

RAW MEAT TROUBLE-SHOOTING CASES

A lecture given on
28 June 1961

This is the 28th of June 1961, AD 11, and you are in the throes of having now established that you know everything there is to know. I'm very glad of that and so on.

But I want you to think for a moment. I want you to think for a moment of Aloysius Q. Schnook of Lower Ambovia. And he's going to ask you, he's going to say, "Well now, you've been to Saint Hill, so you know all the answers. Now, why is it that you stand the pc on their head before starting Routine 3?" I want you to be thinking of what you will tell him. Or what you will do with him. Because you'll be embarrassed. You will now be in the horrible situation of people knowing that you know. The question is, do you? Do you?

All right. I'm looking at one person who's going back to a part of the world as the first pioneer to practice Scientology in that part of the world: Riverside. And another one where Scientology is going to be tried. It's been attempted: Los Angeles. And another one where they had every opportunity but forgot to read the subsequent bulletins: Johannesburg.

There are quite a few like this. I wouldn't call you all by rote, but one of these questions came through from as near away as London, which is almost on our backs. Although, sitting down here in the beautiful calm of Sussex, you would never really suspect London existed if you didn't have to go back there. And it came burningly and screamingly through the wire. A bunch of questions about the CCHs that apparently had nothing much to do with the CCHs that I could figure out. So my answer to it was as follows: that I was writing a whole bulletin rather than answer the telex.

Now, the reason I can't tell you what this said is I myself couldn't figure out what it said. But fortunately we have someone amongst us who will be going back to London very soon, in the organization, will be able to answer all these questions sharply, glibly and with enormous permeation. Isn't that right?

Female voice: Yes.

Now, you may be in the throes of absorbing knowledge, but let's not forget the fact that somebody is going to want to know about it from you. And there you are on cloud nine being very proud of having actually gotten through and endured the Saint Hill Briefing Course and so forth. Let's make sure you don't get yanked off that pinnacle and look at them, you know, as they ask this question, your jaw drops slightly and a sort of a blank look comes in your eyes. And you say "The CCH 1. Now, let's see, what is that?" Or "Let's see, uh . . . uh . . . the needle, I think the needle of the E-Meter. . . Yeah, yeah, the E-Meter has a needle." Let's not do that. Let's not do that. Let's be able to speak up quickly, loudly and authoritatively and, above everything else, correctly. The time to find out about that sort of thing is here and now. And if you don't ask questions about that sort of thing, of course, you won't find out. And you'll be in a bad state. Now, I didn't mean any slurs on Riverside or Johannesburg or something. It's because we're friends of these areas that we want to help them out.

The number of questions I've been asked lately on these lectures are very few, so maybe you have one now. Yes, Bob.

Male voice: Ron, if someone comes in who is raw meat from the street, and you want to have him properly disseminated, he'll never be fished out. You got the idea? He could be improperly audited and fished out in this lifetime or his next five. You see? But to be improperly instructed, or dissemination to be improperly done . . . that's an overt. It obviously is because you've barriered the track against his being fished out. You see? You've said "The very best thing that you could possibly run is musical processing. And musical processing, that's the thing. And the way you do musical processing is you take this book on Suba-ooba-ooba, and you stand in the middle of the floor, and you go round and round and round and round and round, you see. Then you stand very still, you see. And then the gods communicate with you. When you fall down in a dead faint, why, then you're Clear."

All right. That's a very good question. Raw meat walks in off the street. What do you decide . . . how do you decide what routine to run on him? All right. There he is. You have several criteria. Your first and foremost criteria is to give him a battery of tests. And if you're not able to give and correct tests, you will find yourself denied this particular rule. They can sometimes look very reasonable, and yet their profiles come out all wrong.

Now, in view of the fact that the profile is much more reliable . . . much, much more reliable . . . than any other single means of determining what's to be run, it'll be a very good thing if you knew how to administer one and grade one.

All right. They come in. Make them do a test. I'm assuming, now, a field auditor in operation. Well, make them do a test. Actually, this is a fairly professional thing to do. All right. They do this test. Now, you take the test and you evaluate it in this fashion: If it is riding all the way along the bottom or if several points of it are at the bottom of the graph, it is inevitably CCHs, so therefore it's Routine 1. All right? That's inevitably Routine 1 . . . inevitably. Don't let anybody fool you. That is the only thing that'll get this case on the road with great certainty.

Now, there are many things that might get the case on the road, and we know lots of things that might do it, and we've wasted more time being hopeful than any other thing. Because we bring hope to people, we are apt to dramatize it ourselves a little bit, you see. And we're very hopeful that this or that will occur, and the thing we know will make something occur is a properly run Routine 1.

Now, what was missing and why the old CCHs didn't move this one, by the way, this low-graph case . . . the reason for that . . . was that nobody was pulling the overts off. And they could run in the overts faster than you could pull them off. So CCHs work on that very positively if properly run. Run 1, 2, 3, 4 . . . just the way you're running them now. All right.

If the case is riding very high on the graph, extremely high on the graph, and when you get them on an E-Meter particularly, the needle appears to be a little sticky, that's Routine 1. Now, as you look at a graph with the graph facing you, you'll notice that over on the left-hand side of the graph you have your A, B, C, D columns. Those are the important columns. That part of the graph which goes from the left to the middle. That is to say reading horizontally A, B, C, D . . . whatever the letter that occurs in the middle of the graph. That whole section is the vital part of the graph to pay attention to.

The rest of the graph mainly hinges on current havingness. Even though it might be pretty well pinned down, and it might be kind of unchangeably so, you, by simply neglecting to find the pc's Havingness Process, can actually depress that side of the graph, without actually messing up the case at all. So you might say that the left half of one of these profiles or graphs is the important diagnostic area. And if columns A, B or C are either very low or very high, you can then expect the pc to have a great deal of difficulty following an auditing command. So therefore, Routine 2 is really not possible.

