

ANATOMY OF NEEDLES - DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURE - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on
24 July 1958

July 24th, 1958. And I'm going to give you a warning. Beginning about tomorrow, those that haven't asked questions are going to be called on for them. It's your responsibility to integrate this information and it's too much to ask that this much information which has remained relatively obscured for the last few billion, trillion years would be all digestible to you in one fell lump and that you would never have a question about it.

Well, one way this could occur is that you'd feel rather apathetic about it. In view of the fact that concepts are passing through here in these lectures that challenge some of man's most deep-seated convictions, it would be abnormal not to have a question about some of them. It means that you just must be letting it go by and taking everything Ron says without analysis and boy, you start doing that and you'll have a hell of a time for yourself; I'm not kidding you.

Even on staff, tell somebody to do something and if they don't start asking me "Why?" once in a while - which is a thing that would never happen in a military organization, you know? You say to somebody, "Now, let's get those things wrapped up in green paper after this, hm?" And if somebody in a military organization said, "Why?" why, of course, he'd be court-martialed and disgraced and they'd shoot him or give him wheel - tie him to a wheel out in the field or something. But that is not the way we work around here.

What we seek is your intelligent participation and what we frown on is your hypnotic never-inspection. And if you don't inspect this stuff, what's it doing? It's just going in as a lock on what you already have of it. See, it's an exploration of you as well as anything else and if you just say, "Well, that's the way it is because Ron says it is," why... It's either true or it isn't, you see? And if it isn't true for you, it isn't true.

And if somebody on staff doesn't ask me once in a while, "Why do you want it wrapped up in green paper?" I know they've just sunk into the humdrum apathy of it all and the waves of time are washing over them as they roll in the dirty sand. You get the idea? Now true enough, theoretically, it'd be so clear and concise and so forth, that you pick it up. But it'd be too much to ask that somewhere along the line some point or another didn't go - just went in sideways, you know, and it just didn't fit at all and you just couldn't see how that one went in.

If no point of this material - if no point ever did this, then we could only assume one thing: that you were either OT or Clear or - hm! awful shape.

Yes, Hal?

Male voice: One thing I'm worried about is my auditor judgment. And it's not that I'm so confused about what you say as it is that when I get in session I feel that I've - I haven't got an ounce of judgment left. I don't get...

Now, that's typical of swallowing too much data. I know exactly what you're talking about.

Male voice: Yeah, because.

That's typical of swallowing too much data without inspecting some of it.

Male voice: Is that it?

Yeah, that's right. That's right. And that is a common course manifestation. Now, one of the ways to handle this - and the way it's usually handled, is somebody puts it on the back burner

and see if it works and hopes it'll turn out and become glimmeringly bright as far as they're concerned.

I told you the other day, I said, "You just get up there to the driver's side of these TRs, see? Get up on the cause side of the TRs." Now, how has that worked out?

Audience: Very well, Ron.

Yeah, very well, sure. Now, I can tell you the same thing, Hal. You just get up on the driver's side of the data. If you just get the idea that you originated all that data, you'd have the truth. See? It would be the truth. You didn't originate the phraseology or presentation or maybe the organization but you certainly did originate this data one way or the other or you wouldn't find yourself living in this universe with these people. Get the idea? So, that by flipping over to the cause side of the thing, you can sometimes let yourself in for some awfully dizzy feelings because you'll go straight through the irresponsibilities and the forgetters. You know? And you'll say - all of a sudden you'll just go blank. You'll just sit there looking at an E-Meter and you just go blank! That's all. There sits the E-Meter and you say, "What the hell is this? And where am I?" you know? You've backed up to the cause side of the phenomena in somebody else's mind and it stays blank for maybe fifteen, twenty seconds, you know like, "Where am I? What am I doing?" Well, it's all right. There's nothing wrong with that at all as long as it doesn't upset your pc. Pc wants to know what happened to you or he looking at you strangely or he's out of beat and so forth, you tell him, "Well, I just went blank for a minute." He'll understand this. If you don't tell your pc what really did go on, you have got a basic unreality going in the session which will eventually add up to what? An ARC break.

You keep lying to your pc. "Oh, I'm doing fine. I've just got your case right in the bracket, (except I'm sitting here being blown out of my chair every couple of seconds)." Your pc does not appreciate your abandoning responsibility because you're in such bad shape. This he does not appreciate. But equally, he doesn't appreciate your being dishonest with him. And you're expected to stay in there pitching and at the same time not be dishonest about what you are doing.

Now, back up to the cause side of the data. And the first thing you know, you will have a grip on the situation which is fantastic. It's not my data. See, here's the whole trick: It's not my data at all. The truth of the matter is that the data has been generated and agreed upon and postulated and wound up and balled up in the long tangles of time that some people laughingly call a time track and all I'm doing is restimulating it, in essence. (That doesn't mean I'm restimulating you.) So much so that every once in a while somebody says, "Well, gee-whiz, if you want to audit a valence, why, you ought to audit Ron." Get the idea? "And then you'll feel much better." Funny part of it is, they always feel much worse. I wonder why. Well...

Male voice: It's prosurvival.

It's prosurvival. I never did beat any of you up, so forth. You get the idea? And you start going along the line and if you start auditing it out, what you audit out in reality are all of the half-moved-through blocks, see? And then the guy is put back to nowhere, see? But now, you can steady out yourself and as an auditor - much better than a preclear - blow your way through. And when you've done that and come up to the cause side of what you are doing, boy, have you got it made, see? You've got it made.

