

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: ENDING AN INTENSIVE

A lecture given on
8 June 1961

Thank you.

All right. You haven't . . let's see. What is this? This is the 8th of June 1961, solar system. Have to keep you oriented.

You haven't had any opportunity to ask any questions the last couple of lectures. I have simply decided what you didn't know anything about and filled you in. So now I want some questions. Of course, it's kind of cowardly asking you for questions in the first place because this assumes that I don't know what you're fogged up on. Yes?

Female voice: Exactly how and when the Havingness and Confront commands, and where, are fitted into a run on SOP Goals. Just where they go in relation to running the level?

When do Havingness-or where do Havingness and Confront commands get fitted into SOP Goals. Actually, I'll answer it for all sessions.

Female voice: Yeah.

If you have the pc's Havingness and Confront commands, you start the session with them after the rudiments and end the session with them when this room situation goes . . when you ask about the auditing environment. The point there is you run them backwards at the end. You run the Confront and then you run the Have. You just run them at the beginning . . Have-Confront . . that is after the beginning rudiments . . and at the end rudiments you run them Confront and then Have. This actually is quite mechanical.

You can take these two processes and throw the guy into his bank. See, you bring him into the room and then throw him into his bank. Just look at it that way, you see? He comes into the auditing room, and you say, "Is all right if I audit you in this room?" you know. You say something like this and he says, "All right." And you say, "All right." Far as you're concerned it's all right, but you haven't got him in the room yet.

Now, if you've got his Havingness and Confront, you move this over into his first process. In other words, you bypass the rudiments. You ask him if it's all right to audit in this room, and we don't care what he says. If you're going to run his Havingness and Confront Process the first thing you do-what does it matter whether it's all right to audit in the room or not? You're going to straighten this up shortly anyhow. Well, why isn't it all right to audit in the room? Well, he probably has a PT problem and ARC break and a withhold. That's why it's not all right to audit in the room. So who cares! It's there in the rudiments mostly to call attention to the fact that there is an auditing room, which might have been missed by the pc. you get the idea?

All right. So that's not anything that you handle, although there is a process given to handle it. But that process assumes . . TR 10 in a Model Session . . that you don't have the pc's Havingness and Confront Processes. So, you say, "Is it all right to audit in this room." And it goes wha-a-a-am, crash! And you say, "Fine," and go right on to your next rudiment. Don't use that as an excuse to waste auditing time. you got the idea? There's no point in it if you've got his Havingness Process.

All right. Now, let's finish up the rudiments. And our first process is now going to be a Have Process, and of course that nnumpp was mainly an ARC break, PT problem and withhold or one of them. So you've taken care of that now. Now you can bring him here. See, a present time problem has got him out there somewhere. So you can knock that out, of course, he's more here, isn't he?

So you run your rudiments and then you saw into the Have and Confront Processes immediately after the rudiments. Your Have first, and then your Confront. Well, you've handled his PT problem, his withhold and his ARC break and so forth, so therefore, he's more willing to be in session. You run the Havingness Process, and of course he tends to leave where he has been and arrive where he is at. And now you run the Confront, and you say . . . you're saying just the same as, "Just between you and me, I think you ought to take a look at your bank. It is time you ceased to avoid all this. It's a question of how can a thetan live in this much mush?" You got the idea?

So you say, "Well, let's now take a look at your bank. Let's take a look at your case." you could say this, you see, very splendiferously. Theoretically you could do that. you could . . . you say, "Well, here you are in the room." And you've straightened it up so the guy can be audited, and "Here you are in the room. And now, what do you think about your case?" See? Well, instead of saying, "Well, what do you think about your case?" you run a Confront Process.

All right. Confront Processes cycle. They go out of PT and into PT. So if you are very clever, you will run just one cycle. Out of PT and into PT. See? If you're very clever. Out he goes and back he comes. You say, "Look. It is safe to leave present time in this room. (1) The room is safe. We've just run Havingness on it; and (2) we are now demonstrating to you, that it is very safe for you to slide down the track a little bit. And when you come back, you'll still find the room here." What do you know!