They alter-is the commands obsessively. There's another way to get around that, and that is to take the Prehav Scale . . . You can get around all these things, but you have to be clever and tricky and so forth.

You can take the Prehav Scale and assess the Change Scale, the Secondary Change Scale, and keep running the pc out in that area, and you'll take off this obsessive alter-is. It could be done. There are lots of things that could be done, but your safest bet, your easiest bet and your fastest bet is Routine 1.

Now, the person who is at the very, very top of the left-hand side of the graph can be expected to come on at the very bottom of the graph. That person is actually worse off, more overwhelmed than the person who is low on the graph. So don't be fooled. Don't be fooled. That is not necessarily derogatory. That means simply this. There is no connotation to this. It's simply this:

When you first find this person's terminal on SOP Goals, you see, assuming you ran SOP Goals on a person, you would find that the terminal assessed way, way, way up at the top . . . 63, 62; level 63, 62, 64, see, way up. That means the terminal that has overwhelmed them is in a terrific state of high serenity. And that terminal deteriorates as the pc is audited and will deteriorate.

And you very often don't register that terminal anymore on your next profile, but get the pc, who is now coming on at the bottom. And that's the pc's graph that comes on at the bottom.

Now, because you're not giving them one every few minutes or every few hours or even every few days, you actually fail to note the gradient scale of progress of the pc as measured by the graph. And that, of course, would be off the top and on the bottom and up. But remember, something else is going to happen here at the same time. The left side of the graph is going to deteriorate as this valence is discharged and dismissed. It actually is going to deteriorate. And it'll look, offhand, as though something bad is going on in auditing.

Now, the way we determine if something bad is going on in auditing is to look at the right side of the graph. If the right side of the graph depresses that is, from the middle letter on up to the end letter of the graph . . if the right side of the graph depresses, you know that ARC breaks are present.

The rudiments are out, you see, because the person's havingness is deteriorating. So if that right side of the graph drops, this is an index of deterioration of havingness, and it only has one source in auditing, and that is ARC breaks with the auditor. Remember that now. It only has one source in auditing: ARC breaks with the auditor. That's terribly important. You look over on that side, you see that in one week the pc had it at about twenty plus on the right side of the graph, and the next week we audit the pc, and then we get another graph, and it is now fifteen minus on the right side of the graph. I'm talking about these column figures, now, up around H, I, that sort of thing, see. That area. Ahhh, if we were to take the pc at that moment and put him on the E-Meter and say, "Have you got an ARC break with your auditor?" Clang! Clang! Little flags wave, and the needle plays "Yankee Doodle." Yes, he's got an ARC break with the auditor.

If you wanted a pc to wipe out all liabilities to havingness doing auditing, you would clear up ARC breaks with a rough-off pc about every ten minutes. That's how fast they occur. Usually the auditing itself wipes it out, and you don't notice it. But you should sometime, just for the fun of it, clean up an ARC break with a pc. Just insist he has one and find it every time. You know? "What is it now? What is your ARC break?" It's mirrored in the deterioration of havingness, and so you get a drop of that side of the graph.

All right. Now, supposing the right side of the graph remains constant, and you get no change on the right side of the graph at all. It is neither up and it's not down. Ho-hooooo. That pc was being audited with a present time problem. There was a present time problem. Another rudiment was out all the time he was being audited. Only that will also reflect on the left side of the graph over in the lower letters A, B, C, D and so forth. Present time problem will blow straight across the graph. In other words, you're getting no progress at all.

Now, that the left side of the graph deteriorates is meaningless, see. That's meaningless. But that the right side of the graph deteriorates, that's very meaningful. That the left side of the graph remains unchanged is very meaningful . . present time problem. That the right side of the graph remains unchanged . . present time problem. Got it? That the left side of the graph deteriorates under auditing simply means the decline of a valence. It does not mean a criticism of the auditor. I'm talking about left and right sides now as you have the graph in your lap looking at it.

Now, these are the determinations as far as a graph is concerned. And that is the best way to measure up what is going on with this case.

But let's suppose this case was running at about minus seventy on the left side of the graph. Now let's get to Routine 2. It was running about minus seventy or a bit above and was middle grounded or high or low on the right-hand side . . we don't care what. Now, let's supposing it was somewhere between minus seventy and the center line (the zero line of the graph) through the left-hand side of the graph. You can run Routine 2 on this pc usually with the greatest of ease. This is what you've known as a mean graph. It's not an average graph. It's just a graph that a person isn't in too bad shape. I mean, they're just sort of loused up, but they kind of know it. You got the idea. You can run Routine 2 on this pc.

By the way, you can also run Routine 2 on a low graph, a very, very low graph. Routine 2 does not work hardly at all on a theetie-weetie high graph. It doesn't work at all on it. You can just beat your brains out. SOP Goals works on it, but with what complications do you have to execute SOP Goals when you're running it below the case level? It'll run all the way to the bottom. Any case could be run on SOP Goals, but now we get tricky. Now we get complicated assessments. Now we've got complicated situations. Now we've got large numbers of goals. Not necessarily that large numbers of goals means the case is rough, but we . . . it's one of the things that happens as a liability when we try to run SOP Goals on it. Now Routine 2, in other words, would be the most effective process to run on somebody who was minus seventy up. No points lower than minus seventy and maybe some points up to plus twenty on the left side of the graph.

In Routine 2 this case would take off like a startled gazelle. As you see diagnostically, if you want to use that word, you are paying no attention at all over here to the right side of the graph.

All right. Now, supposing the person was riding up at the center line or above. That is, on the left side of the graph. The fastest thing to do would be SOP Goals. Now, we're not talking about what we can do to this raw meat off the street. We can do any of these things. We can do any of these things. We're not talking about what we can do; we're talking exclusively about what is the most effective thing to do. This is the fastest thing to do. Got it? And that actually answers in full the question which you just gave me: What are you going to do, how do you measure up, and what to run on this person?