Takes a little bit of guts to do something like that but it is quite common for a staff auditor. Staff auditor comes up and says, "Ron, I-I-I'm - I haven't got a clue. What is this guy doing?" And I say, "Well, what's it look like?" and so on, and I'd say, "Well, it's probably so-and-so and so-and-so, you know?" And the auditor doesn't inspect it; he just goes back down and he runs it. Next time I say something to him, or something like this, he's liable to go kind of, you know, blank.

And I watch this. I watch for this and when I find a person doing that and not coming up on the cause side of the data at all, but just drinking it down, I know we got somebody who is insufficiently cause to regenerate the data. And I know they're going to have a hard time. I just usually sometimes get them some auditing, just in general, not on anything, just clean them up just a little bit more, get a little bit more of the Rock off the case. Or plead with them, "Come on now, just sit up there in the driver's seat. Don't put me in the auditing chair." And you get a tremendous resurgence of ability and initiative.

It isn't that what I'm telling you is repressing initiative. It's what I'm telling you is restimulating data for which you have abandoned, to a marked degree, responsibility. Therefore, it's very easy to say, "Well, Ron's responsible for that," you see, because you've already abandoned the responsibility for it. Now, the second you begin to assume responsibility for it through the action of auditing, you will blow through a tremendous - a lot of junk, bank and everything else. You get the idea? Sometimes an auditor sitting there'll say, "Well, I just can't say one more command. I'm just going through the floor. I am so tired. I am so weary. The Instructors keep telling me to confront, confront, confront. So what? So what? I'm going mad, mad, mad." Well, what's essentially wrong? Somewhere in this session - somewhere in this session he was not in the driver's seat, you see, and he didn't come up to cause-point on the data, and he started to abandon responsibility for that immediate session, for that immediate datum. And as fast as he abandons responsibility for it, he keys himself in on having abandoned responsibility for it, don't you see? And the next thing you know, why, there he is in a mess.

Well, the way to get out of one of these messes is just get to cause-point on the thing. And you will find astonishingly enough that you are, particularly in this ACC, just about as close to the right thing that you could do in the circumstances as we can easily get to here.

But the right thing to do when a pc says he's in trouble is to, of course, give him a hand and find out what kind of trouble he is in and so on. That's the right thing to do.

The right thing to do when somebody executes an auditing command is to answer up and acknowledge the fact that he has. The right thing to do is to get the Rock off the case and knock out the obsessive creativeness, and so forth, and get this fellow so he isn't creating everything under the sun, moon and stars and lousing himself up gorgeously. These are all right things to do.

As a result, all you have to do is survey the rightness of what you are doing and by that alone, you assume some of the responsibility back and the blankness goes. Okay?

Male voice: It's better.

All right, all right.

Yes?

Male voice: In the creation of one of these dispersal cases, what is the little tick that gets them over on the high side of the meter?

What's the computation there, do you know? How the hell are they created? How is a case like that created?

Male voice: Yes.

Well, let's look at this. Supposing you had to take care of a dog. And you didn't much care for dogs one way or the other but here was this dog and somebody told you to take care of the dog. And you didn't take care of the dog, so they whipped you and told you you had to take care of the dog. They explained to you how dogs suffered and etc., etc., ad nauseam. And so you took care of the dog a little bit more and then you got sloppy about it, or something like that, and the dog got sick; this is an enforcement too.

And so you said, "Well, I'd better take care of the dog." And then you slopped off again and forgot to feed the dog for three days and then whoever was making you take care of the dog gave you hell and threatened you with a beating and bed without supper and all the rest of it, you know? And you've got to take care of the dog. You wind up in a funny frame of mind about the dog.

You were doing something without an ARC connected with it that is adequate to the situation. Takes ARC to as-is things, so your actions are now all sticky. You're not looking at them. You're not inspecting them. You're just doing them because you have to do them. You get the idea? And the next thing you know, because of punishment... Punishment, by the way, has to accompany this sort of thing. It has to be physical duress, not of the magnitude of really being spanked. It's physical duress of being put in an electronic disintegrator and made nothing out of in a hurry, or something like that, on the backtrack, see, that starts this sort of thing.

And after a while you, drifting out in the world by yourself and no longer in those associated confines, you get a dog yourself. And you worry about the dog, see? You worry about the dog. You don't enjoy having a dog. You just worry about a dog, you see? And then let's say something happens to this dog, as dogs ordinarily have things happen to them. That's sort of a fate of dogs. Their life span is much less than that of a man, so by the time they're nine or twelve or fourteen, certainly, the dog kicks the bucket and goes to the happy barking ground and that's that.

Now, you don't - you don't acquire another dog. Strangely, you just don't acquire another dog. You're fairly friendly with dogs. Dogs, you can take dogs; you can leave dogs alone. That's sort of your attitude about it all. But dogs aren't something anybody gets very excited about and rather, dogs are something you sort of ignore, maybe.

You can't quite see why Joe owns one. It seems hard to believe that he'd go to all the trouble of owning a dog. But occasionally little thoughts cross your mind about "Isn't this a funny society with 90 million dogs and cats in it and only 170 million people" - peanuts.

And you have now set up, not a super-aberrative situation, but you have now set up a - one leg of a bracket that is stuck. Got that? All right.

Now, somebody comes along - now somebody comes along and puts you on an E-Meter and finds when he says, "Dogs," that you get a misbehavior of the meter. If it was a severe thing, you'd get a stick. Don't you see? All right. So much for the anatomy of a ridge.