You're saying that in essence then when you're running the Confront Process.

So, all of the processes today . . . all Security Checks, all everything . . . when, if in doubt about how to say "good morning" to the preclear, say it in Model Session. Use Model Session for everything that pertains to auditing. This does not apply to a Johannesburg Security Check given for purposes of security only. There you don't even bother to clear the commands. You try to clear the commands, and if you don't clear the command, you look at the fellow and say, "Well now, listen. If I have to leave this one with it still falling off the pin, you realize you've failed a Security Check. Are you sure there is nothing you wish to tell me?"

He thinks this over for a minute and he says, "Well, maybe I'd better tell him about the bank robbery, you know? The illicit diamond buying" And so he sometimes gives up like that. But you wouldn't work day and night, on and on and on and on and on to clear somebody's Security Check, you see, if it were to be given for an employment Security Check.

In the first place, somebody whose Security Check is so bad that, particularly on the subject . . . The original question, by the way, "Have you ever cooked a company's books?" It sounded just a little bit slangy to me. It out created me on the subject. "Have you ever cooked a company's books?" And you now have that under the heading of "falsified," I think it is. And you strike that one, you see, while you're security checking somebody for employment, and it goes clang! And what do you want to clear it for? You wouldn't have the guy on a bet!

All right. So we finally find out, well, he only falsified them a little bit. He's just been entering everything into the petty cash column and sticking it in his pocket, or he's been doing something innocent here that should never be reprehended anyhow. When you're security checking as a Security Check . . . just en passant here . . . you must know what a meter's talking about.

It takes a good auditor to do Security Checking. You can't teach somebody in ten minutes how to do a Security Check and then trust any result he gets. Because what's he do? He gets somebody on the meter, and there's no . . . there's no meter responses of any kind whatsoever . . . you know that the person is totally irresponsible anyway. Dead thetan reading properly at the Clear read. And it all says, "There. That's all right with that." He asks all the way through the Security Check rapidly. He gets no reaction of any kind whatsoever, so he says the person's secure. The person just got out of Dartmoor Scrubs, you know . . . just that day!

So you have to know something about pcs and a meter in order to size up the person, and if they're not getting any reactions anyplace on a Johannesburg Security Check . . . you know this is impossible anyway . . . your auditing experience. But you don't run that in Model Session, and you finish the check

in any event. No matter who you're running it on, you always finish the check, but you don't necessarily spend four hours clearing up one level. You just want to know if he's hotter than a pistol on these various levels.

And one of the ways to do it is go right on through the check, whammity-whammity-whammity-whammity-wham, getting all the withholds that he gives you as you go by. And then you've marked several that didn't null, and go back over these and ask searchingly about them . . something on the polite nonauditing attitude of "Well, you realize that if these levels retain withholds, as they apparently do. and you have not told me all, which you obviously haven't, that if you fail to do so, that is it; you have failed a Security Check and will be rated here as an insecure person. Now do you want to tell me about it?"

And the fellow says, "Well, the meter must be wrong and so forth, and so forth."

You say, "Okay. You've had it." Reach down to the bottom of the page and say, "Failed check, such-and-such a date. Unemployable." That's it. Don't monkey with it.

That's not true in auditing, you see. You run that in Model Session and you get those questions just as clean as wolf's teeth. You see, there's a tremendous difference between giving a processing check and a Security Check, even though you're using the same list of questions. Now, you just take those things apart. So in . . en passant, I mentioned that.

All right. Havingness and Confront is run after beginning rudiments in the order of the Have and then the Confront, and before end rudiments in the order of the Confront and the Have. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you.

Right. Any other question?

Female voice: Yes.

Yes.

Female voice: You've told us this before, but it hasn't sunk in and I'd like for you to tell us again.

Okay.