Diagnosis on an E-Meter is . . . has the liability of the cans being improperly squeezed so your sensitivity is improperly set. Furthermore it requires a lot of judgment and adjudication. This judgment and adjudication is all done by the graph. Why worry about it?

There are other symptoms, however, which are quite interesting. And one is that you can have somebody at a misread on the tone arm dial or at exactly Clear read on the tone arm dial, but with a sticky or misbehaving needle . . . a very jerky or hectic needle or a very still needle or something like this. You're looking at somebody there who doesn't register hardly at all, and you're actually not going to get anyplace, really, running a thought process on this case. You can do it. It's going to take you a long time. It'll be successful at the bitter end, running Routine 2 or Routine 3, but my advice is don't do it.

Now, as far as the routines are concerned, you can run Routine 1 . . . which is remarkable about the routines . . . you can run them 1, 2 or 3 on any case that is still breathing. If you can get into communication, verbal communication, of any kind whatsoever, you can run Routine 2 or 3. Of course, if the case is unconscious completely, you've only got the CCHs. But that is . . . that's going a little bit below our level of adjudication. So you could run 1, 2 or 3 on practically any pc that walked in the door. If he could walk in the door, he could be made to have a gain on Routine 1, Routine 2 and Routine 3. And the sole criteria that you're reaching for is which one, the fastest. That's what you're reaching for.

Now, we're out then, of a total lose proposition providing these things are run right. And that is the other thing that enters into the thing, and that is to say if you have a couple of auditors and one of them just can't run CCHs . . . you know, the fellow just can't put an intention into things or something like this. They had a hard time with the CCHs, you see. Don't get much of a gain. There's this vagary amongst auditors. They practically don't do them when they don't run. But there is this: that some auditors do it better than others.

Supposing you had two pcs and two auditors, and one of these auditors ran very fine CCHs, and the other one could use an E-Meter. Then you'd better set up both pcs to be CCH'd by the same auditor and swap the periods of the day or swap the consecutive periods around in such a way that both auditors would keep working, but one would be doing Security Checks and the other one would be doing the CCHs, don't you see? Something on that order.

Or supposing you were running a bunch of Routine 2 and one of your people there wasn't too hot at running Routine 2. Well, let's run Routine 2 . . . the same auditor runs both pcs on Routine 2, see, and the other auditor runs them both on Security Checks. You can split it up like this. In other words, you could take an HGC, you could take somebody who just comes in off the Academy, and you could set him up, doing the bit and piece work. Got the idea?

And this brings up: what is it safe to do? You said, "How do you determine what to do?" Well, if you wanted to carry the question out to its *reductio ad absurdum*, you'd have to include "What can you do?" you know. And that is part of being effective. So supposing we had this other kind of a condition whereby some of our auditors weren't very well trained. We were running an HGC, you see, and some of them weren't very well trained, and we were conscience stricken about, you know, putting them on the public, and that sort of thing. Well, there are several things that it's very safe to do. Oddly enough, one of them is SOP Goals Assessment, providing it's done even moderately correctly. Not running it. No, no. That isn't safe. Not letting him say that is the final goal. No. That isn't safe. But just digging up the goal and then digging up the terminal under some sort of supervision . . yeah, that's a safe action. And very therapeutic and very good.

All right. That's safe. Security Checking is safe. You can let anybody Security Check. You can show them what the meter looks like and so forth. Even though they're kind of goofy and they . . they don't quite . . and they let the rudiments get out, and a lot of things . . weird things happen, nothing is going to happen but benefit on Security Checking. Got the idea? So there are two actions that can be undertaken independent of all of the other actions. So you could set up people to have these things done, you see, by auditors that weren't particularly well skilled, and have them sort of get familiar with it all and that sort of thing, doing these two actions. So therefore, "What could you do?" has to do with, "Who are you going to do it with?" And there are certain elements in Routine 1, 2 and 3 which are safe to do by almost anybody. That's pretty good. One of them is Security Checking, and the other is actually assessing for goals and terminal. Not running them; that's different.

All right. Now, there are several things that are unsafe to do. And that is let somebody who just knows from nowhere attempt the CCHs . . somebody that's liable, actually, to blow up in the session or leave the pc high and dry or skit out from under or something like this. That's dangerous. That's dangerous. So you'd pick auditors that you . . were reliable to do that with.

Routine 2 requires a fairly accurate assessment, fairly accurate. But it's only the accuracy of a what? Of a significance. And therefore a person could be poorly run on Routine 2 without too much happening providing the processes got flat. That is dangerous to leave the processes of Routine 2 . . general runs, Prehav Scale . . unflat. If you leave one unflat and go on to the next one and then leave that unflat and go on to the next one and leave that unflat and go on to the next one . . by that time, if your pc doesn't feel like he or she is spinning, why, I'll eat the E-Meter.

The pc will feel spinny. Now, this condition actually can turn about in SOP Goals the same way. You leave a level unflat and then you go to the next level, and if that level were very unflat and the person is very queasy about it, you see, at the time it's left, and then the next level, the person starts in on this level, they will feel like they're spinning. They just feel spinny, that's all. They've got two levels going at once here, and they're counterpoised, and they're all messed up with each other, and so forth.

So, general Prehav runs and SOP Goals terminals runs are limited by this factor: that a pc can be loused up. Now, SOP Goals has a further limitation: You can choose the wrong terminal. You can choose the wrong goal and then choose the wrong terminal. You can make the pc run the goal or terminal which ought to be run on the auditor or something stupid like this can occur. Really, I've seen it occur.

