

ACC TRAINING PROCEDURE

A lecture given on
18 July 1958

Thank you.

Well, I understand that we have a little fulmination here today, have had in the last day or so. All those who are going to blow should blow on these dummy sessions before we start auditing for real. And there are still several people who haven't blown yet, so let's not be quite so complacent. There are at least half a dozen I think that, or more than that, that haven't blown up and blown their stacks and so forth.

Don't feel so alone if you have blown. No, don't feel so alone because it's in the best ACC tradition. It's always a little painful and it maybe sometimes takes you as much as a day to settle out and get down and get to feeling better.

But the time to blow is before somebody has the Rock in fifty percent restimulation. That's the time to blow - not afterwards.

Okay. This is the fifth lecture, 20th ACC, July 18, 1958. And we're going right ahead here today with the ACC training procedure.

Now, if we look this over very carefully we will discover that we have so far covered in lectures everything up to communication. But we haven't said too much about goals and PT problems. We haven't said too much about this and we've said practically nothing about communication. So we're going to take those things up today.

Now, CCH 0 is a composite of all of the things you do or should do or could do in order to get a session started. And there are probably a bunch of other things that should go into CCH 0, but they're not there. But the things that are there are very, very important. That is to say, you tell somebody that the session has begun. That's an integral part of it. You try to establish some goals and that's a solicitation of a participation by the preclear, a contribution to the session. You could go over goals and run a process on goals, an old process, a rather good one, but that's not indicated here. You merely establish some goals, some goals that are real to the preclear.

Now, right there I'll give you the main thing - and you possibly never thought of it before as the main thing - but let's make sure that this survive-succumb proposition is taken care of.

Now, your goals are to get the preclear to survive. Now, let's just make sure that the preclear has a similar vector, and if he doesn't have, why, your adroitness is solicited. There's nothing you can do about it but be clever. It's always unfortunate in a routine where we put a little area in there and say, "Well, the thing you do about this is be clever." But the truth of the matter is, that's the best advice.

How would you be clever about goals if you found somebody was just there to kick the bucket? Hm? How would you be clever about it? Well, there would be a number of ways, all of them dependent upon the preclear. Just exactly how is he trying to kick the bucket? And we must remember that there are eight dynamics and he may be trying to kick the bucket on only seven of them, you see? And he's got one dynamic on which he's not trying to kick the bucket. Well, that's fine, we at least have an entering wedge.

But a pc who is on a negative dynamic - you saw the congress there; talked about negative dynamics, remember? And you've known about negative dynamics before. Well, a pc who is on a negative three is definitely on a succumb negative one, negative two, negative three. You see?

He's trying to die on three dynamics. Well, you could audit a long time on somebody who's trying to die on three dynamics, but the concentration may only be on the third dynamic.

He's trying to get away from "this horrible, terrible, awful environment," he tells you; because all of the "nasty people" who are kicking him around. Now, he may not state it quite that bluntly and wave a red flag in front of your nose and say, "See, see, textbook case, textbook case!" It may take a little talking on your part on the subject of goals.

And you can discover some of the wildest things about a preclear in talking about goals. And if you don't, then you evidently aren't running goals or aren't interested or something. If you occasionally don't discover a real wild curve in the area of goals, then you just aren't giving it enough attention.

Now, one of the ways of doing it, the arduous way, not recommended, but give you an idea, would just be to take up all the dynamics. Ever occur to you before? A goal on the first, a goal on the second, a goal on the third, a goal on the fourth, a goal on the fifth, a goal on the sixth. What do you want to have happen to this universe? See? You're auditing a pc and you ask him, "What do you want to have happen to this universe as a result of this auditing session?" You're liable to get a wild reply.

"Now, what do you expect to have happen to the kingdom of thetans as a result of this session?" Well, that's a staggering question. Now, if he's on an inverted seven, he'll give you an answer. Otherwise he'd just kind of be staggered or it'll just be totally unreal and he'll pass it off. But if he's on an inverted seven and you ask him a question like that, you're liable to hit real fireworks and do more for that case in that little brief period of time in asking for goals than you do with an awful lot of auditing. You brought something into his view and brought something into your view.