Now let's take somebody who has been part of an organization that had to be responsible for something and somebody who, although somebody was responsible for him, betrayed him - let's get the rest of the legs in here - and let's get other people who had to be responsible for things but weren't and let's get a police force that's responsible for crime so generates it, and let's get this and let's get that. And the next thing you know, we have an interestingly blocked-up case. Only this time its ridges are on other flows as well as the personal outflow, you see? Well, where everything has had to be responsible for other things and nobody liked being responsible for anything, and everybody sort of abandoned the idea of responsibility after a while, there's only one place to go and that's out. Only there's no "out" because the total perimeter of the horizon is entirely blocked. There's no place to go, but the direction is out.

Now, if you said, "Get out," to this fellow, it wouldn't worry him. By the way, this is one of the tests of these cases; we tell him to "Get out." A case that's bad off in this direction is always trying to get out. In a marriage he's always trying to leave the home and that sort of thing. That's common, see? Or he reverses and gets obsessively stuck in the home; can't see why anybody would ever leave a home.

And you get this case, the only direction is out but out is nowhere. And you come along and you say to him, "Get out." Well, "get out" and the action of getting out is not itself what

blows him up; it's the how. You've just presented him with the toughest problem of his life, you see? And the "how," which means impossible. See? And this impossible hits him. You say, "Get out." He gets "impossible," see? And he goes deuuuhh. You know, he goes yak-ugh-ugh. He feels bad.

And he'll tell you he feels bad because somebody told him to get out. That isn't true. He feels bad because it's impossible to get out. Get the idea of this? Now, this case gets so banked up after a while and begins to consider that everything is a barrier. He has all barriers identified with all barriers, you see? If you were to show him an escape route - Lord Dunsany's story of hens and his story of human beings who were kept in a cage and so forth; very exemplary of this sort of thing.

You open the runway, it is smooth walking, the wide horizons reach in all directions, and this person will stand there stupidly and look everywhere but at the road out. You get the idea? It's rather pathetic. You get a total entrapment and this total entrapment computation gives us this case who is riding way high or is riding way low and he can't find even a barrier. Not even the barriers are real. If he could find a barrier, he could cross one maybe, but he can't find one anymore. So he kind of says, "They don't exist and nothing exists and nothing is real." The best answer to it all, of course, is just forget the whole thing and not be responsible for anything, and you've got it made. Then you get a president or something. The best thing to do when Sherman Adams is attacked is declare war on Lebanon. It's the best road out.

Male voice: Sure.

Second male voice: So be it.

That answer your question? You say, "What makes a case like that?"

Male voice: Yes, "Have to be" as the original enforcement.

That's correct.

Male voice: And then entangling with other...

That's right.

Male voice:... enforced responsibilities on other flows.

Right. That's it.

Yes?

Male voice: You mentioned something in the lecture when the fellow looks at what he had to do with this lifetime. He says, "Nothing." And then he realizes that it was the whole lifetime.

Yeah.

Male voice:... that he didn't decide to enter into.

Yeah.

Male voice: He has no reality, then, on having been forced.

Well, that's ...

Male voice: This might come as an idea and it might fit all the facts but he still has no idea of any enforcement.

I'm glad you brought that up, Stan. The fellow says no, he doesn't have a lifetime. He hasn't any enforced responsibility. He can get an analytical idea of it but he has no further reality on it. That is why we use the rest of the buttons than Responsibility.

But the most choice button is Responsibility, but it sometimes cannot be used.

You could ask him this question and he might get a reality on it. The best way to do this, by the way, is just to go over the five buttons with him and ask him to define each one. And the most reasonable explanation that seems to be real to him - he can give, you know, a textbook definition that just doesn't have any bearing at all either - but what apparently is the realest thing to him, and the buttons fade on back to Change.

Change is the lowest one. As the case fades out he can still get an idea of change.

You say, "What have you had to change in this lifetime?"

Well, that's a pale shadow of responsibility, but the fellow is liable to say, "Wow, now wait a minute, oh boy, I - the thing I have to change is myself," or "The thing I have to change is this." "Well, the thing I have to change is that." You start asking him things he has had to change and you'll discover, then, that you'll get your needle manifestation of stuck and free and stuck and free; but the wonder of it is, is you've changed the meter behavior and the needle behavior. And that is the trick in this case, is to get a change in the meter behavior. You got that, Stan?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

Okay. You're welcome.

Yes, Jack?

Male voice: I'm not sure how you'd look at the enforced button of Problems on that.

I gave an example, the - an oracle, or an auditor.

Male voice: Hm. Solutions.

Yeah. They keep walking up with problems. They - asking you to take responsibility for problems continually. Somebody walks in and they say, "I have a problem. Here is it." And you're expected to solve their problem.

Now, you're taking a responsibility for the solutions of these problems. And after a while, why, you say, "Problems, oh, somebody else's problems, well, that's their worry." You get to be a - you see this so commonly in the - amongst the rulers of earth, you know?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yeah.

They say, "Well, that's their worry, you know?" "That's their idea." This guy is just refusing to take responsibility for problems.

Well, when any person is put in an executive position, let us say, well, let's say in the army, he's put in some sort of a position. And there he is and that position carries with it a certain number of problems and he's got to take responsibility for solving these things and answering up to them and so on. Well, if it comes into duress, he'll get court-martialed if he doesn't handle them and all of this sort of thing. After all, he then begins to say, "Problems? Oh, I don't know..." so on.

