

DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN

A lecture given on
19 April 1962

Thank you.

Here we are, second lecture and this is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 19 April AD 12. And we're going to talk to you now about processes, recommended—recommended processes. Now, I haven't actually issued an authoritative statement on this—recommended processes—for some time. And it's about time that we did a summary on this particular activity.

Now, you're always going to run into difficulty on an interpretation. Interpretation gives you lots of difficulty, particularly if you do something else that isn't said, but something that is apparently understood in the statement. And nobody else understands it, but—that way and so forth.

But nevertheless, in the absence of a recommended procedure, of course, you could make a lot of mistakes of one kind or another. Now, I'll tell you an optimum method of auditing a pc, more or less, as of now. There's some data through on this and I've inspected quite a few cases in the last two or three months and several things show up. Now, I told you that Prepchecking, we dropped Prepchecking out and we only drop it out in the line of a permanent gain. See, we don't rely on Prepchecking for a long, permanent gain.

In the first place you could make a long permanent gain, perhaps with Prepchecking, if auditors would go deeply enough. And it isn't that the Prepchecking will not produce results, it's just that the auditor isn't producing a long, permanent gain with Prepchecking.

Nevertheless, this does not drop Prepchecking out of your lineup, a long way from it. Let's use Prepchecking at the depth the auditors are using it and that they're being successful with it. Now, this is the basic formula on which I would audit a pc today. I would establish whether or not the pc was getting tone arm action and then would adjudicate my future course on that basis. I'm not even telling you how you would have established this, don't you see? And get into 3D Criss Cross as soon as I was sure that the pc would get tone arm action and that his rudiments stayed in easily.

In other words, I'd get on 3D Criss Cross as soon as I auditorily could. See, I'd get to it as soon as I could. I'm talking now as though you were auditing a pc in an HGC or in your own practice, something or other. That's the way I'm talking right now. I'm not talking about, necessarily, how we would audit a pc here or how you have to audit a pc.

I'd establish this fact and if tone arm action was liberal and present I would get into 3D Criss Cross at once and sail from there, doing just standard, flawless, 3D Criss Cross. And I would get myself at least twenty lines. And in case I forget to mention it, 3D Criss Cross items are most beneficial, apparently, if oppterm at once. In other words, if you get a line, oppterm it so that you don't have lines without two items. In other words don't keep letting them slide. Apparently this thing goes together better and runs better if it's done this way.

That is almost an opinion, don't you see? I mean, that it—it's better that way. All right, it can easily be done the other way, but apparently it's much easier on the pc, gives the pc much better gains. His attention is right there on half of it so therefore you can get the other half rather easily and so forth. And it'll probably save you auditing time, make the pc more comfortable and there are apparently quite a few advantages to doing this. Okay? That's just as almost an aside.

But you get about twenty items—twenty lines rather and then you’ve got twenty lines, you’ve got forty items, haven’t you? So you’d wind up with forty items. Now, somewhere along this line with this many lines, you would undoubtedly have reached practically every part and parcel of the bank one way or the other.

Now, I’d go back and get the third item for the lot by assessment.—See, I’d just go over these twenty items. I’d just read them off to the pc and see which was bouncing the hardest and I would oppterm it. Neglecting that one now I’d see which one was now bouncing the hardest and I’d oppterm that until I had a line—a third rack for all of them. See? Now I’ve got three for all. See? And then I’d get four for all. Then I’d get five for all. you got the idea how it could go on?

Certainly, with that liberal spread, I guarantee that along about this time you’ll be finding the pc. That’s a very broad look in expectancy of what would be a complete 3D Criss Cross. It’d get complete along about that time. You’d wind up—you’d wind up with a crosscut saw and it oppterm timber. And then you would get timber oppterming a crosscut saw. And everything would start to cone down to this is what you got. And these were the items. And the pc was being the crosscut saw. And about that time he’d exteriorize from the crosscut saw and he’d be able to get into his body and the . . . You’ve got various things that could go on from there, don’t you see.

But actually you’re getting down—what you’re doing is looking for the thing which the pc has been and which he has been interiorizing into as. See, he’s been this thing. He’s been this thing for ages. And really, it’s the first thing he’s been. Shades of the Rock. See, the Rock was the first thing the pc had been. you got the idea?

So, of course, if you get the thing—first thing that the pc had obsessively been, that is the last thing the pc will look at and exteriorize from.

Now, that’s a theoretical map of 3D Criss Cross without doing any auditing of the items.

Now, you’ll find that sooner or later your situation is going to change and your early items will deintensify. They’ll start to drop out and the bank starts to fall apart and things that were reading now aren’t reading, you know, you get that idea? Only your last lineup reads. The early lineups no longer read. There isn’t enough charge left in the bank to make them wiggle. See?