Female voice: If you're got something which has been restimulated by the questions in a Security Check, but it doesn't seem to be on the first ones, would you go on through and then check back on them afterwards?

Not in processing.

Female voice: No.

In doing a Security Check for employment or loyalty or something of this sort, some other purpose, yes, you would do it as you said it, but not for processing. You do not leave a falling level behind you. Leave nothing falling behind you. That's pretty hard to do. you very often get them falling on later things and in the panic about withhold. But remember, if it's been carefully given in Model Session, you will have the opportunity to ask the pc if he's withholding anything in the Model Session. And the reason you've got withhold in there at beginning and end rudiments, is because you get two cracks at the pc every session.

So, if a question were hanging up in that particular fashion and you couldn't seem to get anything out of the pc or get it clear, you might suspect, because of the sporadic reaction of the needle . . if it's not on the button, you see, it doesn't act constantly, it acts sporadically. That means you're near something, but you're not on it. It falls and it theta bops and it rock slams, and then it goes null, and it falls and then it goes null, and then it rock slams and . . you're just not asking the right question, that's all.

And if you were to get . . I didn't say that you should get baffled at this point, but if you were to get baffled, you know, about the whole thing, a good thing to do is take a break. Well, you'd take a break by ending your session, wouldn't you?

So that gives you a crack at the withholds, doesn't it? And then you take a three-minute break. And then you start a new session. And this gives you another crack at the pc's withholds when you're clearing that rudiment, you see. And this time, you'd clear the rudiments, real hard; the end rudiment and the new beginning rudiment. And by the time you got back to the question again, you've probably gotten the withhold that he kept ticking or tacking on, and that question now will probably be free. And that is the . . really the right way to handle it. I'm sure you can see the sense of that.

And the other point to make here is your pc, if he's doing this, is probably having trouble. And there's another co-related factor of this. If a pc is having trouble, his attention span is poor. If his attention span is poor, the best remedy for that is short-sessioning, which in itself is a technique. If you were to take a pc who was having a lot of trouble and you were to begin a session and run TR 10 as the sole body of the session . . just ten minutes of it, you see . . and then run end rudiments and end the session, and then begin a session and run some more TR 10 and end rudiments; you would oddly enough get a lot of cases with formal auditing that are really CCH cases. So it's well worth knowing how to do that. So it is not a waste of time to do that. It is beneficial to do that. And I'd recommend that if you are having an awful lot of trouble giving a processing check, that you also add in this thing called short-sessioning. You could go at it like this: a session per question if he was having too hard a time. Then you'd sure get it every time, but that would be the extremity, the *reductio ad absurdum*. Okay? That answer your question?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Any other question? Yes, Reg.

Male voice: On the assessing for goals, we have the goal, the terminal and the level fine, and you tell us that they each . . reaction should be the same for each . . rock slam, rock slam, rock slam, throughout.

Mm-hm.

Male voice: Now, if on the Primary Scale you get your same reaction, is it then necessary to go on to the Secondary Scale?

No. This is a matter of judgment.

Male voice: Mm-hm.

Let me clear up . . clarify up some things like this. This is the same reaction on the goal, the same reaction on the terminal, the same reaction on the Primary; now would you go over into the Secondary Scale? Would it really be necessary to assess the Secondary Scale? Well, we've gotten here our first question that tells us actually a Secondary Scale at this stage is too complex. There actually will one of these days be a tertiary scale. And rather than spend the next two months keeping you from having something resembling a complete scale, I relegated my final sort-out to after the first publication. So therefore, at this stage of the game, you find the Secondary Scale rather clumsy. There won't be anywhere near as many words as that on your present Secondary Scale when I finally get them all sorted. You see? A lot of those words will be over on the tertiary scale. So your question, then in the future will also apply to if you find it on the Primary Scale, is it any reason to go on to the Secondary Scale, if you find the same reaction. All right.