Now, the smartest thing for a Scientologist to do is to audit the person rather than to solve their problems. We don't solve people's problems. We get them to handle the problems, don't you

see? And in this way you get a quite real circumstance and it's quite workable. And they can go on then. We can handle the general problem of problems and by handling that, we're all set.

Well, if we set ourselves up as an oracle, or something, and we start evaluating for preclears and we start saying, "Well now, you're having trouble with your mother-in-law. Well, the thing for you to do is to go home and be nice to the old lady and enter into communication with her, and then ease her out of the house." You see? And that's what we tell them.

And the next person comes in and we're tired and they say, "Well, I have a terrible problem. I just got a parking ticket." "Well," you say, "you go down to the so-and-so and then you do so-and-so and so-and-so." And after you've done this for a few years and particularly if they didn't ever pay you anything - and they cut your willingness down. The keynote of all this is reduction of willingness.

Maintaining responsibility for and reducing willingness at the same time brings about these ridges. He'll get damn tired of problems after a while if this sort of thing happened.

Male voice: Well, I'm still not sure. You could say to the preclear, "What have you had to create or what have you had to be responsible for?" But I can't quite see how you can say, "Well, what have you had to problem?" you know?

Female voice: No, "What problems have you had to solve?"

Male voice: "What problems have you had to solve?"

Second male voice: It would have to be alter-ised.

Did you ever know anybody who gave you a lot of problems?

Audience: Yes. Sure.

See, that's a good entrance point. That's a good point you're bringing up because it isn't a smooth formula question.

"Ever know anybody who gave you a lot of problems?" and so on. You're liable to hit real paydirt on something like this, you know. And they say, "Oh, my God, yes, my mother!" - you know, or something like that. Wow.

Now, the worst part of this unburdening, by the way, the worst part of this unburdening is it doesn't reach with any great reality into past lives. And you can run across the barrier of past lives and you're liable to get yourself into some interesting circumstances if you don't avoid avoiding. Just because the pc has no reality on having lived before is no reason why you should Q-and-A with his unreality, you see? So, I ran a case like this last night. I got a bit of a session myself last night and audited somebody else afterwards. And it was quite amusing to me that I was running a person with no reality on ever having lived before. And the thing I finally wound up with a stuck button on - oh, I cleared off more buttons off this case, you know, just wham, wham. Oh, person was feeling much better. Tone arm was varying, coming on down to where it should be. I think it's been up there consistently now for two or three months - way high, you know, and nobody budging it.

And I was just running what part of their life had they had to be responsible for, and we scared some locks out they'd never even thought of. The final thing was, the pc suddenly said to me - just out of the blue said, "Well, had to be responsible for?" and - "the Church." We cleaned "church" off the whole present lifetime. Had - what part of the church had they had to be responsible for? And boy, they really found they'd had to be responsible for some stuff.

The stuck point there, by the way, was the collection plate. And the pc finally got to line charging on collection plates - I think you can turn on a line charge this way rather easily - and line charged on collection plates like mad and went right off into Druids.

Preclar voluntarily gave me this datum: that as a little girl she had customarily stuck pins in a certain tree on the way to school in order to have luck. And I said, "Well, where did you hear about that as a little girl?"

"Oh, nowhere."

See, trees, Druidism, that sort of thing. So I started asking questions about holy trees. Finally asked them what the Druids used for collection plates. And this question boggled the pc so much that I saw the pc this morning for a very brief period of time - rather had a communication with the pc - and said, "Looked up in the Encyclopaedia Britannica last night all about Druids. Couldn't find anything about Druids. Found Druidism and couldn't find a word of what they said about collection plates." See, here we were already steaming down the line. This person, no reality on past lives, but my casual, brief question concerning Druids and Druidism - ever - asked them, "Have you ever been a Druid? Have you ever been mixed up with the Druids?" so on. And pc merely started to talking about Stonehenge, and all sorts of oddities connected with Druidism - they all stripped off. Everything stripped off except "Druid." Everything we took off Druidism freed the needle, except "Druid." And I wound up with this analysis of the case with "Druid" still stuck and of course that's many centuries ago.

But in the process, pc also volunteered this interesting fact - coming right back to what you said about problems - pc said, "What would I have had to be responsible for? Well, having to be responsible for other people's problems, you know, like an oracle or something, in Greece. And living in a cave and people keep bringing their problems to you and you have to keep solving them. Boy, that would be the most, you know. That's not for me." So, here we've got a - here we've got a track which is probably two, three hundred B.C. See how this track is shaping up. Two or three hundred B.C., maybe sometime after the birth of Christ area, you got Druidism. And in this lifetime we had a tremendous church background, see, on which we had a collection plate the most thoroughly stuck object, and so on. And problems showed up on that chain of having to be responsible for somebody's problems, you see? How would you ask the question? It'd probably be in terms of solutions. You'd say, "Whose problems have you had to solve?"

Male voice: Yeah.

Possibly the best question on that.

By the way, the phenomenon of unwrapping whole track - I might make a little mention of in passing - is first, it's totally unreal and then it gets realer and realer, and there's more and more data shows up on it, more and more fascinating, more and more arduous, more and more bunched, more visible (usually totally collapsed or something, you see) and then pieces start to come off of it and stuck points begin to show up as stuck points.

