going to keep going down forever. Well, you run an adequate amount - session or two - of ARC Straightwire and the person becomes aware of the fact that something is stopping him from getting worse. And in view of the fact that something is stopping him from getting worse, his hope resurges.

But I have seen people, you know, strictly on the bugs - pulling bugs off themselves - turn sane right in front of my eyes on ARC Straightwire. What are the - what's the commands? The same command as in the end of Self Analysis. Needn't be any vast change about it.

You could work out, from the cause angle, better commands and so forth, perhaps. You could say, "Recall a time you communicated with something or somebody. Recall a time you felt some affinity for something or somebody. Recall a time you thought something or somebody was real." Or, you know, that type of command. But it isn't so much the command; it's confrontingness. It's a confrontingness on the three principal buttons that make up life and understanding. And an individual will suddenly understand a little bit more about himself.

That has a ceiling, of course; you can't run this for days and days and weeks and weeks and expect to get very much out of it. It's one of these one - shot propositions. Somebody is feeling pretty spinny, run a little ARC Straightwire on them, and they feel a lot better. But it's something that stops the spin more than anything else. It isn't universally workable, it isn't an unlimited process that goes on forever, but it is a valuable process, and it jolly well better not be dropped out of the lineup, because it's valuable. Has its uses.

Also it has a very good training use. You can run this thing and run it and run it. It's unlimited to the degree that it can be run forever, but it won't produce results forever. You get the idea? It goes up to a flat spot and that's that. But you can keep on running it and the guy recalls the same things.

Only one thing I'd like to make a remark on is once in a while in Academies and so forth, you see ARC Straightwire being run in this particular line. This is really crazy. The guy says, "Recall something that's really real to you."

And the pc says, "Yes."

And "Recall a time you felt some affinity."

Pc says, "Yes."

And the auditor says, "All right....

Hey, what's all this, you know? You find out after a while this guy starts stacking up with missed withholds and things. And he starts going out of communication and he starts getting upset. So you have to remember, when you're running a process like that, not to take these

"yes" answers. The guy says, "Yes." Well, of course the question actually didn't demand he say anything but "yes." So you have to ask the second question. You say, "What was that?"

"Oh, that was my mother."

All right. You say, "That's good."

In other words, find out what. Stay in communication with the pc without nagging the pc.

Now, there's another type of assist has loomed over the horizon in the last few months, has been what we will call primary buttons - Suppress, Invalidate. And it comes under the heading of a Prepcheck assist. And all you do is flatten Suppress and Invalidate. They're just the two buttons. And you'll find out that if you were giving a five - hour intensive (if you can imagine such a thing) to somebody who had been all loused up like fire drill, why, if you just flattened these two buttons in those five hours, you would have done a lot for the pc. Those are primary rudiments. They're one and two. Just Suppress and Invalidate. And they work wonders. They really do. I mean, you can just take those two.

For instance, I find increasingly today, when I'm trying to get the pc to go on listing, I just give him Suppress and Invalidate, and don't give him anything else. And before he can get Invalidate clear he's listing again, so the devil with it, why put in the rest of them?

So those are primary as far as the rudiments are concerned, are Suppress and Invalidate. And they make an intensive. But it gives us Prepcheck. And we enter into the level of what - this whole category called Prepchecking.

Now, what is Prepchecking? Well, it's preparatory to clearing, and you will always find it's preparatory to clearing, you'll always have to do it as preparatory to clearing or somewhere in clearing you've got to do it, so it becomes a very necessary skill. And there you see it, a Prepcheck assist, in its most fundamental form. You say, "Start of session. Since yesterday has anything been suppressed?" You flatten that permissively, repetitively, then clean it on the meter or don't clean it at all. It'll just depend on the pc. And then you go on and hit Invalidate and get that as long as the pc will answer that. And you say, "All right. Fine. End of session," or whatever you care to. You find out you have quite a remarkable effect. But that's sort of an assist sort of a proposition.

Well, that's actually all Prepchecking consists of, is just cleaning up these buttons. Prepchecking is different than fast checking. And the only thing that you repetitively use in fast checking is Suppress. You always get that in repetitively without consulting the meter. Unless of course, you're really trying to unload a goal, and then you take your last three left - hand buttons. (This is a trick you didn't know.) You take your three buttons over here, on the left, Suppress, Fail to reveal and Careful of Those are your basic suppress type of buttons. They'll prevent the read. Everything else - well, there's a couple of them are middle ground - but the rest of them create a read, or steal a read. But these things Just make the read disappear entirely and they don't even come up. You don't even see it on the button sometimes. In other words, you can have a Suppress, you don't even see a Suppress read, and so on. So you clean those three repetitively on the goal. You see, or on the list or something.