Now, what if his vector is totally negative on seven? Seventh dynamic goal for this session: to get a few more of the damn things trapped. Well now, what do you do? Well, there isn't very much you can do because this is not a process.

The only thing you can do on it is two-way comm and put it down in your little notebook which is - I carry mine over on this side of my skull; I have a section of white bone in there - I don't have any brains evidently. It leaves me lots of writing space and I can reach in there and put down notes, and it says, "Thetans, Freedom of, Recover in Goals." And I just clear this every time I turn around. See? I clear this. I don't clear it as often as I clear a command, but I sure hit it every now and then. That's to make sure he cognites on it somewhere along the line.

I wouldn't go so far as to hold a gun on a preclear until he cognited. But I'd certainly give him enough line to hang himself with a good cognition.

The beauty of it is - the beauty of it is when you're covering dynamics and goals - is that the destructive, inverted side of the dynamics, one to eight inverted (that's all destructive), tend to reverse rather easily, and that's why no vast process was ever leveled at this. A fellow doesn't stay there forever if you call it to his attention. He'll feel silly telling you, "Well, maybe we'll be able to get a few more of the damn things trapped." See, on the seventh dynamic it's a silly thing. He recognizes that it's silly.

Now, the funny part of it is that a thetan does know and does realize and does recognize that an inverted dynamic is wrong. He does do so. This is quite remarkable. That's not because of his social training or what he read in the newspapers or what the judge in the court says. We'll go into this later on when we're talking about the Rock. His sanity is as good as he can recognize the wrongness in destruction. It isn't necessary to be able to tolerate destruction to be Clear. It's quite odd. But the fellow was right who said something about the optimum solution: the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics.

And the better he gets and the better he feels and the better he operates, the better are his goals on the dynamics. And when his goals shape up to the greater good for the greater number of dynamics, when they shape up in that direction, he himself is freer, more able to function, has greater ability and is incidentally able to wreak more destruction, but doesn't, which is fascinating. When he's in this terrifically destructive mood he cannot wreak the destruction he would like to wreak. Isn't that interesting? This fellow feels like he'd like to blow up the whole world, he is so mad; he'd just like to tear it to pieces. Awfully deflating to tell him to go ahead. Just tell him to go ahead; if he wants to blow up the whole world, go ahead. He'll recognize that he cannot because he is not able to.

The maddest thing in the world, the angriest thing, the thing that most wants to chop up everything is probably a little tiny spider that couldn't even bite effectively.

The more he specializes in destruction the less able he is to destroy. The more he destroys the less able he is to destroy. Quite interesting. It's too bad that Russia never used atomic bombs in World War II. The US having used one in World War II is probably almost incapable of using another one. Isn't that interesting? If Russia had used one, why, they'd be fairly incapable of it, but they don't know yet. I hope they don't experiment on us first. But the point is, here, that the more an individual obsessively has to destroy, the less he is capable of destruction.

It's quite interesting that destruction itself is such a two-edged sword. I don't know about a two-edged sword, I've found them very handy from time to time in action and so forth. When I say two-edged sword, I remember a sword that shattered its hilt one time because I hit somebody over a helmet, and it shattered its hilt and the blade extended all the way down through the hilt. You get the idea? Nobody had blunted the blade when it went through the hilt. Boy, that sure made mincemeat out of my hand! Well, it's an edged hilt that we're interested in with this thing, destruction, an edged hilt. You could handle it all right if you handled it with some care, but don't hit anybody with the blade because you'll cut your own hand off.

Now, destruction of MEST, destruction of anything, as you go down the line, which is willful and intentional and all the rest of it with malice aforethought, normally winds up in a destruction of the ability that it took to destroy in the first place. So that boxers get worse and worse and less and less, you know? They don't improve.

And if you want to look for the curve of improvement, look into the constructive fields of endeavor.