So choosing or deciding whether or not that is the right goal, and deciding whether or not that is the right terminal for the goal, is a job for an expert. That is really an expert job. You get that thing wrong and all hell is going to break loose. There's a test on whether or not you've got the right terminal. On the second assessment, when you go over the Prehav Scale, have you got about a dozen levels live. If there are a dozen levels falling on that scale, the probability is you haven't got the right terminal. Because the more you run the wrong terminal, the more you are avoiding the case and the more the actual terminal starts kicking levels live. And every level that you

run or touch, kicks over into the main level which is then without relief and the correct terminal is getting stronger and stronger and tougher and tougher and meaner and meaner, and the pc can't tell which way he's going.

So that it is very, very dangerous . . I couldn't impress this upon you enough . . to choose the wrong goal and the wrong terminal and then run it.

Choose it . . nobody's going to be harmed. But after chosen, run it . . oh, wow!

If it's the wrong one, the pc has had it. There is only one right one. So of course, where does this put the actual running of SOP Goals when you say raw meat off the street?

All right, assess him. You could assess him. Almost anybody could assess him showing him the ropes. But running him? Ahhh, we're not so sure. Now, the other thing is, how well can an auditor keep in a rudiment?

How well can they keep in rudiments? And you can get around this by getting the rudiments cross-checked by supervision and one auditing team checking the rudiments of another auditing team and so . . such mechanisms as this . . and you also keep the case running.

Now, all of these things apply to "What do you run on a pc?" Well, what do you run on raw meat? It applies to whether it's raw meat. It applies to anything else. There is this addition. We have run into this trouble. A fellow comes in, and he says, "Well, I've heard of this Scientology and I would like to get some auditing." And you start running CCHs on him. You don't ask him anything. Ah, he's never heard of this. He doesn't know what you're doing. He doesn't know why. He hasn't got a clue. He's wrapped up and going nowhere.

You got the idea?

All right. He will go nowhere faster and faster and faster, and the present time problem in this case is "What the hell are you doing?" So he gets no change.

So therefore, it requires this factor to give some attention to. You have to sort of run a tiny little bit of SOP Goals Assessment on this person when he walks in off the street. And this SOP Goals Assessment simply consists of this: "What difficulties are you trying to overcome?" It's the answer to the question, "What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" And he'll say, "Well, it's my memory. It's my memory. That's what it is. I realize my memory is going. And it worries me," and so forth.

Well, frankly . . this is an exact case . . we had a pc in Johannesburg; walked in and he was immediately run on Technique Zed, Q and Alpha, you see, and he was going nowhere in a hurry, and Mary Sue called this to my attention, and I said, "Well, for heaven's sakes," I said, "what's his goal?"

"Well, he just wants to improve his memory. That's what he wants to improve. That's all he wants to do: improve his memory."

I said, "Well, all right. Run 'Something you wouldn't mind forgetting' on him for twenty-five hours."

They did. His memory improved. He was tremendously satisfied. He was very happy about the whole thing. We used a slow process, don't you see. Now, he'd attained that goal, so now he had a reality on what was going forward, and the next time we had anything to do with him, we could've put him at once on Routine 2 or even the CCHs. You got the idea?

But to take a case who knows nothing about it whatsoever and just run Routine 1, Routine 2 or Routine 3 with no further introduction, explanation and without any reality on what is going on is very, very hard on the case.

Now, the one process that gets around this is an assessment for SOP Goals, which is very therapeutic. That would be a very good thing to do with this case, see. You don't have to think up the extraordinary solution like I had to, you see. Just assess him for goals. Just like you're doing, you see. You just go on. Oh, you'd be surprised. I mean, the littlest child or the oldest man or the dumbest medico. One of whom

was just trying to kid me about Scientology. He said his leg got well because I had sent him a cable after he had gotten it broken, you see.

And I kept telling him to be careful with it. I got even with him. Kept telling him to be careful with his leg there, and so forth. He was outside, parading around and giving me the all, and so on. And sure enough, when he came back, he was limping. I did get him, didn't I? I told him I wasn't really worried about his leg. I was worried about the psychic trauma driving him around the bend. Mary Sue came up at that moment, or somebody did. And he said yes, he'd been worried about it for some time . . . going around the bend. And he was off the subject, and so forth.

But goals, goals . . . they'll all respond to goals. Now, you could do something like this with him. You could get somebody running SOP Goals on him, you know. And then at the same time, run him on a CCH, you see. Mix the routines. He'd wonder what you were doing. But it was all right. He was perfectly satisfied with auditing, so he'd go along with this. And all of a sudden he'd go whir clank, and suddenly realize these CCHs were doing something. And he wouldn't quite decide what, and then you'd say, "Well, if you're feeling bad because of that it's because you haven't had your Processing Check. And you'd give him a Security Check. And he'd realize that was confessing, which he realizes he should have done back there in 1492 instead of burning the church down, and he'll go along with this.

In other words, you could use SOP Goals Assessment, not run, but assessment as a break in on this particular case who was ignorant and from nowhere, okay? I have spoken on the answer to that question.

Male voice: Thank you.

You're welcome. All right. Yes?

Male voice: On trouble-shooting cases, what factors do you look at before other factors?

Oh, all right. Trouble-shooting cases. What factors do you look at before other factors? Of course, Ken would be very interested in this because he probably has . . . let's see, how many people are there in Los Angeles now? Anyway, there's that many impossible or stalled cases out in that particular area, and you don't ever audit in the Los Angeles area; you trouble shoot.

Basically, somebody comes in and he's kind of going "Bleahp-glup, bleahbup, bleah-blup."

And you say, "What's the matter? What's the matter?"

"Well, I've been bloop audited lately, and bloo boop," and so forth.

And "You've been audited lately. You've been audited? Well, what . . . who audited you lately?"

And they say, "Oh, ah, somebody or other."

And you say, "Oh, yeah, audited. Well, now, what did they run?"

"Well, we were doing 'music processing'"

And you say, "What is 'music processing?'"

And they say, "Well, 'music processing' is, you take several narcotic pills, you see, and you put Bach running at high volume in the bedroom, you see. And when you wake up, you're 'Bach-y.'" "And something like this. You'd be amazed. So that question is well asked.