You want this thing to read, you see, you can't get this item to read, you know this item ought to read. And you've seen it read, and so forth. Well, just ignore your right - hand buttons. You want to do a fast job, why, do a Prepcheck. You understand, it's different than a fast check. Suppress, Suppress, Suppress. No attention to the meter, see. All prepchecked. Suppress, Suppress, Suppress, Suppress, Suppress, and he finally runs out of answers. You get any answers you can now find on the meter.

And then, Fail to reveal, Fail to reveal, Fail to reveal - Prepcheck, see? Fail to reveal, Fail to reveal, Fail to reveal. And he finally runs out of answers and you find another one on the

meter; clear that. And then Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of. And bang! He says, "Well, that's all over here."

And you say, "All right." And you check that on the meter. And then you read this, "to be a catfish." Psheww! It's quite remarkable. That's a very, very - that's a quickie, see. That's a quickie. That's a Saint Hill Goals Prepcheck. You can make almost anything read, if it's ever going to be made to read, by going over and over and over those buttons, just ...

Well, you've got this item in the session and you saw it read, yesterday. And now you're going to list it. And you've got to get the thing firing before you list it, so you say, "Catfish." And it says, "Tsk." Huh! You say, "What have you been doing? You been doing anything?"

"Oh, no, no, nothing."

"Catfish." - tsk!

Oh, boy, you had it rocket reading half a dial. Well, the best way to do it is just get in these left - hand buttons, one, two, three. Each one prepchecked. And you come back and you read this. And you say, "Catfish." Psheww! It's a remarkable performance you can make an item put up and it's well worth knowing.

Well, that's your lowest level of Prepcheck. But how many ways can you use Prepcheck? Now, I've shown you Prepcheck as an assist, and I've shown you a Prepcheck in order to get goals to read, and I've shown you a Prepcheck which only uses the left - hand button. Well, all right - the left - hand buttons. And now let's go over and take a look at further Prepchecks. We can choose - you can choose any period of time and get in the eighteen - button Prepcheck, and when you include a goal it gives - you also get the counter-button to the goal. Any period of time. "Since you was a little boy, has anything been suppressed?" Rather indefinite, but it still gives you a Prepcheck. And of course, it's done within the ramifications of a session. You prepcheck the thing out. It means repetitive, repetitive, repetitive, repetitive, no consultation with the meter till the pc runs out of answers. Then you consult the meter. That's all there is to a Prepcheck. No matter how you use this auditing mechanism, there it is.

All right. There's unit - of - time Prepcheck. Eighteen buttons. All right, that's pretty remarkable, but how about a specific item? "On your mother-in-law . . ." see? You can do an eighteen - button Prepcheck "on your mother-in-law," and produce some rather remarkable results, too. And you - it's all Repetitive Prepcheck.

And how many other ways can you use this thing. Well, you can combine the two. And you get a Problems Intensive. And you find a specific item that you're looking for, which is the problem, the greatest change of his lifetime, and then you take a period a month earlier than that and you prepcheck on that date. But actually you're prepchecking at a problem, but you're prepchecking by command on time. Getting your eighteen buttons on the thing. All the same way. Marvelous results.

Now, you can take "On listing_____," "In auditing On the goal_____," "In listing on the goal_____." Doesn't matter how you phrase this sort of thing, you get these different varieties of Prepcheck.

Now, that's a whole category of processes right up to there and they're totally adequate for the education of an HCA. Totally adequate. Now, when we start running up into higher level, Class II and Class III skills, we have 2-12, the original version modified only as you list from RIs, reliable items. We've got 2-12 and that's a - you'll find out the way you were doing it at first - you were finding items and all that sort of thing - well, you just go around finding items that way. Take the biggest, great, big, wide rock slam that you can pick off the list someplace, and oppose it and run it around into a four - way package, use 2-12A only to govern your listing and it'll always be the last rock slamming item on the list. Use this and you won't have a case that you've fixed their sciatica and you can - it's visibly fixed; everything is going

along fine. You cured him, or something, you know. And then they say, "Well, I don't know whether auditing works or not. You know, Scientology might work and might not work. . . " so forth.

They get up, they've thrown their crutches away and so forth and walk out the door still nattering about how awful you are as an auditor. Well, that's a rock slam sort of a proposition, you see. That person's a rock slammer.

And you take a specialized list and you just find the biggest, widest R/S on that prelisted list, and take it. Make a four - way package out of it. Then when you cure their sciatica they say, "Gee! My sciatica's cured." See? In other words, the person has reached mentally instead of resisting you.