You know, "What was I doing around sixteen hundred? Sixteen hundred - sixteen hundred; I keep getting this picture of sixteen hundred. I don't know what I was doing around sixteen hundred." You know, and you never talked to the person about it; you never even run "Dead bodies, Help on," or anything else. You can expect this phenomenon to unroll - this phenomena to unroll in any event. So, don't be too balked about it. Just remember that asking for things they've had to be responsible for does pose us the problem, on a person who has no reality on having lived before, with gradually greasing through it.

And the auditor has to furnish the motive by asking related earlier-life questions without ever once hanging the pc with the idea that he lived before.

See, pc says, this example: We said, "Church - church - what part of a church have you had to be responsible for?" You know, and we go on with this and we finally get to the collection plate

and we discover all sorts of weird things, and then a couple of little crimes with regard to the collection plate - taking money out of it, making change in it, that sort of thing. And of course, this is a normal button to freeze on a thing like church because that is the way you really help a church; that is your help of it, see? And so here's this circumstance and as an auditor you simply ask this innocent question of them - the pc says something like, "And I stuck pins in trees," you see. They didn't know it but they gave you a lead-in into something earlier. Some man might say, "Well, as a little boy I kept throwing spears, you know. I always was making spears, and that sort of thing." Auditor could say, in this thing, "Well, what would you think of a soldier, a Roman soldier, a Greek soldier, an Egyptian soldier", you know? And you all of sudden - maybe he gets a tight down on this sort of thing. You've opened the door and you don't have to open the door any more casually than that.

That take it?

Male voice: Thank you.

All right.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, if you clean up a lock, let's say in the year of 500, and you clean up that lock, does that mean that the case is Clear from now-ness to then-ness between himself and the Rock?

No.

Male voice: In other words, you may find other locks in between there.

Oh, yes.

Male voice: Oh, I see.

They don't come off chronologically, unfortunately.

Male voice: I saw that you did, there. That's why I was interested in that. She was sticking pins in a tree, and then pretty soon, back-back-back.

That was me. That was me. I Q-and-A with the truth of the matter, which is he does have an organized time track. As far as what he's going to discover and present you with off this time track, that's another thing. If he has a total unreality on having lived before, his time track back of this life is a mess.

Boy! He might have the most gorgeous time track from birth onward with full recall on how he swore at his father when he was six months old, see? Might be just gorgeous this whole lifetime. And boy, you back up just right back of the Assumption and you find this horrible, garbled, balled-up mess and you'll find the year - a year six billion years ago sitting forward of two lifetimes ago, you see? He's chronologically out of order.

So, if you clean up a lock at 500, don't be surprised to find you have simply succeeded in freeing up a lot of stuff in 1850.

Male voice: Yes. Now, one more question. Would he have locks beyond the Rock and then come forward to the Rock then?

Oh, they unwind.

Male voice: They do?

They unwind. Yeah, you just take care of that. You understand why you run Step 6?

Male voice: To make his mock-ups more solid.

Yeah, but that's to take care - no, it's worse than that - it's to take care of the perfect creation which preceded the chaos. And you put him in a state where he can make a perfect homogenous creation that isn't built out of secondhand, second-rate MEST universe, his own lifetime energy, don't you see? And he starts doing this and you get him - you get him so that he can as-is his later confusions and chaos and so forth. But if you did this with the Rock present, the Rock would simply get more and more solid and kick his teeth out. And he would resist being cleared.

All right. So, this drill of the earlier locks than the Rock - see, the Step 6 - now steps in and picks up this sort of thing.

Male voice: I see.

Got it. All right.

Yes?

Male voice: How about these processes having to do with the compulsions to the buttons? How are they therapeutically?

A plain scout such as you're doing, if it exceeds more than an hour or so - if you're just trying to stick a needle and you're not doing it in any way - you should probably take off on this other tack, because it is therapeutic and you're getting the show on the road with great regularity.

You're really auditing when you're doing that - as much as scouting - and your pc will feel better and feel better and feel better and feel better and life will be more pleasant, more pleasant, more pleasant.

But don't get so involved in making life more pleasant that you cease to look for the Rock! Therefore, you are getting something done with the case. The case will be pleased with the results, and so forth, but you're still looking for the Rock. Get the idea? A plain scout that lasts more than an hour ought to change over into a somewhat therapeutic line such as this one I've given you today.

Somebody over here trying to ask a qu-...

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, I was just going to say, it seems to me this idea of going for these five buttons would be a very direct way of scanning for the Rock. Obviously the Rock is going to be something that the preclear failed to take responsibility for, failed to change, failed to help. It sounds to me like a very direct way of going in and saying, "All right. Well now, tell me what have you failed to take responsibility for?" And that should run you straight back to it.

Oh, it will. It will, every time. The only thing I say is on most people it becomes so confoundedly easy to a good auditor to just spot the thing in the first few minutes of play, that you're wasting time. Get the idea? You can run into this Rock with such a crash.

Male voice: Okay.

Okay.

Yes?

Male voice: Would you get a needle slam running Connectedness.

You could? Could you get a needle what?

Male voice: Yeah, slam, a needle slam.

Oh, yes! Yes, because you'll start to take apart some of this identified bundle. You see, the motto of the Rock is: A=A=A=A=A. Well, what is that but Connectedness?

Male voice: And that would still indicate the needle...

Remember what I told you a long time ago about unwanted association?

Male voice: Right.

Well, add that up now to having to take responsibility for something he's no longer willing to be responsible for. See that?

Male voice: Right.