It isn't that I have a low opinion of the auditors in California. It's just that I feel for them. And they Q-and-A with the public that demands unusual answers. And it's very difficult to operate either in an HGC, where everybody is demanding unusual answers, or in an HCO office, where everybody wants something new and unusual, or in Los Angeles, where nothing else is salable. And you're liable to Q-

and-A with it. I catch myself doing it once in a blue moon. Catch Mary Sue doing it once, twice, but less often than others.

Somebody sails in and they say, "You know that process you gave me to run on the pc? Well, that didn't work." So this is your first point of troubleshooting. This is the first and most interesting point of troubleshooting. I see you already know it. And that is "The process that you gave me to run on that pc didn't work." And then you say, not "Gee, it didn't? Well, I'll have to think of something else." That's the wrong answer. The right answer is "What process did I give you?" And you usually find they don't know. That is, unfortunately, the usual response.

And then the first thing you do in trouble-shooting . . . "Well, what I told you to run the first time, you go and run." That's your first point in troubleshooting. Find out if what was supposed to have been run was run. That's number one. And it stands up something like San Gorgonio above the desert compared to all other points in trouble-shooting. See, there's this tremendous point: What was done?

Now, the way you establish what was done is this way: You put the pc on an E-Meter and you say, "What was run on you?" Maybe he doesn't remember. He will if you joggle him after a few times. And you're liable to find something fantastic has been going on. That's the first and foremost source of difficulty in Scientology. It is way up there. It's interesting that it is much greater than you would ordinarily suspect, until you start looking for it. And when you start looking for it, your eyes will pop, man.

What is done in the name of Technique Zed, believe me, is fantastic. So trouble-shooting? Find out what was really run. What was really run. Get the pc on an E-Meter and discover it. And don't let him sit there and malign the auditor either. Just find the facts, man. That's all you're interested in . . . like Sergeant Friday of the Los Angeles Police Force. I understand he was relegated to the suburbs recently. Yeah, he actually solved a crime. They couldn't have that.

That's the first thing you find out. That's a piece of police work. What was done? What was really done? Because it's based on this fact: the auditing flubs today are of magnitude before they begin to upset a case. They are of magnitude. It's something on the order of the auditor never reported for the sessions. You get the idea?

It's something of this weird nature. And they're so offbeat and varied, but of such magnitude, that you very often won't look for them. You right away have made the assumption that the auditor sat in the auditing chair, that the pc sat in the pc's chair, and that something was run on the pc. You've made this assumption. You've made the assumption, you see, that Model Session was utilized or that the CCHs were properly run or that they were run at all, or that something was going on here. You see, you've assumed all these things, and you actually don't have the right to assume any one of those things when you're trouble-shooting on a case that is bogged from some kind of a D of P or D of T level. You have no right to assume those things.

So that your line of questioning sounds rather idiotic to somebody who isn't in the know. It's "Well, did you have a session?" Get the idea? "Was the auditor there?" "Were you there?" And they sometimes think you are being very sarcastic or sometimes very good for a laugh. But it prepares them to answer some more searching questions.

So that your trouble-shooting is not relegated only to finding out what bug has this pc got that these processes aren't affecting. That is the standard bug we had assumed existed.

The actual bug that exists is what has been administered to this pc that I don't know about? What has happened with this pc I haven't a clue on? See, that's your first and foremost action.

Now, you all have to do trouble-shooting. You think I'm talking from an executive standpoint. You all have to do trouble-shooting. What do I mean by that? You get pcs who have been audited before. And if you don't troubleshoot this pc, you're going to be in trouble. You should have been troubleshooting, so . . . and you didn't, so now all of a sudden you're in trouble. And you're going to assume that everything that has been run on this pc is flat.

I'll give you an example. There's a very noteworthy character in Scientology down in Australia, who had this interesting thing wrong with her case. And she was in a very important position, and her case was making no gains whatsoever, and I wasn't trouble-shooting it. I was actually running an extraordinary solution. I was running a new process on her of one character or another, and in running it I all of a sudden elicited this interesting, interesting, interesting response: "Well, when I was down in New Zealand a few years ago, they ran CCH 3 on me, and I got tremendous gains, and I've never had any gain since."

You know, it's almost a case of my sighing deeply and saying, "Why the hell didn't you tell anybody this?" "Auditors have been beating their brains out over your case," I could have said to her. "And you had a process on which you were making gains and you've never made any gain since? You've just complained about it. And you never told a soul." This was obvious. You see that.

The trouble-shooting, then, consisted of finding out what was run a long time ago. What is the history of the auditing? And this is all part of it. Now, you get that as an executive or a technical expert in an organization, you see. You get that consistently. But working in the field, you almost never ask this question: "What's been run on you? What is the history of your auditing?" And then you take up an hour or two . . . take up more than that with this pc . . . and you're going to find some interesting things.

Well, we got a pc right here in class, right this minute (namely you). And what happened? The pc had a profile of some type or another, and then was audited, and then had another profile which was entirely different. But the second profile hadn't changed.

Got the idea? Here was a period of auditing on which a profile deteriorated. We just assumed . . . whether right or wrong; didn't even ask the pc. We just looked at the profiles and found out what had been run, knew something about the auditor, and already, and simply ran the auditor off the case. It's interesting that it took so many hours to run the auditor off the case. Fascinating that it took this many hours to run the auditor off the case. That should be a blink for you at once. We didn't even ask what was being run by this auditor. We simply knew here was a profile that sat one way, the pc got audited, here is this new profile. Wow! See? And the profile has deteriorated in the wrong places. All right. We'll audit the auditor off the case. All of a sudden, the pc's profile . . . I don't know whether this pc took a profile immediately after that or not. Did you?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. What did it look like?

Female voice: We haven't graded it yet.