Now, never be fooled by this one: An individual is apparently going out the window and down scale by construction. This is not true. And if you look him over carefully - let's say he's a painter and he's painted and painted and painted until he's painted himself raw and burned himself out and he's painted his career into limbo and he isn't getting better, he's getting worse all the time as he paints, and so on; he's been famous and all that sort of thing - you're looking at the wrong curve. Paralleling it in his conduct in life, you'll find out he was engaging in a tremendous amount of destruction, and as he painted away he was also destroying away. He wasn't just constructing and he was giving great emphasis to destruction. Until at last his constructiveness was devoured in his destructiveness, which apparently gives destructiveness great power.

Destructiveness has only the power of the construction which preceded it. The act of blowing up a large and beautiful city is impressive only to the degree that the city was constructed large and beautiful.

Now, you think this is just a passing remark and a moral lesson on this Friday, but it isn't at all: It is the very heart of clearing. If it weren't for this fact, clearing would be impossible. If destruction had power in its own right, you'd never clear anybody. But the destruction, magnitude of, is totally dependent on the constructiveness which preceded it, and by addressing the constructiveness alone you are able to banish destructiveness. Creation always whips destruction always

Therefore, in clearing goals there is some hope for you, if you simply clear the constructive angle and try to lead the fellow into a little more constructive look at it.

You don't run a process like, "Well, tell me a part of your wife you don't have to destroy." You see, that's a noncommunication sort of process. Or, "A part of your auditor you don't have to slice." You know? But you can say, "Is there anything else you would like to do to your auditor?" See? His goal for the session, let us say, is to give his auditor as bad a time as possible. Now, you could actually talk to somebody until they will more or less admit such a thing; you don't have to drive them very hard. Take somebody that - he wasn't there by his own consent, let us say, he's a member of some family that's dragged in to you to be processed and he isn't there by his own consent. And it doesn't take very long to suddenly scare into view such a goal.

What we want to do is establish the optimum goal that we can establish at the time that we establish it. Establish the best goal that we can establish at the time we establish it. That's all we're interested in. And if the goal is a destructive one, establish goals more often. Continue to establish goals as you go. Not quite so often as you clear a command perhaps, but almost.

The way you do that is to call breaks. You don't call breaks to clear a command, but you call breaks to establish goals again - just for an excuse to start a new session, see? Have a little break, have a cup of coffee or a Coke or something of the sort and come back and hit it all over again. See? And go through goals, only this time be a little more exhaustive.

Now, the processes which you're running, in general, will change his mind about the goals. But he's liable to get stuck with his own postulated goal at the beginning of session and if it's wrong way to, make sure it gets changed. Get the idea? So we're not so much interested in changing the goal in CCH 0 as we are establishing it thoroughly.

One of the things that really upsets an entheta preclear who is going down the line at a great rate - one of the things that really upsets, is to have you go in there, establish an entheta goal, a very bad goal, and then say, "Well, that's fine," and go on to something else. He sort of put it out as bait to tempt you, you know? He started to try to tell you that he's a bad man and he's very dangerous and you'd better be very careful because look at the violence of the goal he has. See? And this doesn't faze you - it itself tends to cave in the goal.

Now, so much for goals. You would say, you - beyond this fact - that you would continue to clear goals and work with goals as you audited until the goals were somewhere on the constructive side of the dynamic span.

You don't disagree with - and this is a proviso I must give you before we leave this subject - you don't disagree with a destructive goal verbally. Your disagreement takes the form of clearing one, often. It'll throw him out of agreement with the auditor. You don't have to agree to the destructive goal; all you have to do is establish that it exists. He'll change his mind with great rapidity if you really get this thing going. So you see, it is to some degree a matter of judgment.

All right. Now let's move over into the burningly important part of CCH 0, which is PT problem.

Now, goals, oddly enough, cannot uphold - hold up your sessions. If you forgot about goals they would come out in the wash. They really would, I mean they'd work out one way or the other. You just slow down the length of time it took to get a result on somebody See, you just slow it down; you'd find yourself investing a lot more hours. See? They work out somehow.