All right. Now, you start running Connectedness and you've got unwanted association untangling because you're just running association. And you run just pure association, you will start to take apart the Rock chain. Well, naturally, evidently, some part of this chain is going to be capable of turning on this slam, as you call it, which is very good. But boy, it's really a slam.

You'd swear the pc was taking his fingers on and off the cans or something of this sort. Nothing could make a needle jump around like that. And you're moving in toward the thing that he must-be-there-mustn't-be-there, must-be-there-mustn't-be-there. You're getting a yo-yo of such magnitude and such erraticness that you've actually penetrated the pc in the middle of the box.

Now, you can't, unfortunately, as I know of, just simply lift him out of that box because the box is of his own creation and every time you lifted him anyplace else you just lift the box too. So, what you'd start doing then - Connectedness all by itself - theoretically, at Lord knows how many thousand hours, has the power of stripping the whole track and knocking apart and straightening out all associations, you see? But it's the long haul.

Now, does that answer your question?

Male voice: Yes.

All right.

Yes?

Female voice: Right along with what he said there, if the pc - now, this happens, this needle phenomenon, that slamming - do you ask the pc, "Something happen there just now?" "No." Well, my question is, does the pc necessarily know?

He doesn't know anything about the needle slam. Hasn't a clue. I wouldn't ever mention it to him. I would simply spot what I asked just before the needle started slamming.

Female voice: Well, on Connectedness...

On Connectedness, you've lost your clue because it's such a generalized question that there's no clue there.

Female voice: That's when it happened to me.

You bet. All right. It's all right.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, how about if it slammed just at the beginning of the session every time?

Well, you've had it.

Female voice: You know what I mean? You sit down and you're just starting to have a session and it slams and then it sticks and theta bops or something else or whatever.

Sure.

Female voice: But just then, you've got no clue then, nothing to go on.

Evidently the sole use of the slam is to tell you you're somewhere near the Rock. You see?

Female voice: Uh-huh.

And if it turned on before you had a clue what was being asked, it's very easy to steady down the slam or pull him off of the slam; then you'd have to wait for a new slam.

Female voice: It could just be bringing the preclear there, couldn't it? That could be...

Could be. Oh, for sure. Exteriorized from his conversation with his friends into an auditing session, which he's very unwilling to have happen, or something, at that time.

Yes, Jack?

Male voice: Ron, on these cases you're talking about, you know, dispersal, these high-dispersal cases, I - looking them back over now - I see that every one of them has been very confused about every one of those five buttons.

Mm.

Male voice: So, sometimes I think that you might have to - this is a question - mightn't it not be necessary to clear first "invent a person. What's that person's idea of a problem?" before you can even do this, if he's so vague on the whole thing.

Then you could just settle down to running a case - running a case on a high generality of button definitions until you got one that sounded fairly sane and the others appeared flat and then you'd go in for diagnosis and you start wheeling.

By the way, there's a technique which is lower than that which is quite amazing. Let me give you a little brief case history that just happened in the HGC. May I? Fellow was diagnosed for cancer, expected to die. One of the best diagnostic clinics in the United States had diagnosed it as cancer of the lungs, cancer of - I don't know what all, heart, intestines, the works. And he was strictly marble slab bait. And his wife brought him down here and started auditing him. And case very restive; very, very restive. Auditor running rather mild techniques, but nevertheless, case quite restive. And this case was consistently protesting; didn't want to be there, so on.

Auditor was finally auditing a case that was apparently damn near dead, even beginning to smell dead. Case wanted to go to another town where a friend of his was a medical doctor. Got an ambulance plane - busted off the intensive - got an ambulance plane, took him there. Doctor investigated him. An enormous swelling had arisen on the groin during processing, very painful and it was getting worse, but a head was appearing.

Director of Processing, auditor, did not want to see this boy go, because obviously the show was on the road, see? Something was happening with the case, but there was a bit of hysteria involved here, and with the people involved with the case, and off he went.

Arrived at his friend, the doctor's, was diagnosed with no cancer but a severe abdominal abscess, which had even then begun to drain. And the case is now on the mend, very definitely, and getting well, and evidently kicking himself that he didn't complete the intensive, and is going to get straightened out in the hospital there and then come back and get cleared.

Up to this time the person, the patient, was very resistive to Scientology but now had seen something; here a cancer had faded away in an abscess.

The last process which was being run is of interest - the last three hours of processing. This person in extreme duress, in extreme pain; and you talk about lowest buttons. "You make that body lie in that bed." Even that wouldn't work, you know? That wasn't the process.

It was "Invent a person who would be pleased with that condition." This was running. All arrangements were made and the person had - was leaving, and so forth, but this one was running and it was evidently the capper that took the rest of it off the case. Only three or four hours of it.

It's interesting, as a process; it's a cousin to Admiration Processing, but not, not really, because you're not dealing in particles here. You want somebody who was pleased with the condition. Our diagnosis of it's that the preclear was sick because the wife was a practitioner; you know, a way of getting attention from the wife.

Now, there's one which is south of inventing the buttons but we have yet to find somebody who wouldn't run on this definition of the buttons. Anybody evidently runs on this one.

You're not asking them to mock somebody up, but they normally do. And you have them invent somebody and even when they got horrible fields and that sort of thing. "Invent somebody. Tell me that person's idea of help," or "Tell me that person's idea of change," or something of this sort. So we have a brace there But underneath all of that, somebody who would be pleased with the situation is evidently the last rung of the case.

Male voice: Yeah.

Yeah, that's way down south. So ARC in some form goes all the way to the bottom of a case. Interesting datum, isn't it? Yes?