You haven't graded it yet. Well, when we see that, I'm sure you will see that the profile snapped back to what it was before the auditor audited the case. You got the idea?

The person must have been audited with ARC breaks in full bloom, or audited with PTPs in full bloom, you see. Audited with the rudiments way out with very powerful processes, and something went wrong here. We don't ask what went wrong. We just see that this was the case, so therefore, we audit off one auditor.

The first time this was ever done was in an Academy. A student suddenly came down with measles; only the doctor couldn't find anything wrong with the student. And I got very clever about this time and asked the burning question, "What had this student been doing just before these measles broke out?" And I found out that the (quote) "auditor" in that particular case had blown the session.

Blown the session! The auditor had blown the session. Get somebody halfway through a measles engram and then blow the session. Pretty good, huh? So I just got somebody to run O/W on that auditor, or the equivalent at that time. And it didn't take a half an hour, and there were . . . the measles were gone. Got the idea? We took the auditing off the case. So you can always do that. You can always remove the auditing

Oddly enough, if the case made any gains during that auditing, the gains are preserved. If the case had any losses during the auditing, the losses are vanished. That's a fantastic thing.

So in trouble-shooting, you can always do that. And that's one of the primary things to look for. And every one of you, I repeat, should be troubleshooting. You should be looking over the auditing this case has had.

Now, failure to look over this auditing will sometimes leave undisclosed, oh, five years in psychoanalysis . . . only, I can spot those from a way off. All I have to do is get the responses of the pc to the auditor.

Well, the pc says, "Well, I think um . . . I think, actually, my mother had a lot to do with this. It's very fixated on Mother. I've been very fixated for some time. Probably had a complex; probably had a complex. And, uh, I felt inferior, you see. And I keep saving these fetishes. And uh . . ."

Along about that time, if I hear anything like this, I get very brilliant and assume the person has been psychoanalyzed. And I say to the person, "Have you ever been psychoanalyzed?"

"Oh, yes."

"Well, have you ever told anybody around here?"

"Oh, well, no. Why should I do that?"

Nothing except the person has been ground down to a nub, and actually now is in the frame of mind of believing that therapy can't do much for them, because they've had one whopping big failed help. Well, there sits the case.

Now, you could probably overcome this with the CCHs. You can run out psychiatric treatment with the CCHs. So obviously, you could run out psychoanalysis and things like this with the CCHs. You see, that's easy. But nevertheless, it's something you sure ought to know. You got the idea?

So find out first and foremost what has been going on. What is the auditing history of this case, or the treatment history of this case. And that's the big one. After that, they all dwindle off onto more interesting, lesser statured things. All of which, by the way, are very important. But they have no great stature compared to that one.

All right. Let's take up the next lower echelon of things, okay?

The next lower echelon is simply this: rudiments. Rudiments? Rudiments. When in doubt, check the rudiments. When trouble-shooting a case, check the rudiments. Look for the rudiments.

After you've found out what's been run, what's being run, what's the general history of the case; rudiments, rudiments, rudiments. All the rudiments. Not just the beginning rudiments, but the end rudiments. Even though they're both the same. Check rudiments.

Now, because you get a mutual withhold and a mutual ARC break with the world and so forth, in long duration auditing teams, the phenomenon occurs that when an outsider checks the rudiments on an auditing team, invariably finds them out. And this makes the auditor look very silly. But actually they weren't falling for him.

He could have made them fall for him, we know that now. By asking the question, "What are we withholding?" you see. Something on the order of "How do we feel about the auditing room?" You know, that kind of a rudiment. "Well, we feel about the auditing room sort of badly because you don't like to audit me in here." Got the idea?

So therefore, the room is really out. "The room's all right with me. Well, I know it's not all right with you." So therefore, the rudiment is out, isn't it? Now, an outsider comes in and he picks up the E-Meter

on this particular thing. And he said now, "All right. Is your auditing room all right?" Clang! No! You know?

The wrong thing to do is to turn around to the auditor . . we know now, you know . . and look at him sneeringly, you know, and say, "You knuckle head. Why didn't you find this?" You know? It wasn't there. That's why he didn't find it. Because something is wrong with the auditing room for him. He's complained a couple of times about it being drafty or something of the sort, you see. And that's enough to put the auditing room out with the pc, you know.

Pcs sometimes wind up protecting their auditors and all kinds of wild things occur. Actually auditor's doing very badly. But just make something that is even vaguely slurring about the auditor. You run into this both ways. You sometimes get obsessive agreement, you know, on the part of the pc. But as commonly, you get the pc right in there fighting with brass knuckles to protect the auditor, you know. "He's doing all right. He's doing his best." Or "She's just doing fine." Or "I really never had a better auditor. I never made any gains until this auditor came along."

And all you inferred was that the auditor would do better after they were trained a bit or something like this, you see, and blaaaaah. You've stuck your foot in it. So you have to handle this kind of diplomatically.

But anyway, check rudiments. Check them from the beginning to the end and back again and around and round and round, and keep them checked.

Because do you realize that the rudiments out in one session is one wasted session? If the rudiments are out for one session, that session is

wasted. The optimum checking of the rudiments, then, is every session.

Now, next to the fact that "Does anything get run properly?" the next question of, "Are the rudiments in?" is your main grind. Is . . are they in? And you'll very often find the rudiments out.

Now, no auditing can occur with the rudiments out. Furthermore, you don't have to keep the rudiments in so strongly that you've got the sensitivity over at 16 checking for the pc's withholds. That isn't enough to throw a session out.

You're now running a process known as the Joburg. Got the idea? You're running TR 10, because you turn the sensitivity knob over to 16 and say, "How do you feel about auditing in the room?" You get flinch! The thing goes bang! "Ohh," you say, "the TR 10 is out. Well, oooh, well, all right. Well, we'll just have to run that." And we run it, you see.

And then we say, "Well, do you have an ARC break?" Plang! "Well, who do you have an ARC break with?"