Now

, to do that I would use, basically, Prehav—the Prehav Assessment and lines from the Prehav Assessment. I would use all the suppressor lines—pardon me, then I’d use the flows lines and then I would use the suppressor lines. Any other kind of a line that seemed to have worked out as being a good line, I’d just get a good sampling of others—a lot. But they would be dominantly suppressors, flows and prehavs. See, they’d mostly amount to those three lines—those three types of line. That’d give you lots. That’d give you lots to work on. I can fully expect that I’ll come up with some even hotter lines, you know, that you say, “List this,” and the pc disintegrates in the chair.

But nothing would change with regard to the procedure. The procedure is the same, what you’re doing is the same and that’s all standard, see. Where you get your lines from, this could remain a bit of a variable, without disturbing the whole lineup at all. All right.

Now, that’s—that’s like this, see. We set the pc down and we look it over and the needle’s live and it isn’t scratchy and the pc’s rudiments go in and we ask him some questions about this and that and he gets some tone arm action, and we say fine and we just go right into listing and we’re off to the races and we get twenty lines and oppterm each line that we get. And that would be the way we would clear somebody, see?

All right, that's fine, that's the way I'd do it. I'd make the test to find out which way this thing went. I wouldn't particularly depend on profiles and I wouldn't depend on anything else. I'd just want to see that tone arm wiggle.

Now, I'm not telling you at this time the best method of finding out if the tone arm will wiggle. Because I wouldn't—I don't know it. I haven't investigated it on a whole bunch of pc's that have never been audited before and found what was the best way to test whether or not the line was wiggling. But fortunately you're not faced with that very often. You generally have a bit of history on this pc that you're doing and if you don't have a bit of history on the pc, why, you could do several things. You could give him a—start to give him a Problems Intensive or something like that. And you're going to find out if that thing is going to move, see? Anything that will establish whether or not the rudiments can be put in and the tone arm will move. See, any way you could establish that would tell you, "That's fine, we'll go on and do 3D Criss Cross," or, "Now, let's get to the crux of the situation—heh, we'll do something else, *heh-eh*."

It looks something on the order of a fixed beam. It sits there and it goes beautifully from 4.75 to 5.0 and drops all the way back to 4.75 and then goes all the way up to 5.0. And this continues on, but as the session progresses the tone arm gradually drifts down so that it's reading a bit lower. But at no time is it moving. Do you see how you'd get the idea then that movement is different than drifting? Well it is slightly. A constantly rising needle, for instance, will get you a constantly increasing tone arm, you see? You can also have constantly dropping needles. It isn't motion. It's just gradual, there's nothing happening.

You might say it's tone arm action without needle read, if you can imagine this thing. These things will drift. During the course of a two-hour session, why, the pc drifts down one division of the tone arm scale. Or he drifts up. That's not what you would call motion. Motion is regulated every twenty minutes and is usually in different directions. It's going up and it's going down and it's going up a little and it's going down a lot and then it's going up a lot and down a little, you got the idea? It's not just falling, falling, falling and then it finally—this falling needle finally just sits. And if you were to continue the session to four hours it would have sat the last two hours or something like that, do you see—this is needle behavior, tone arm behavior.

The—you can tell, you can tell—it takes a little bit of observation. You can tell whether or not somebody is going to have a moving tone arm, whether their tone arm moves. It's not a very hard thing to figure out. you get used to it. you observe it. you say that's it. That's a moving tone arm and that isn't. That's all.

All right. What happens? What do you do? Well, frankly, it's not enough to just give it up. I wouldn't say, "Well, he's had it." Because we have a much better solution. And that's a combination and an alternation between Prepchecking and CCHs.

Now, you've got CCHs which all by themselves, if you observe the pc's physical origin and take it up as an origination and query it—you can make mistakes on that, you know. I found out an auditor sometimes can't see the pc's physical origins, you know. The pc's head falls off and rolls across the floor and the auditor says, "Give me that hand."

So, there is no vast shift of case while doing the CCHs, because the auditor isn't really doing the CCHs, you know. He isn't taking up the physical origins of the pc and isn't getting the pc exteriorized out of these little somatics and so forth—isn't doing a good job.

We feel a certain delicacy right now because everybody isn't doing this uniformly all that well. you know, it's something you got to get the hang of. I'm sure you can learn how to do it. But you haven't all got the hang of it yet, by a long ways.

But even if you didn't have the hang of it, you would eventually win. you get the idea. So we're operating kind of with a lead-pipe cinch here—if you combine it with Prepchecking.

Now, if you combine good CCHs with good Prepchecking, man, you've got a winner! See. But, if you combine indifferent Prepchecking—providing you miss no withholds, providing you don't run up a bunch of missed withholds on the case—and indifferent CCHs, you still got a winner. That's what we've got to count on, see. We unfortunately can't count on a perfection all along the line.