Only occasionally when you had somebody who came in to commit suicide during auditing would you really come up against it. See? So goals become very important in such a case. Somebody comes in to knock off the body and he wants your help, and you don't establish any

goals and then the main thing that happens there to the auditor is that he becomes upset. The auditor feels pretty bad when somebody goes glimmering on him because he never got an agreement on the subject of what he was doing. He just was assuming the preclear wanted to survive; therefore, if the preclear died it was the auditor's fault, don't you see? And it makes the auditor feel bad.

If he establishes goals, one, he prevents this occurrence very markedly of somebody knocking himself off and two, he certainly is not in the dark concerning the intentions of the preclear via auditing.

Well, goals being what they are, the PT problem is much more important, because a PT problem in CCH 0 can hold up the whole parade of auditing and nullify your every effort. Goals cannot. But you get no advance or change of profile if you leave a present time problem lying there untouched or if you leave it incomplete or if you get a preclear who was audited by somebody else who didn't complete a present time problem. You got this? Boy, this is one of the burning facts of auditing today. It isn't something you do to make him feel better; it isn't something you do to get him into session. It's something you do to get some change on the case, and that's what you're auditing him for, so PT problem becomes extremely important.

Now, the funny part of it is the individual doesn't always tell you he has a present time problem. Isn't that right? He doesn't always tell you. In fact, I've never had one tell me yet unless I ask him. He's sitting there glumly and so I ask him. And he says, "No, I don't have anything worrying me, nothing troubling me, no."

But the point is, he's not contributing anything to the session so he must not be there, and if he can't contribute anything to the session he isn't going to go anyplace. All the contribution he's doing to the world is contributing his worry to some set of terminals which are in conflict and confusion somewhere else.

And the first thing we have to know about a PT problem is often overlooked by the auditor. And don't let me ever catch you overlooking this one about a PT problem. It's part of its definition: A PT problem is a present time problem only if it exists physically and concurrently in the real universe where the auditing session is taking place. A PT problem, a present time problem, is real and actual and a PT problem and should be handled only if it is taking place, exists, is happening, has other terminals and is located in the physical universe at the time of the auditing session.

This fellow says, "Well, I have sciatica." Looks like that's a PT problem, huh? The devil it's a PT problem; it has nothing to do with it! It's in the auditing room for sure and it's undoubtedly on the backtrack. Right? It's way back when. So he hurts in the session. Well, sometimes something like this can distract a preclear sufficiently so he can't be audited. Funny part of it is you would probably dive right in and start taking it up at once without getting the preclear into session if you considered it a PT problem. Well, it isn't. Because the fellow who hit him in the sciat has been dead for a thousand years. So it certainly isn't happening in the physical universe now. Therefore, you can actually audit somebody with a somatic. You can actually do so. Ignore it utterly and have it come out in the wash.

Actually, in view of the fact that he is mocking it up at that moment, himself, and that your auditing more or less addresses what he is mocking up causes you to address the somatic in any event. But it can be neglected.

This one can't be neglected: His mother-in-law arrived that morning and the first he heard of it was her three trunks being put on the front porch. And he noticed this as he came down the steps to report to you in an auditing session. It wasn't a grip he saw; it was three trunks. Well now, those trunks exist in the physical universe. He's in the middle of an uncomplete, incomplete, uncompleted cycle of action. One of the things he's doing is waiting for the end of it. So he's waiting somewhere else than in the auditing room.

You could say so many odds and ends about PT problems that it's hardly worth summing them all up because they all add up to a total interruption of everything as far as the preclear is concerned.

Now, what is it that makes it a problem? Well, it's plus or minus randomness. It is a different pace than he considers life should be lived at. Something has happened faster or slower. More has happened or less has happened.

Now, you see PT problem could be: he expected his paycheck and his paycheck for his accumulated back pay and everything was supposed to be one thousand dollars and he got a little slip from the treasurer and a check for twenty-five cents - less has happened.

He has an envelope delivered to him which he thinks is his back pay. He opens it up and finds twenty-five thousand dollar bills in it and simultaneously discovers that the treasurer's office has been robbed.