"Well, I . . I didn't know I had an ARC . . . Let's see, I think with my dog, yeah. My dog, yes. I had an ARC break with my dog. He woke me up about five o'clock this morning and wanted to go out. And . . yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. I had an ARC break with my dog"

"Well, all right. Good. Now, do you have an ARC break?" Clank! "Well, who do you have an ARC break with?"

"Well, I have an ARC break I don't know. Did it say something?" They try to look at the meter.

"Yeah. It said something all right. Now, who'd you have this other ARC break with?"

"Oh, let's see. Oh, I know who that'd be. Yeah, yeah. Over at lunch I almost got shortchanged in the restaurant. Yeah. Yeah! As a matter of fact, I did. Oh, well, what do you know, man? Yeah."

"All right," you say. "Good. Well, you got any other ARC breaks?" Clank!

“Who is that with?”

Wrong way to ask the question, see. “Who is that with?”

“Oh, I don’t know. Did it fall?” You got the idea?

Wrong way to run rudiments. Because things that are falling with sensitivity 16 on the average pc . . well, of course, you can always get a fall at sensitivity 16 on any one of these questions. You’re running the whole case by rudiments.

How much does a rudiment have to be out in order to interrupt the case?

It is enough to show on the needle at a third-of-a-dial drop. And that’s something you better put down because you’ll have to tell everybody under the sun, moon and stars this when you start saying “Keep the rudiments in.”

And immediately they’ll get very conscientious, and they’ll turn that sensitivity knob over to 16. And after that you get nothing audited but rudiments.

Look, if rudiments could have made somebody well, why, we would run nothing else but. Because they’ve existed since 1956, but there have been a lot of failed cases since 56. Test enough?

All right. How much does the rudiment have to be in? It’s enough to show a change of characteristic. A reaction on the needle with the sensitivity knob set for a third-of-a-dial drop on the can squeeze. And that is the exact technical response. You can’t see a rudiment at a third-of-a-dial drop, ignore it. You got it?

Of course, you can always, then, play a good trick as an executive. As a D of P or something, and then turn your sensitivity up to 16. After you . . the auditor has been running at a third-of-a-dial drop, why, you turn your sensitivity up to 16, when you check his pc, you know. And you’ll find all the rudiments out, of course.

Now, how thoroughly does it have to be in? Well, I’ve answered that question. It has to be in to that degree. Because if a rudiment will react at a third-of-a-dial drop, it is enough to interrupt the session.

All the rudiments are for is getting the pc into session. And any rudiment that is going to louse up the pc is going to be flagrantly out. Flagrantly out. You’re going to see that reaction. And don’t let me catch you with the sensitivity knob sitting for a third-of-a-dial drop . . don’t let me catch you finding a PT problem falling a couple of divisions or four or five divisions on that thing and passing it by because the pc says it’s merely a mention of the idea of present time problems that’s got him and that’s falling on this or that. And he explains it all away.

Don’t do it. Because you’re going to have a pc exploding, going into apathy or going out of session within an hour to an hour and a half. You’ve just predicted it right there. Not only is he going to get no gain, but he’s going to blow up, one way or the other on a PT problem. Don’t pass them by. You understand?

But you turn the sensitivity up to 16 and you ask the pc, “Do you have a present time problem?” you will almost always get a needle reaction. Almost always. Since high sensitivity knob readings are used for the Joburg, and there you pick the bones clean. You got the idea? Or where you’re looking for something or trying to trace something down or date something.

If you’re trying to find something, you can always put the sensitivity knob up high. But the liability is that when you do it on the rudiments, you have immediately set up the rudiments to be the session. And that isn’t what you’re supposed to be doing. If they don’t fall at all at a third-of-a-dial drop, they’re in. And that’s all you can say about it.

Now, the next thing that will happen in trouble-shooting a case, is that somebody will have been run on a level that isn't flat, or run on the CCHs, and that one wasn't flat before they went on to the next one. And you have to check this flatness. That is the next most important thing. Are these things flat? You go back and go over what's been run and find out if they're flat. Look over the auditor's reports. Say these things to the pc on the E-Meter and see if you get a needle reaction on them. Find out if these things were flat because the next most fruitful source of case stall is failure to flatten the process.

And immediately following that is the . . in order . . the next most fruitful case, and almost as frequent, is this horrible one: It's been flat for days, and it's still being run. It's just been flat for days, that's all. It's been flat for a session or two, or something like that. You'll find these real goofs, you know?

Now, the only disastrous thing that can happen under that circumstance is that the needle will stick so that you can't reassess. And the remedy for that particular thing is one of several, but amongst them is not running the incident that the overrun has stuck them in. That's not a remedy.

The most fruitful remedy is, is run the auditor off. And you'll all of a sudden find it'll come back to battery. And you can assess it again.

Where a pc consistently has the rudiments out . . . Now let's get down to trickiness. Now we're down to being tricky auditors and so forth, and we're not really fooling with the case. You know, and we're not looking for these gross errors. We're just trying to set up a case better. The pc is running all right, but they just always have an enormous number of present time problems and ARC breaks. And it just seems to be continuous. And we take two thirds of the session to clean up the rudiments. And then we take one-sixth of the session to run the process, and then the remainder of the session is spent on running the end rudiments.

First check to find out if the rudiments are being established properly . . third-of-a-dial-drop test . . or are we trying to run all of the reaction of a needle out of all of the rudiments forever?

And if that is not the case, the next thing you do immediately after that . . clang, bang, sock . . is you assume this person is running continuous overts against the present time environment and everybody in it. The person is going pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, you know. Unkind-thought overts. Unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought. They look at you: unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought. They look . . if there's another person around: unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought. You got the idea? Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. Automaticity. Unkind thought which leads to ARC breaks, present time problems. They have a hell of a time in life. And underlying these various things is pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, automaticity, unkind thought. You got the idea? And you're trying to run somebody that's stacking his case up with overts faster than you can unstack it with processing. And this is a very common, common, common source of difficulty.