It would also apply then-well, if you found the same reaction on the Secondary Scale, would there be any reason to go over into the tertiary scale? You get the idea? So the question would be-could be broadened to include the whole future formation of the Prehav Scale. And I'll answer it in that particular fashion.

I myself had wonderful luck with the original issue, and the only ones that I missed, aren't now on the Primary Scale except under "motion" and "misemotion." The emotional states of pcs are missing on the Primary Scale. So what I would do . . . what I would do-would be to take certain selected levels as necessary levels. If somebody has an original Prehav Scale, I will read you what those levels are, and I would say that if they fell on these levels, go to the Secondary Scale as a necessity, and if they don't fall on these levels, take it. See, I can give you a qualified answer because it's a matter of judgment. I'm not trying to be complicated with you.

Now, any level here that was on the original scale, if that fell as much as the terminal . . . good, heavy reaction-I would go ahead and run it. And I wouldn't much bother with going over into the Secondary Scale. But those levels here which really weren't on the original, it would be safest to assess them again over on the Secondary Scale, even though they fell as hard as the terminal, for the excellent reason that they are too pervasive, with this odd exception: overts. Overts.

Now, you've got an overt situation, that if you get the general form "overt" falling as hard as the terminal, nothing has been told you except the person has an attitude. And you can go ahead and run, "What have you done to", and "What have you withheld from?" but you've already substituted an auditing command for this word overt, or you've done one substitution. So you for sure had better find out what kind of an overt. And the overt is the longest list.

Apparently the English language has specialized in ways and means of "averting" and for that reason, pcs have enormously odd categories for these types of overts. And from one pc, when they fall on the word overt, this means, refraining to think an unkind thought about them so as to put them right, or something very complicated. And to another pc, it means hitting them over the head with a brickbat. And that is the only overt there is. you get the idea? And this is peculiar to the whole list of overts. Each pc has a different type of overt that he considers an overt.

So it's such a matter for judgment that I for sure would move over into the overt list even though overt fell like mad. I wouldn't then just automatically run "do," because you've already done one substitution. What kind of a do? Let's find out, because it will fall on overt, but what does he classify as an overt? That is singular, the way that stands out. So you'd say, well, if you fall on overt, assess the Secondary Scale. That one for sure.

Now, looking over the rest of these levels, there are two more, which if they fell, would leave you with no recourse but to do the whole Secondary Scale, and you sure better had. And that's "emotional" and "misemotional." You better find out what is misemotion. Is it standing woodenly or is it screaming at the top of his voice or what? So again it requires the secondary list to qualify the term.

Let me forget what I said there at first. I can give you a good test. I just thought of one here. Any time you yourself would have to make a wild substitution for the level, assess the Secondary Scale. That would be the rule. Yeah. Any time you'd have to make a wild substitution to find out what it was all about, well just move into the Secondary Scale and you won't be guessing. Then you'd be safe. But if that is not the case, you can run any other of these levels. Let me say it that way. If that's not the case, you can run any others.

Now let me give you one further piece of data on that that is interesting. And that is, the goal fell a certain consistent amount or reacted a certain amount. The terminal then in its turn fell or reacted a certain amount. All right. That terminal is going to remain falling that amount, but when you check it back against the goal, you're checking it back as to how much the goal now falls. And this is not . . . not what's meant. It's how much did the goal fall? Because the second his attention comes off of the significance of goal and onto the solidity of terminal, you get a change on the goal's reaction. Your goal's reaction on your Assessment Sheets must be noted very precisely as to how many divisions of rock slam . . . put it down in inches if you're not sure, in some guesstimate of inches. How much theta bop? How consistent? How much fall? How consistent? You put that down about your goal because you're now going to lose it. And you're not going to see that reaction on the goal until you've got a terminal cleared off of it.