Now, in either event, when he reports to you, he's in no shape to be audited because something is going on in the physical universe which has his attention. And it's plus or minus randomness, so his attention is fixed and his attention is on wait." This burning question, "What is going to happen out there?" entirely prevents him from finding out what's going to happen in the auditing session - plus or minus randomness.

But don't, please, ever consider a present time problem a present time problem when it isn't taking place in the physical universe now, when it doesn't have terminals which are alive now.

Do you know why you have to do that, why you have to put that very slashing "This is it!" line of demarcation on a present time problem? Because an auditor will do this - a good auditor would never do that and so none of you will ever do this - but you start running a PT problem and find yourself on a chain of problems and you start going down the chain. Well, why don't you just take out your pocketknife and cut your preclear's throat and cut your throat too because that's the end of that.

When he starts going off into a chain and into the past you're no longer in a PT problem and you are probably not running the optimum process to handle that chain.

You start running as a PT problem the fact that his head aches. You certainly are going to go way on down back - the backtrack. Yes, his head aches now, here - his head aches now, here - and it aches so much he is having a hard time concentrating on the session. Well, all you've got to do is groove a session with processes sufficiently light to be audited in spite of his headache and his headache will disappear. If you run old TR 10 or something silly - hardly anything, you know - or TR 5: You make that body sit in that chair.

He isn't in good shape so you run a light process. See? That's always a little maxim an auditor goes by anyhow: The worse shape a preclear is in, the lighter the process you run on him. That's because of the Effect Scale. If you know the Effect Scale that, of course, takes place. And it's amazing to be able to make a very sick person feel much better by just offering to audit him or something. You know, that's an awfully light process. He actually has been reached, he's been reached too thoroughly by the society and by things and if you try to reach him with great force again, then he doesn't respond, because auditing is the trick of making the preclear reach. You could define it like that.

And when you use processes which prevent his reachingness totally, why, then he of course nulls on down and gets worse. So you want to use a very light process if your preclear has some somatics. But that's not a PT problem, see? Now, some people, mentally, you know, kind of back in the back of the skull or something - mentally - is something you do unconsciously according to psychology. A subject all of you - I want to recommend to you a subject - the subject of psychology - I want to recommend it to you thoroughly. Don't ever let Scientology

get into that state. I recommend it to you as a horrible example of complete hotchpotch. Mental reservations, mental this, mental that, and they don't even know what's in the mind.

When you get a person with a PT problem you mustn't ever sort of unconsciously divide it up in such a way that - well, he's here in present time and he doesn't feel well and therefore he has a PT problem. You get the idea? Don't have a feeling that a PT problem is sort of a significant state. You know? It's not. See? A PT problem is a couple of terminals, two or more terminals, having at it or not having at it.

See, Papa and Mama no longer talking to each other is almost as much a PT problem as Papa and Mama cutting each other's throats. So don't ever fall into this lazy one, you know, of thinking, "Well, this person has a present time problem because he's uncomfortable." That's not the definition of one.

The present time problem must exist as terminals in the present moment of time - live meat and blood and MESTy terminals that everybody can see. Don't ever get lazy about that definition because you'll go astray, astray, astray and this is the only way you can really hold up a profile.

I mean, the only way you could absolutely fix a profile so that it will not change: just - just hold it on the same line. The profile goes like this; at the end of the week it goes like that; the next week it goes like that; the next week it goes like that; the next week it goes like that; the same profile, same profile, same profile, same profile. The only thing that'll do that, week after week, is a PT problem untouched by the auditor. And that'll do it.

Now, if you get Auditor Code breaks and ARC breaks with the preclear every time you turn around or he thinks you do, you could get a suppression of the profile. It's above the line a few points and at the end of a week's intensive it's below the line a few points. Well, that's ARC breaks. ARC breaks cannot paralyze and hold frozen a profile in its same pattern week after week.

Well, that's because the preclear is on wait, so his state of case, his state of beingness, his criticalness, his aggressiveness, all of these things are a fixed pattern of wait. And you've got to get him off of that wait in order to change that profile at all.