In other words, that keeps the person - it's something like rudiments and Havingness, don't you see, at a much higher level. You give them rudiments and Havingness to get used to auditing; well, you give them 2-12 so they can appreciate it. They actually will never get well unless you do something like that. You wouldn't be able to find their goal or anything. I doubt it very much that you could crack through such a case.

So that's a marvelous thing to have. And now we take 3M, you've got the créme de la créme. You've worked it up, now. You've worked the case up along the line, you'd get that case in a state where you could knock these goals off and get rocket reading goals, and find the pc's goal by any method that you find the pc's goal. And list it on out on 3M and find your items and don't go knuckleheaded on picking the wrong item, wrong way to or something like that and it all runs off, and by golly you wind up with a Clear.

Now, that's your ramification of processes. And as far as I'm concerned, that's it. I don't need any more processes - you may think you do, but I don't - because I've been fooled too often by HGC staff auditors and things like that. They come in and they want a wonderful, wonderful new process from me see. I think them up marvelous, wonderful new processes - I used to, before I learned better - and they go off and they don't do them.

And now here's a series of processes that I know by great subjective reality, by excellent objective reality as an auditor, by consistent and continual reports out through the world of one kind and another, from here and there and so forth. I ' know all these things work. And whereas undoubtedly there could be a great fund of processes that remain utterly undiscovered, well, frankly, they can go on and remain undiscovered as far as I'm concerned, because we don't need them. We don't need them.

Processes are what they are because they depend upon the cooperation and participation of the preclear and his communication with the auditor. Now, therefore we'll never have processes whereby we tell the guy to drop his pants and we shoot him in the gluteus maximus with a horse needle and he becomes Clear. That will never happen! Because it absolutely violates the basic principles of self - determinism and cause. It won't ever happen! All right. So what do we need? We need a gradient whereby he can accept cause. And in the processes I have given you in this lecture, we have got that gradient whereby we can accept cause. He can accept cause and he can come on up the line and therefore he can be cleared. And we can get everything out of the road that keeps him from being at cause. What more do you want?

Well, there's ramifications of it, and I'm sure that auditing styles will change from time to time. Those of you who just passed Model Session, today, will be cheered to know that I have just issued a brand - new release this afternoon. You've got to put up with me to this degree. Actually, I codified a Goal Finder's Model Session into a much smoother package that puts the pc in - session a bit better by reversing a couple of things in it. It's actually not much different than anything else you had before.

But you will see there's little points like this get adjusted as we go. Fashions change. E - Meters will all get painted black at some period or other, you can be sure of that. You can be

certain that auditing rooms must be at the temperature of 79.6 in America and 59.1 in England. You can sure that codifications of this kind of thing will be released. Auditing above the altitude of 6,800 feet is not beneficial, you know, big discoveries can be made from here on out.

But I've done my job because of this: Twenty - five hundred years ago there was a bloke by the name of Gautama Siddhartha Buddha. Now, whether he did or did not become bodhi and whether he was a first - or second - goal Clear, I don't know. As far as I know it has not happened on this planet. I'm very certain that it hasn't happened on this planet for twenty - five hundred years, or somebody would have found out something about it.

I see most of the material raised at that time has been booby - trapped. All right. Twenty - five hundred years after the fact, we've done it. Now, we've done it much more easily and much more understandably and much more applicably than it was ever done before, because I haven't been worried about number one. I've been worried about you and nearly all of our technology is directed toward training it or applying it to the other guy. Not sitting on a mountain contemplating one's navel till he blows out of his silly head, you see? So it's a very practical address to the situation. And the whole thing is tailor - made on this kind of an address. It's for you to do to him, you see, that's the whole address to the problem. Every bit of its research has come up along this line and so forth.

So there it is. There's been no breakthrough in the intervening centuries. We've come up to that point and we have made this breakthrough.

Now, because we are a very tight organization, a very tight, close - woven network of data and that sort of thing, it's interesting that within days, actually, within days of releasing this information, at Saint Hill, Clears were being made in Washington, DC. Now, how fast do you think this is going to go? It's going to go plenty fast. We've got an organization, we have the technology, we have the methods of training people as we go along the line. All right. We've arrived all at one and the same time. I kind of figured we would, but that's the way it is.

And there's the technology. And I've just outlined it to you. Now, if you're sitting around waiting for more technology to be developed and more technology to be developed and for somebody with a twenty - two - inch horse needle to jam into you and hit the plunger so that you can get Clear, then you better apply someplace else because we don't do it that way. Our clearing doesn't put it all on you as a responsibility by a long ways, but it says that you must become cause before you are Clear. I think that's a very worthwhile thing.

All right. That's a rundown of processes and where we have gotten to.

And thank you very much. And good night.