Now you may be able to go back and find a lot of reaction on the goal again. And you might not be able to. So let me clarify that, just as long as it's part of this clarification. Yes, the terminal must fall as much as the goal; the level must fall as much as the terminal. But the terminal and the level alone can be measured against each other. You can't measure all in one breath, the goal, the terminal, the level. You can't say, "to pick gooseberries," "General MacArthur," and "failed withhold," and compare them one against the other. You couldn't do an operating condition of this character in auditing because "to pick gooseberries" is lost back in the limbo someplace, you see, and you'd have to get that one from your notes. Now is the terminal falling as much as you found the goal falling in your notes? Because this goal is now only falling in your notes. It's not falling on the pc this much. It still will react, but not as much. So checking your terminal against the level can be done however, directly.

You say "General MacArthur, failed withhold, General MacArthur, failed withhold, General MacArthur, failed withhold." You wouldn't do that, but I say you could do that, and you'd get the same reaction for General MacArthur as the right level. And that would be the only test.

But if anything leaves you in doubt . . . just to answer your direct question . . . if anything leaves you in doubt as to what auditing command to shove into this, on this primary list here, there are several here. Inverted Communication. You get this awful fall on Inverted Communication, you see. Well, what's Inverted Communication? Of course, one of the phrases that you can use for it is "intend not . . . to not communicate." But nevertheless this . . . could be other inverted communications, peculiar communications. "Communication on a via" is also a peculiar communication. You could ask, "Would you communicate to a cat on a via?" And the terminal's a cat, you know. And you get an awful fall on this thing. Well, maybe you could run it directly. "Communicate to a cat on a via." But you've got an Inverted Communication Secondary Scale that clarifies the whole thing for you. So it has a practical use as well as a pedantic one. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. Thank you.

Okay. Any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: Well, it's still the query on the Havingness and Confront. Originally the thing on Havingness and Confront was you assessed for them after the first terminal was flying.

Yes?

Female voice: Now I know of three cases, you know, that had them added in . . .

Yeah.

Female voice: . . . while on their first terminal. When you . . . just at what point, now, on running SOP Goals, do we look for the Havingness and Confront?

That isn't the question you asked. If that's the question you mean . . .

Female voice: Well, that's the one I intend to ask. That's the one I intend to ask.

All right. All right. Okay.

Female voice: When?

You ask when to run them.

Female voice: When to assess one and start including them in their sessions as a regular part of auditing SOP Goals?

All right. All right. I will also answer that. Answered it yesterday.

Female voice: Yeah.

How many parts or stages or stops or pause points are there in Routines 1, 2 and 3?

Female voice: Well, one at the end of beginning rudiments.

No, ma'am.

Female voice: Oh, yeah.

Now you track with me.

Female voice: You mean the other separate rudiment. Yeah, yeah.

If you're going to insist this exact question be answered, you track on this one now. Take a look at it now.

Female voice: All right. Yeah.

How many places in the process of intensives . . .

Female voice: Yeah.

. . . would be pause points . . where you could use your power of choice on what you were supposed to do to the pc . . are there, in Routines 1, 2 and 3 consecutively?

Female voice: As you finish each section of the Routine there's certainly a pause point.

No. Every . . ah, yes. As you finish each and every section, any level, any Security Check, any CCH step, any anything . . .

Female voice: Yeah.

. . . Have and Confront can be located.

Female voice: All right.

There's no point in being pedantic about something it'd be stupid to be pedantic about. You can find them anywhere, anytime, as long as you've got done what you were doing.

Female voice: All right.

So you do a case assessment, you can find the pc's havingness and confront.

Female voice: In other words there's no particularly optimum time to start using. . . ?

Oh, yes. Well now, that's a different question.

Female voice: Yeah.

Ah, but that's a different question.

Female voice: All right.

You've asked me can. All right.