This is the only thing we know of that will do this because every time we've found a pc's profile unchanged - every time - we've then (when we could get hold of the preclear and we've gotten hold of the preclear) just shake the cake until it was a bunch of crumbs and sure enough a PT problem would fall out that he was knowingly withholding from the auditor.

A serious PT problem can apparently be the whole case. You know? My husband's leaving me; my husband's leaving me; my husband's leaving me; my husband's leaving me; my husband's leaving me; won't live with me anymore; is over there somewhere. Husband's leaving me. You know? We have a case right now that is: Wife leaving me; wife's leaving me; wife's left me; wife's leaving me; wife's left me. Week after week after week after week after week this fellow has been so involved in this PT problem he makes no progress in auditing, because he's also saying, "Maybe she'll come back; maybe she'll come back." You know? He's on wait. He's on a big maybe. It's a big unknown. Here he is parked somewhere on the MEST universe time track by these occurrences.

Well, what can you do?

Well, in this particular case the present time problem, as it will occasionally be, is also evidently the Rock. So the Rock is in total restim by reason of the PT problem and to take one off the other, is demanding auditing skill the like of which nobody ever had to exert before.

But by using the terminals involved in the PT problem with Step 6 - you know, running the PT problem with Step 6 - Terminal A is part of the PT problem. All right. In front of that body make up Terminal A and keep her from going away. Behind that body make up Terminal A and

keep her from going away. You get the idea? By beefing up the process used on the PT problem it is apparently, at this stage, being handled.

Therefore, a PT problem is also not defined by the process that's run on it. Don't say, "It must be a PT problem because we ran Responsibility on it." I know this sounds queer, I know this sounds weird for me to say that, but you actually kind of could, you know.

You could say, "Well, it's a PT problem so we run the standard process for PT problems on it." And then we lose because a PT problem is not defined by the process run on it. You could run anything on a PT problem. Any dynamite that you want to throw into the case, any process you ever heard of that you think will bite on a PT problem can be run on a PT problem.

In this particular case, I think the PT problem has greater width than the auditor has ever established and I have not had a consultation, oddly enough, about this particular case. I've just had it lightly discussed but the profiles of this case have for some reason never been brought up to me by the Director of Processing and we have never gone over this case as a case - with a big thud. And I remember making a note on the case one time but that's about all.

But I would suspect if it wasn't surrendering, if this PT problem wasn't surrendering, that the trouble with the PT problem was that it hadn't been isolated, that we had another problem in front of the problem. And he's talking about the loss of his wife, the loss of his wife, the loss of his wife as the PT problem and it's so apparent and... God bless auditors, they're so reasonable. It sounds so much the thing, they're so much in agreement with the possibility that this could be a PT problem that I don't think anybody's ever gone behind this and looked around to find out what it was.

Now, frankly, you might be able to find out all sorts of things about this instead of just accepting this pat situation. It's so pat it's almost out of a paperback novel, you know? So, of course, it must be the present time problem; it's so ordinary and usual.

Well, when one doesn't surrender in an hour or two you'd better get suspicious that you have not surrounded it and looked it over. Now, how do we know it's loss of his wife, loss of his wife, loss of his wife; how do we know that's the present time problem at all? Because having received this I seriously doubt if we have looked searchingly and exhaustively for a second PT problem. Maybe he's also experiencing the loss of a boyfriend. He'd be much less likely to remark on that to his auditor, wouldn't he? Maybe - maybe there's a darn good reason why his wife's leaving him. Maybe he has a social disease. Maybe this is his PT problem. Maybe he feels he's going to go nuts in the next couple of years with some incurable social disease or something. You get the idea? You could only get messed up about a present time problem if you buy the idea that it's always the kind of a problem that you would consider a problem. The test of a present time problem and its ability to hold up a case is not whether or not the auditor would consider it a problem. That's not the test. The test is something quite different, is: does it hold up the case and does it exist in physical terminals in the real universe right now? And does the pc think it's a problem after you've worked it over awhile? Let me tell you something about the behavior of one of these darn things. You say so-and-so to the pc, "Do you have anything worrying you now? Anything causing you any concern out in the world or in your business or in your home, something like that?" And he says, "No. No." Needle doesn't drop on the E-Meter.