See, even indifferent 3D Criss Cross gets you some gains. And similarly, in not-too-perfect and not-too-searching Prepchecking, plus not-too-good a CCH combination will still get you wins. In other words, you—we haven't got losing processes here which is a good thing.

But it looks to me that the CCHs have to be handled as CCHs and Prepchecking has to be handled as Prepchecking. And you don't combine a session of CCH and Prepchecking. It looks to me like this is clumsy. This apparently is clumsy.

Now, a person who can't as-is things because he is being it all—you know, he's being the whole universe and he can't as-is anything—it looks to me like this person really isn't going to as-is very much on the Prepcheck and at the same time isn't going to as-is very much on the CCHs. But both of them will have some tiny workability. And they have a greater workability if interplayed.

Now, you needn't be so mathematical as Prepcheck one session, CCH one session, Prepcheck one session, CCH one session, you see, because this ratio would vary from pc to pc and therefore you can't lay it down as a textbook solution beyond this: Just what can we get done in a session? That's the whole thing. What can we get done in a session?

Of course, it'd be a terrible mistake to prepcheck—remember now, I'm talking about somebody you would audit, not here, just—you know, you sat down and you handed them the cans and you started the session and you did something, whatever, to establish what kind of tone arm action they were going to have, even get their past history and illnesses, see. That will establish tone arm action. You know, do your Preclear Assessment Form and keep a good record of the TA action on it—whatever you're going to do. And you said, "This isn't much, man. This isn't very much. When we're talking about the past and his thinkingness, it isn't very much."

Now, you might get good TA action as long as he was talking straight to you and you were doing some kind of a two-way comm basis where he was trying to tell you about something and his attention was totally on you. you might get more TA action than you really deserve to get. So the TA action test would have to be taken on the basis of "think." It's TA action while he is thinking of something, not TA action while he is talking to you. See. So your TA action while he is talking to you doesn't mean a thing except he might have to have CCHs run, see. But TA action while you're asking him to think—that's the important action, you know?

"How many times have you been sick in your life?" You know.

Now, he says, "So-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." And you've been getting this kind of TA action, see.

You've been saying, well—he's been saying, "Oh, well uh... Let's see. Would I—would I mind talking to you? Uh—well, I—I guess I could talk to you all right. You—you seem to be—you seem to be very—very sympathetic"—the attention square on you. All right, that tone arm action—do—hardly bother—you can note it down for the record, but don't take that as your adjudication.

"Now, let's see, what uh—what—what have you—how many brothers and sisters do you have?" See.

"Well, brothers and sisters—yes, brothers and sisters, brothers and sisters, yes—uh—brothers and sisters. Oh, you want to know how many brothers and sisters I have. Let's see. *Hmmmm*,

brothers and sisters, *hmmm-hmmm, hmmm-hmmm*, brothers and sisters—well I haven't got any."

"Well, all right. Well, how many times have you been sick in your life?"

"Well, let's see—been sick in my life, sick in my life. *Mmmmmmm*, been sick—oh—been sick—long time ago. *Mmmmmmm*, I'm very healthy. I've never been sick in my whole life."

"All right. Well, good. Now, what goals have you had?" and so on.

"Well, oh, I've had quite a few goals. Not—not many recently."

It doesn't matter a damn what he's saying. Watch that tone arm, you see, when you're asking him introverted questions. That's what will count. And man, if you didn't get any more than that 3.0 to 3.25 to back to 3.0 again or if it was just a big drift up, with no confront, you know, just going up, up, up, up—the more you ask him about think, you know and so on. And you notice you have to keep setting the thing and so on. Twenty minutes have gone by, you've gotten 7.75 in twenty minutes, you betcha you have—it's rising. And he's getting out of there. He's just gone past Arcturus by about now. And you audit him for an hour and he's up to here someplace, and so forth, and gradually comes on up. See, that's not tone arm action, that's drift. See, tone arm action is this way. Drift is just consistently up or consistently down. See.

All right, you would say: "Brother, we've had it." That's what you'd say because you know several things. One, you know the rudiments are not going to stay in. That's what you know. And if you have to put them in, my God, it's like driving stakes with a candy stick, you know? Trying to lay railroad rails, you know, with chewing gum. *Psssst*. You know you've had it there, see. So you're not getting adequate tone arm motion.

And so you would say that we is going to do two things with this pc. We're not necessarily going to go off and do nothing but slog CCHs. We're going to do CCHs and Prepchecking on this pc. That's what we is gonna do. And we're going to do CCHs and then we're going to prepcheck in the direction of trying to get his rudiments in. And a session of CCHs is a session of CCHs and a session of Prepchecking is a session of Prepchecking and neither the twain shall mix.