Now, you write down his name, rank and serial number and finish off with how many of his parents deserted how many of his grandparents or whatever, see? And you've got that all taped, you could turn right in, find his Havingness and Confront Process. You could do this case assessment, and you could

find his Havingness Process. Then you could go ahead and run a Joburg Security Check and find his Confront Process. Oddly enough, you could find his Confront Process . . . and now we're getting unoptimum . . . immediately after you did this check, without damaging the pc in the least, or you could do it when he was totally finished with Routine 1. Wait until then to find his Confront. You could find his Havingness Process, actually, at the time he flattened his first terminal on SOP Goals running. By that time, you've got to have it.

Female voice: Ah. All right.

And that happens to be just about your last hung dog. Going from there on without finding the Havingness and Confront Processes is expensive in auditing time, because the pc never gets a chance to orient his bank or orient himself in the physical universe as he is running. So therefore, a great deal of auditing time is devoured from that point on, if his havingness and confront are not present.

Less auditing time is devoured proportionately to your being . . . toward the beginning of his auditing. The closer you are to the beginning of the auditing, the less auditing time is at stake.

For instance, you find that immediately after your case assessment, you're wasting time. So when we get that close to the beginning we're becoming silly, because one Joburg is going to change his Have and going to change his Confront. So you found them for what purpose? For their use in one session, two sessions, three sessions. Now you're going to have to find another Havingness and Confront Process. And you're also liable to get all balled up on "Well, let's see, his needle keeps tightening and the tone arm keeps going stiff here on his confront and I don't know what this is all about. It's just getting awfully confusing. I guess the pc is confused." No, he's changing!

And you are going to have a harder time finding the havingness and confront the earlier you find them in a pc's intensives, not sessions. The earlier you look for them, the harder time you're going to have finding the Havingness and Confront Processes. And the more time you're going to use doing it and the less use they will be to the pc because they're going to change anyhow. So you can get silly about this. See, it ceases to be just precautionary, and it becomes simply a flagrant waste of auditing time.

All right. Now let's move in to the CCHs. Let's say that this pc was going to be scraped all the way off the bottom. All right. All the way up the line. All the way through all routines. Got the idea?

All right. During the CCHs, locating his havingness and confront is of no benefit of any kind because you are not running in Model Session. You're running CCHs. So when are you going to use the Havingness and Confront? So once more you don't need the Havingness and Confront, but it would be perfectly all right to assess for them and get them. You got the idea?

All right. Now we get up to a point of where they become useful. They are now useful. And that would have to do with your general runs and Joburgs, you see. That would be useful.

Now, in view of the fact that you're going to run Joburgs along with the CCHs, you nevertheless haven't got too many sessions going there, so it . . . and your Joburg and the Havin - and the CCHs are going to change the case a lot. And you're going to have to find new Havingness and Confront Process. So you can just go on a treadmill of wasting auditing time by finding Havingness and Confront Processes practically any time through Routine 1. You can just mark that right down in the book. That's practically a waste of time, because the case is going to change all over the place, and you're going to have to find a new one every time you turn around. So the pc's havingness runs down, so he's uncomfortable; well, he's been uncomfortable for a couple of hundred trillion years. Well, it won't hurt him to be uncomfortable a little while longer. In terms of auditing time, it's rather wasted to try to find Havingness and Confront Processes during the CCH and Joburgs that make up Routine 1.

All right. General Prehav runs and Joburgs at that level: Ah! Now we're getting somewhere. But the first run flattened is sort of the pc getting used to what's going on and getting his feet under him. He's already grasping too much! You know, "What's this? I . . . I my . . . all . . . all my life... Goodness gracious, could this be true? Uh, hauh! I uh . . ." You know? He's terribly interested. It's . . . these levels are

running at absolute obsessive interest, you know, practically, because you've got him of course, right where he lives.

All right. Let's say, "Well, let's stop being interested, pc, and let's stop talking about all the things you're trying to tell me about, and let's throw all this away because it's not much importance to me. Ha-ha, ha-ha, ha-ha. And we're going to find your Havingness and Confront Process. We've got lots of time to waste here. You've bought two hundred hours." Well, that's just about how it would sound to the pc.