And we've got an answer to that in Prehav 13. You just take everybody the pc knows, do an assessment and so forth. And I've given you the details on how you do this Prehav 13 before. But you run Prehav 13 on the case. Just skip whatever you're doing on the case and just flatten Prehav 13. Just devote four or five sessions to getting Prehav 13 out of the road. And all of a sudden this person feels wonderful. And actually, if you do it right, they'll make all their goals for auditing right there, apparently. Of course, they aren't any where. But it's a very temporary situation, because that valence . . which has already got to be licked, you see . . in a few months at the absolute outside will be going again pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. So you actually just clean them up so they can be audited. That's the value of Prehav 13.

All right. Now, you're not running into this one as often now because in the routines it is provided for cross and center. But it used to be, that a major . . much earlier in value than this list I've been giving you . . source of auditor-pc difficulty and trouble-shooting and so forth was the withhold. The case had the withhold, and therefore was not in two-way communication with the auditor. But you're using Joburgs, and that's taking care of this in the auditing. So it is less in this. If you suspect this now, you order a Joburg. You say, "Well, that's all right, lay aside what you're doing and go on a Joburg." You get a reaction on a withhold, don't try to dig it up particularly. Just order a Joburg. Okay?

All right. And if you do those things with these various routines, you'll find more cases straighten out than all of the tricky solutions you ever could dream of. Because in opposition to all of these practical solutions of how to trouble-shoot a case, is the continual insistence by the pc, by the public, even by auditors under your supervision, that you think of something new, strange and wonderful that solves this case, because it is so different. And you're liable to succumb to it.

Once in a blue moon, you have to succumb to it. But that's when all else fails, man. That's really when all else fails. And then you'll find out it comes under the first category. There's something weird, wild and wonderful going on that nobody has communicated to you whatsoever. Such as the fact that the girl's living with three men simultaneously and none of the three men know about it, or the fact the pc self-audits all night, or something else is going on here, you see, which you just didn't happen to find out about. But that comes under the first heading.

Now, the trouble-shooting of the case is very important because by doing that you actually also keep Scientology on the track. And if they think there's somebody going to be around in the establishment or in the town, or something like that, that can trouble-shoot a case, and will remorselessly do so, everybody starts to be better.

They all of a sudden think, "Well, you know, a month or so this person might wander over and Ken might look at her. And then all of my sins will out." As a matter of fact, it's a very good thing to foster that particular piece of propaganda.

"Well, go ahead and waste the next two hundred hours of auditing if you want to. Sooner or later, why, I'll have this case sitting here on an E-Meter. And I'll find out what the devil you've been doing in those two hundred hours of auditing." You know I can hear now the certain names that I could mention out in Los Angeles all go ulp-urp.

You realize that by the Code of a Scientologist, if you weren't administering Scientology to the pc, he doesn't have to pay you. My God! What a horribly fiendish thing. Well, I won't put ideas in your mind. There are ways of getting it done right.

The job of the D of P is trouble-shooting. The job of the D of T is quite different. D of Ts often turn their Academies into clinics. And they start making sure that all the cases of the students get progress. And that's not what they're supposed to be doing. And fellows come out of there, out of Academies in pretty good shape casewise, but you say "CCH" to them, and they say, "CCH-now, he did . . . we did hear something about CCH. Lets see, what was that? Oh, yes, yes, yes. That's one of the levels of the Prehav Scale." But their cases are in good shape. You get the idea?

So in trouble-shooting in an Academy, you don't. You just don't. That's it. Some Instructor comes to you or somebody who's teaching Scientology or something like this, you know, and he's teaching courses of some kind or another, and he comes up to you, and he says, "Having the awfulest trouble with this case", you see?

"Oh? You are? Isn't that interesting? Do you have trouble with bulletins too? I imagine you have lots of trouble with bulletins."

And the fellow says, "What do you mean?"

"Well, haven't you read anything about what you're supposed to be doing in the Academy? You're supposed to be training people in the Academy. If you think there's something wrong with this fellow's case, sign him up for some processing over in the HGC."

And this'll be a new, wild, strange one. I have seen an Academy with a full clinic, full clinical setup, from one end to the other, nobody learning a thing, and the Instructors just frantic about everybody's cases, these cases. Well, now look how shortsighted this is.

They may be frantic about those cases that are in the Academy, but let me point out to you that they are neglecting all of the cases these auditors will audit. And the only thing you can really do wrong with

Scientology . . you can use it backwards and upside down and run it wrong and everything else, and you actually won't commit much of a crime. But improper or incorrect or failure to disseminate Scientology adds up to one awful overt. Ask yourself for a moment, why?

Well, if Scientology is abroad in a workable state, even though this fellow kicks the bucket, he'll be picked out of it someday.

All right. So this character gets loused up by processing, and next life, next life, next life, he has run on him, "You take this book on Suba-ooba-ooba, and you stand in the middle of the room, and you go around in circles, and then when you fall down you're Clear." It's no road out. And that's happened to Buddhism, Lamaism, the original Taoism. Happened to any development they've had here on Earth. Started out free . . by bad dissemination . . booby trap. See?

I imagine Christianity was all right sometime or another. I imagine it didn't have some of the intentions which it eventually expressed, such as Inquisition and burning people in East Grinstead, and a few other things. Oh, you didn't know there were people burned in East Grinstead?

They're lying right up here in the courtyard. You want to drop into the church cemetery there someday. You'll see them. They're buried right up on the High Street. I mean, they were burned on the High Street and buried eventually in consecrated ground. It was interesting. But what's most interesting about it is that it didn't sour people on it; it only soured people on a branch of it.

Okay. Enough of this propaganda. Okay. Well, I've kept you overtime again.

Thank you very much.

Audience: Thank you.