Female voice: This last period you've been - you mentioned about "Invent a person who could be pleased with that condition." How about using that as an assist for somebody coming with a chronic somatic and you haven't any intensive set up or anything. Would that be a good way to pinpoint it?

Sure. It's an awful dirty way to get rid of the service fac. Wonderful way to get rid of the service fac. Service fac's too much in your road; you make the person - condition or situation - you make the person explain this present time situation.

Let's take this fellow who is constantly in trouble with his wife and can't be audited because he's always got nothing but PT problems but can't run any PT problems, and you get this. This obviously is a service fac. After a while, after a few weeks, anybody would begin to suspect this.

And so, what do we have here, Maida? We have somebody who has to continue to define the situation. We'd have to have him continue to define the situation and ask him to invent a person who would be pleased with it. And we would kill the service fac deader than a mackerel. So your suggestion that that's a good one to run on his chronic somatic is - that's possibly not the best.

Certainly service fac. Chronic somatic will very often turn out to be an auditable part of the Rock - will very often; often enough so that you should look at it.

Female voice: I was thinking more in terms of a problem that kept being presented and not resolved and obviously wasn't too important. It was like, you know, taking you away from the important thing and I couldn't find a good terminal for it. This would make - invent a person to be the terminal and you could get rid of the condition.

That's right. That's right. Slick way of getting around the thing.

Yes?

Female voice: Would that apply to a body, to a whole body?

Well.

Female voice: I mean, could you use the body?

I think the exact auditing command that was used there, as cleared with the fellow: "Invent a person who would be pleased with your condition." Now, that is even broader than the body, see? But "Invent a person who would be pleased with that body" would be likely to be very aimless because in the first place, it would pin him down, pin the pc down into this lifetime, would not permit him to stray. "Invent a person that would be pleased with a body" might be more workable, but nevertheless is, you would find I'm afraid, quite indefinite.

Female voice: Okay. Then would you use "The condition that body is in?"

"With your condition is.

Female voice: "With your condition..."

Yes, "With your condition."

Female voice: inclusive enough.

Oh, yes.

Female voice: All right.

Now this is not, by the way, one of these things that clears a case forever and aye and all of that sort of thing.

Female voice: No, but couldn't it be an entrance into an un-enterable case?

Oh, yes.

Female voice: Okay.

Yes. It's - this case that is apparently not going anywhere and nothing's happening on, and he's taking great pride in it, and that sort of thing, why, boy, this is a killer. This is sort of a last resort sort of process that an auditor would audit. You know, he's had the case in process now for seven hours and nothing is happening. I consider that to be a long time to have somebody in process with nothing happening, see? Seven hours. Time to throw something at him. Shake him up. Do something to him. And this will do things to them. Make them quite cheerful. And throw them in ARC.

Male voice: On succumb.

On succumb, yeah. Very good.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, using this process we were just talking about, mocking up, I - does it make any difference at all whether you get a body part or the condition in this case? Would it be better to have the body part?

Well, it is better to have the body part for this reason: You have a definite terminal. And it's always better to run terminals than conditions.

Now, the old thing, the old rule is: Run terminals, don't run conditions. Don't run significances, run terminals. That's an old, old rule. Well, the way you get around this rule is to add a terminal to the process. Now, it could be a present life walls and bric-a-brac terminal. You could add to the process a mock-up, you see? You could add to the process a lot of things. But if you've got two terminals operative, it is even better.

Oddly enough, we've gone into a period here of processes which operate both on terminals and conditions. Help will run on conditions. But because there's some liability on running in conditions and has been in all prior processes, we still steer clear of it if we can. And just as you say, a body part would be superior to the condition, providing you generalized the body part and providing it was obviously in a bad condition, see? You get the idea? Right. And if you can't isolate that, "your condition" is safe enough. All right.

Male voice: Isn't it possible for a thetan to continue a condition down through the track through many kinds of terminals?

Oh, yes.

Male voice: That's why this process you named might be more workable.

It might be, yes. In view of the fact it isn't a keystone process to clearing, why, the thing becomes merely a speculative exercise and an excellent way of assisting somebody.

You ask somebody who has just had an automobile accident to invent somebody who would be pleased with that accident and you're liable to get a total boggle, you know? Nobody in the world would ever be pleased with the accident. And then all of a sudden come up with a total automaticity. The insurance people, if they didn't have accidents, why, they wouldn't ever sell any insurance. And people, people, people, people - cops wouldn't have a job and repairmen wouldn't have repair shops and so on. There'd just be people all over the place pleased with that accident and eventually it may come down to the fact that he had the accident because it would please somebody.

Male voice: Would that more often be a common denominator for the service fac?

Yes. Yes. Oh, the service fac has always been very pleasing to everybody. Nothing like having a person totally with one foot in the grave to please nearly everybody. You ask, "What would be the optimum condition for a child from the viewpoint of your mother and father?" Clumsy question but I just want to get the meaning in there, see? And most people will tell you that a good child is a sick child. That's a good child. What is being good? Being sick.

I found out what my kids think is being good, now. I know what being good is. The moral structure of my daughter is very well taken care of now. You eat all of your dinner. That's the total definition. If you're a good girl you've eaten all of your dinner.

Yes, Ray?

Male voice: In running a bracket, how can you tell if you're making a mistake in having the comm bridge too long or too short? What harm can be done if the comm bridge is short but the ARC is high?

Well, now, let me understand this clearly. You're not putting a comm bridge between each command of a bracket as you run one command to the next, are you?