All right. But let's get that first level flat. And let's get that good and flat, and let's get our first Joburg done at Routine 2. Let's get our first Joburg done, and let's get another level run and flat. Now the pc feels like he can breathe. And right about then it becomes economical to run your Havingness and Confront Processes. And it's economical, and continues to be economical right up to the point where it ceases to be adjudicative and becomes an absolute, utter necessity. And that's in Routine 3, first level run on the pc's goal terminal. And if you haven't found the Havingness and Confront by that time, your pc is now going to start to run very slowly, and you're going to wonder why.

Now, that's the whole story. So, possible? . . . anytime. Optimum? . . . sometime in the middle of Routine 2. Oh, I'd say in any time during the first third of the totality of Routine 2, it's kind of wasteful. But after that it becomes quite economical, to find them. Now you're saving auditing time.

And during the CCHs, oh man, are you wasting auditing time. But you can find them. And it's perfectly okay, and the pc will tell you he feels marvelous and isn't it a good thing, and his havingness is way down, and you've just set him up so that he can come into every session, and he's learned a new trick now. He hasn't got anything to think about. You're running the CCHs, see. He's learned this new trick: "My havingness is way down. How do people act? Let's see. It says in the textbook here. How do people act when their havingness is down?" See, it's a new trick. Then he'll say, "Oh, gee, I've just found out there are a whole bunch of things I can't confront." This is a big cognition. So he obsessively wants to try to confront them. See, you're starting to get a process in the road of your processing. And the pc's interest becomes unduly absorbed any time during Routine 1 with Havingness and Confront. That's all there is to it. Of course, I'm talking about a raw meat pc running in right from the beginning.

That fairly clean, clear and cool and collected? Well, I'm glad I finally answered your question.

Female voice: Thank you very much.

All right. Any other questions? Okay. What day is today?

Female voice: June 8th.

Yeah, I know it's the 8th but what day is it? This is Thursday. Let's see. I'd better talk to you something about leveling off a case, in just a few minutes. I'll just give you a few minutes of "how do you level off a case." This would be true in an HGC. It'd be true in your private auditing, and so forth. A case is not going to get any processing for a while. What do you do?

It is sequitur to exactly what we've been talking about with Have and Confront Processes, so I might as well add it in here. It is not just unkind, it is stupid, not to end an intensive. Just as you would think it was stupid to fail to end a session. Similarly, it is very dull not to end an intensive.

Well, an intensive of a twenty-five hours is relatively uneconomical. But it nevertheless has to be ended. I mean it's uneconomical to get twenty-five hours of auditing. Now, a person just gets off the launching pad, and he's just going over the end of the runway lights, and the control tower says it's time to whipstall. That's about what it sounds like, too. you see, the guy has just taken off, you know, and he just gets the idea that he might go someplace, and he whipstalls.

Fifty hours, that's fairly economical. He gets a chance to go someplace. All pcs could be compared to the frog who climbs out of the well at the rate of three inches up in the daytime and falling back two every night. But this is proportionate. The deeper he is in the well and the earlier he is in auditing, the

more gain he makes up in the daytime and the further he falls at night. And so when we say, ending an intensive, it is better to cleanly and properly end even a twenty-five-hour intensive. It is better to do that than to say, "Well, it's a waste of auditing time," because he'll feel better for it if you do end it right. Fifty hours: it's economical to end them, because you practically stabilize the person's gains. You bring him out of the woods and so on.

You end an intensive depending to a large degree on what has been run during the intensive . . what has been run during the intensive. And you would end the Routine 1 differently than you would end Routines 2 and 3. Two and 3 could be ended almost exactly in the same way.

Let me say what would be an optimum twenty-five-hour intensive even though it's uneconomical: A Joburg complete; one CCH flat. If you haven't accomplished those in the twenty-five hours, be rough, you see.