You got a better E-Meter: How does his willingness to contribute to the session compare to former willingness to contribute to the session or proper willingness to contribute to the session, hm? How does that compare? If it's less, look for that PT problem until you wear the E-Meter out, because it's there. Only two things could be wrong. He could be feeling ill, see, which would suppress his contribution to the session. So the devil with that, just go on and audit him. You see? Audit him on something light, don't keep up with that plow technique, maybe, that you were using, but soften it up a little bit.

The way to soften up a very, very tough process might be of interest to you. You throw more two-way comm in between the commands. You slow down the number of commands per unit time. You can actually soften up a process without changing a process. It's quite interesting. And you could take a process that was tearing his head off, and then he shows up for the next session and he feels a little ill, not necessarily because of the processing at all, and you say, "Boy this - he isn't in good enough shape to run this process. It'd be a mistake to change the process maybe." You see? It probably would be a mistake to change the process but to get it run you might have to soften it up. The way you would soften it up would be to throw more two-way comm in it and throw more ARC into the session. Show more interest in it. Clear his goals much better, you know, and do various things.

Now, PT problem doesn't necessarily stand up on its hind legs and smack you in the nose. It does that more slowly; it waits a whole week until you give them their second APA to smack you in the nose if you don't find it. And you've been in there with great enthusiasm and you've been auditing him and you've been nnzzz and it's going this way and that, and you get to the end of the week and you give him a profile and he takes all the examinations and you add it up and buuu, what the hell is this! Well, if it went down - if it went down, there was an ARC break in there someplace. Maybe not even in that session, you know, maybe in some earlier session and the ARC break remanifested itself.

But if it didn't change at all, then a PT problem was sitting right - two, three feet back of his head laughing at you very snidely. That's what happened. That's all that happened so don't go kicking yourself around. We've got this thing in a box. This is crated and marked, "Important. Express." Now, somebody suggested to me the other day that if you ran Connectedness for a little while a PT problem that was buried would show up. I haven't done this yet but it sounds like a very good suggestion. It opens up the possibility of running a little bit of a process of one kind or another and then asking him again for the PT problem, you know, without - regardless of whether it was Connectedness. You see? Process him a little bit and then talk about the present time problem and then process him a little bit and talk about the present time problem - rather than just beat it to death - because processing will change his mind slightly or at least shake his communication system up a little bit, see, and maybe change his mind on the situation.

Now, you can eventually get any real present time problem to show up on the E-Meter providing he'll show a lie reaction on the E-Meter. If he won't show a lie reaction on the E-Meter, if the needle's so stuck that that won't happen, then for sure you won't see a present time problem on the E-Meter. Got that? So a good test is when you first ask him whether or not - you see, you can do this real covertly - when you ask him at first, right there at first, if he has a PT problem - you've just done some goals and this sort of thing - and he has a PT problem.

By the way, his PT problem could be so pressing and so much in there that he couldn't establish goals, at which time you'd have to take up goals after the present time problem, again. Don't you see? It'd be taking up goals again, not take them up after, if he has a pressing present time problem. If he has a pressing present time problem and it was very pressing and had him very upset, you'd better take up goals again, don't you see? Slide him in back of this.

But if this fellow doesn't show up - you see, you haven't had too much chance to study his behavior on an E-Meter - and if he doesn't show up with a drop on a PT problem the first time you ask for it or the second time you ask for it, crank that sensitivity button way up and pull the tone arm down to re-center the needle swing so as to get a fantastically sensitive reading. And now ask him again if he has a PT problem.

If he bangs on that be sure and ask him again to see if you get the same bang, because it isn't true that a PT problem at first doesn't show up on the E-Meter - that is not an accurate statement - it doesn't show up much at first. See, that's very accurate. It doesn't show up very much.