Male voices: We have been.

Male voice: We've been instructed...

All right.

Male voice:... instructed that we did.

That's all right. That's good practice in comm bridges but it's damn slow auditing.

Now, the best thing to do on clearing a command if you're auditing for blood - and you can do this from here on - the best thing to do is to clear the whole bracket as one command and take each word in it - as I told you some days ago - clear each word in it and straighten that all out and then just run it, because a comm bridge gets horribly in somebody's road after a little while.

Remember, auditing is what you can get away with. And the test of this is can you get away with it? And the answer is: usually.

Okay, Ray?

Male voice: Thank you.

You bet.

Yes?

Male voice: Is it all right to use these processes that you give us in the auditing here? Is that - I just wanted to clear this?

No. Not an off-beat process like "Who would be pleased with that condition?" and so forth. Because these will take you astray. There is nobody here so bad off or so sick that you would have to go that far south. But you have already been given clearing up definitions with "Invent a person," and "What is his idea of?"

Male voice: We can use that?

So, that's totally usable.

Male voice: That's what I wanted to know.

All right. Now, that was given to you days ago.

Male voice: Yeah.

And this other analysis-type process whereby you find what he has had to be responsible for, had to change, you know, had to create, that sort of a thing - that is very definitely standard diagnosis.

Male voice: Okay. Thanks a lot, Ron.

Okay I let you go for a little while here on a scout, on just a plain scout, so as not to get you too entangled because, you see, what I've just given you is more complicated. I've let you go on just an ordinary, routine, run-of-the-mill scout so that you'd know how to do it, because that is easily the fastest way - if it does require considerable skill - it's the fastest way to find the Rock and sail right on down the line.

There's another question you're going to ask me.

Female voice: How about when you are running Help and some of the brackets are pretty free, is it all right to.

You'd omit it - you can omit a totally free bracket. You can cut your brackets down, down, down as you go if you want to.

Male voice: You mean omit the leg of it.

Hm?

Male voice: You mean omit the legs.

Yeah, just omit that leg, see? Omit that part of the bracket.

You keep saying, "How could another person help you?" and you've never gotten anything but a free needle on it.

Female voice: Yes.

Well, boy, you're wasting your time.

Female voice: Oh, you don't run that.

Well, just omit it. It's quite normal to take a nine-way bracket and drop it down to a five.

Yes?

Female voice: Would you clarify just when is the best time to leave a PT problem?

When it's flat. When the person no longer...

Female voice: When is it flat?

.. no longer wishes to do anything about it. That has an old definition.

Female voice: You said the other day when it no longer bops, and that's a different definition from the other.

Yes, I'm afraid that the same definition applies. The E-Meter does register real life. When a PT problem no longer bops, the person is no longer anxious to do something about it.

Female voice: I see.

Got it? They're the same statement except one is given in the reference to the meter; the other is given in a reference to the preclear's thinkingness.

If you want to know from choice, I always choose the preclear's thinkingness.

Female voice: Good.

Yeah, I ask him, “Well, what would you like to do about that now - this problem of your wife running off with the chauffeur,” and so forth. And the pc says, “Well, let them go (sigh).” Still infers he’d like to do something about it. Funny part of it is, it’ll still bop. See, it’ll still drop on the meter. Then finally he says, “Well, I don’t know, it’ll work itself out one way or the other. If she was the kind of girl who would run off with the chauffeur, she’s the kind of girl who would run off with the chauffeur. Let’s get on with the session.

Don’t be startled if a PT problem of apparently that magnitude did flatten out that well. Everybody would say, “Well, he must be nuts. He’s not going to run off the chauffeur and shoot him and he’s not going to strangle his wife and he must be crazy, you know. He’s not normal.”

Yes, Jay?

Male voice: On this PT problem, if the needle shows a large drop but whenever the pc starts to talk about it, it is free, he’s not telling you what his PT problem is and putting it into words.

I don’t pay any attention to needle drops anymore that go free and are there and aren’t there and are there and aren’t there. I find something that’ll drop consistently, because the person’s doing a dispersal. And that’s a dispersal process and if you did start auditing him on it, he’d just disperse off of it anyway. So, I’d find some slicker method of sliding in there.

Male voice: Could I have a little question?

Yes.

Male voice: You were speaking in your lecture about a needle that was very wild. I think you were referring to it as a slamming needle.

Yeah.

Male voice: You said that was a very hot indication of you being near the Rock?

Yeah, you’ve gotten somewhere near the Rock when you start getting needle slams.

Male voice: Then you’d have to run into this...

It won’t tell you another thing.

Male voice: It won’t?

No, don’t count it for anything. That’s all it’ll tell you. Because you can right then find some part of the Rock and steady it right down to whop. And that’s what you’re trying to do. It’s something like an indicator, but it’s not very diagnostic. It just tells you you’re somewhere near the Rock. The subject on which you are now involved is wrapped up in the Rock chain, that’s for sure. And you didn’t get a needle slam on women, you didn’t get a needle slam on men, you didn’t get a needle slam on airplanes and you didn’t get a needle slam on God, and all of a sudden there you are running “banks,” financial banks, and the needle starts slamming. Heh-heh-heh-heh. Let’s go from there.

Yes?

Female voice: Then you’re just looking for a stuck needle there?

That’s all you’re doing. That’s all you’re doing, looking for a stuck needle. Much more important. I haven’t got another instant. We have run way out of time here.

[End of lecture.]