All right. How would you end this intensive? Well, you'd better end this intensive by making sure both of those are ended. The one CCH which you got flat, let's make sure that that's flat. And let's make sure that Joburg is now standing up and saying okay. And that's how you'd end the intensive. Got the idea? I mean, you do no more than just check over these two items. Of course, you check over that CCH rather briefly because you can unsettle any process. Processes come to temporary flat points and then unflatten.

All right. That's about the best you could do. except during the last hour or so, it would be very beneficial to run TR 10 . . without Model Session or with it, it doesn't matter . . but to run TR 10. All right.

Now let's take Routine 2 or 3. How would you end the intensive? I'd say during the last few hours of the intensive, do nothing but run the Havingness and the Confront Processes of the pc. Now, in a Routine 2 intensive of twenty-five hours, you should certainly have had one level . . one general level . . flat and one Joburg completely completed. And the person's Havingness and Confront Process found, and you would spend at least the last three hours of the intensive, preferably five, which would make the last HGC day of that intensive, doing nothing but running the Have and Confront Process.

Just run the Have Process to a loose needle, run the Confront to a slowed tone arm. You know, tone arm doesn't look like it's wobbling very much right this minute, so now we're going to run some Have, and then we're going back to the Confront. Now we're going to run some Have, we're going to run some Confront, and it stabilizes the case most gorgeously. And he walks out of that intensive feeling marvelous. If you do that and you do a good job, you stabilize the gains. Otherwise, he's still kind of stuck in the intensive. He's still wishing he had some more auditing. He's still fixated on all kinds of little factors. And the kind thing to do to him is let him gain from his gains, and you level him out with your Have and Confront.

Have, by the way, is never run further than a loosened needle. I see people running ten minutes of Havingness. This is incredible unless they're only getting in five commands in ten minutes or something. This is incredible! That's an awful bogged Havingness these days!

All you're trying to do is run it from needle test to needle test, can squeeze to can squeeze. Is it looser? That's it! That's you've had it. That's it. And it's only about twelve commands. If you've got the right Havingness Process, it's twelve commands. That's it.

Now you can get fancy with the Confront Process and run it to what is called a blowdown, and that is to say the needle rises and blows down. You come off of it. See? One cycle of a needle of the tone arm, pardon me. One cycle of the tone arm. It will rise a little bit and blow down. And you run it until the tone arm rises, largely or slightly, and continue to run it until it goes thoomp! Or slides back down a bit. And you come off of it and you run twelve commands of Have, see. But somebody running ten minutes of Havingness is somebody . . just like somebody eating sugar, you see . . "I think I'll have some sugar. Would you hand me that hundred-pound sack?" It's very hard on the digestion. And this is factual. You see, the Have Process can run the case. And you don't want it to run the case. you want it to orient the pc in the environment. Please get its purpose.

See, you start running Have, and you run more than twelve commands of Have, and what happens? The pc's bank starts fluctuating. And the next thing you know he can run Have against the bank. And he's running . . . you're running the bank with a Have process, and you're not supposed to do that. You're supposed to run the bank with a Confront Process. So it's a misuse of the process. It's something like using a pair of shears to dig up a garden. Not quite clever.

And you run ten minutes with it, and you've got the guy going through engrams and his somatics turning on. That's Havingness? Oh, yeah! You can do fantastic things with Havingness. It isn't that Havingness doesn't work and it isn't that Havingness won't run the bank because it will! Boy, will it! But you've now started a new process known as "running the bank with Havingness." And you go more than about twelve commands with it and you've started that new process, and you're going to get tone arm motion, and you'd better run it now till the tone arm motion gets out of it, and . . . But it's a misused process. It isn't for that purpose at all. It's to tell the pc, "Hey! Look! Physical universe!"

And he says, "Well, what do you know? Oh! Physical universe. That's pretty good."

And you say, "Good. I'm going to give you two more commands and then end this process. And, pow! That's it! And then you got the Confront, and you move right into the Confront, get a jiggle out of the tone arm . . .