So that if you had it set over here at 2.0 on the sensitivity button, you see, and you say, "Well, has anything been worrying you lately?" and so forth, and he says "No," and it stays there

very steady; and yet just that morning - just that morning - somebody had come upstairs and had spilled his ashtray off into his shirts in the drawer and they all burned up. And it's left him literally without a shirt on his back and he's got to go downtown and buy some more shirts but he doesn't have any money to do so - or some weird thing like this, you know.

He says, "Well, this kind of happens and there's no reason for me to go on blaming people because it happened and therefore, it's sort of my own fault, letting them into my room anyway," and therefore, this hardly could interrupt an auditing session.

Now that - absorb this datum, will you - the preclear's no judge of the importance of a PT problem; he's no judge at all.

And when you first ask him (with that sensitivity set on 2.0 there) about present time problem, it apparently doesn't flicker. And the funny part of it is if the sensitivity is cranked up high enough, it will flicker.

Now, of course, the way you've been doing this is to set at 2.0 and you ask him the first time and you ask him the second time and you ask him the third time and you ask him the fourth time and finally, all of a sudden you get a little blip on the meter. Well, that's sort of slow freight through Arkansas. Very slow. And if you ask him once and don't get a drop it's always a good thing to crank up the sensitivity knob and ask him twice. If it's there, it's there and you'll sure see it there, even though he's in apathy about it.

Now, what is your guarantee that you will not leave a present time problem unrun? You haven't got one. You have no guarantee at all beyond your own observation. Is it there or isn't it there? Maybe the problem is so antisocial he dare not mention it.

We used to suspect that people who made no gain ever in auditing, even though audited a year or two or something - and there were some people around who did this - never made a gain, had something they dared not tell, in particular, a Scientologist. And since that time a check on several of these cases has demonstrated this to be very much the case. It was something they couldn't tell a Scientologist, but that must have meant it was going on in the real universe right at that time. Some influence of it, some crosscurrent of it must be taking place at that time.

In one of these particular cases, we were of the belief that he'd received some money to do the organization in. This was the first time it ever got really clued into view. And this we thought was the case. So we asked him. He broke down, flew all to pieces and after that was auditable. Isn't this a grim one? Because he actually had been around for a couple of years getting audited without ever showing a gain on an E-Meter.

Now, this doesn't mean that everybody who shows no gain is privately doing something covertly to Scientology. But it does mean that such a thing amounts to a present time problem which can never be exposed. So those present time problems which can never be exposed are the most insidious things on a case, but they're present time problems and they do exist in the physical universe at the auditing time.

If they by some fluke became yesterday's present time problem - there was some end of cycle no matter how indefinite - then they would simply become part of the case and any technique would touch them. But that they're still contained in the physical universe keeps techniques from reaching them. Do you follow this? So that PT problem is easily the most important part of CCH 0 unless CCH 0 is so scanted as to constitute an ARC break with the preclear, at which time the ARC break with the preclear because it depresses an APA must be more important than the present time problem. Do you see this? Now, if you get a clear understanding of this, the results which you get in sessions will materially improve and become much more uniform. You're doing very well now, but here and then I know you, as well as I have, have muffed a case. You know it didn't thuh, and so on.

We know now why: present time problem or a series of ARC breaks with the auditor. These two things are the only things which can stand in the road of a process working. And these two things are really both contained, to a very marked degree, in CCH 0.

So we could say that CCH 0 is the only single series of actions which could prevent a case from gaining, the only barrier on the track to improvement, the only barriers, since there are two of them: ARC breaks between auditor and preclear - he didn't start the session, he didn't do this, he didn't do that, he wasn't interested in the preclear, you know, all that sort of thing that all come up, then are established in CCH 0 - or a PT problem. These things were not handled and therefore the case made no progress.

The answer to getting cases into session is CCH 0 and keeping them gaining are also contained in CCH 0. So I think you'll find this a fairly important step even though it's the step you have to get rid of in order to get auditing done.

Remember, if it's just the step you have to get rid of in order to get auditing done, remember to get rid of it with great thoroughness.

Thank you.

[end of lecture.]