I told you a little while ago I didn't know anything much about this. Well, I've seen a little bit about it, I haven't gain—haven't gained an awful lot of information concerning it but it just looks clumsy. I don't know that it's bad. But I have found out that TA action on the CCHs at first test, appears to be very good in spite of the fact that TA action is probably lessened by the tester jumping in with the E-Meter every few minutes. Apparently it's very good on a case that ordinarily wouldn't get much TA action. We haven't finished that study either, but the first indicators on the thing are that it's very good, your TA action on the CCHs. You don't get a chance to observe it you know, because you haven't got a long enough lead.

The auditor down in Joburg who kept coming back to the Dir Mat and asking for a longer lead on his cans. Finally they blew up. "Longer lead? What the hell! How many feet do you need?" You know?

"Well, I have to have enough feet, because it's going to have to reach across the room, you know, and so forth. When the pc's doing 8-C he moves across the room, back and forth."

Nobody up to this time—nobody had ever told this poor auditor that he didn't use these, see? He'd just assumed that if it was auditing you had an E-Meter and that was all there was to it. They sure were baffled around there, while he was asking for these longer and longer cords, though. Imagine it was embarrassing when the pc did a turnaround, you know, wrap them around . . .

But anyway—anyway this indicator is here. We've been just handing a pair of electrodes and getting the tone arm position of the pc and then he goes on for awhile. And we've been doing it against an arbitrary time period, you see—every three minutes, I think it was. And whatever the pc was being made to do, we just interrupted and handed him the electrodes. And the TA action's pretty good.

Well, that's fine. That's fine. But I have found this out about the CCHs; that if CCHs turn into a wrestling match, the auditor's missed a withhold. Simple. Interesting thing to find out, isn't it? If it becomes a wrestling match, the auditor's missed a withhold. Well, so there you are. How are you going to get a withhold off a pc who is doing the CCHs? Well, you're going to do it by doing the CCHs. If it becomes a wrestling match in that session and you go out of two-way comm with the pc and you can't talk him back into it again, it's a wrestling match, that's all. you finish up the session. And then you go and next session, why, you're going to do Prepchecking—particularly on the Zero question, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" or "Has a withhold been missed on you?" And you go ahead and straighten this out.

Now, supposing you can't straighten this out in one session? Supposing you're leaving him way down the track and all hung up? Well, then you, of course, do Prepchecking for two sessions. And then if you're—got the E-Meter cord all wrapped around your neck by that time and you can't get out of that and it just seems like you're hanging yourself, you'd better go back to the CCHs if you didn't clean it up in two. I wouldn't go running a marathon, here. I think the zenith would be about three before you went back to the CCHs, because you're handling somebody who probably has a poor ability to as-is, see? And you can bury him deep, man. you can really push him down for the third time by doing or making him think, think, think, because he isn't getting much tone arm action.

Of course, you're prepchecking against no tone arm action to amount to anything, so you're liable to be in trouble. But nevertheless, you'll pick up enough missed withholds so he isn't all that mad at you and he'll make enough gain toward present time in the CCH—next CCH session you run on him, so he isn't all that out of present time and that seems to be going along very smoothly. And now your CCHs seem to be pretty well flattened out on this pc. You've done maybe three sessions and they all appear to be kind of—a little bit more even, you know, and so forth. And it looks like you get minimal change. Right? So, let's go back to Prepchecking. See? Let's prepcheck him. And we get something a little bit flat, feeling a little bit easier about it and so forth—actually running the Prepcheck through a change to a no-change, same way. Let's go back to CCHs after that.

Optimum, would be of course, to follow the Auditor's Code and to prepcheck him as long as he was producing change—to CCH him as long as he was producing change. And if you get too involved or too upset on making up your mind *when*, well, just follow the Auditor's Code on it and it'll be all right.

That, by the way, may not be optimum. You may be burning more time up than you should be burning up, but in the final analysis that would get you there, you see. Because if you did that to—in *extremis* you might find yourself doing 60 hours of CCHs and then 50 hours of Prepchecking, whereas you might have been able to make the whole gain in 50 hours of Prepchecking and CCHs, instead of the 110, you see? It might be that much faster.

In the first place, you're treating them independently, not as two different processes. I say, the theoretical method of doing it would be to flatten the CCH approach and then flatten the Prepcheck approach and then flatten the CCH approach, and so forth. And if you're—if you get too much in a quandary about what to do with the pc, fall back on that one, see?

But you could also run it this way. Pick up a gain—here's another way to adjudicate it, rather than arbitrary times—pick up a gain on the pc in Prepchecking and be happy about it and pick up a gain on the CCHs and be happy about it and pick up a gain on the Prepchecking and be happy about it—making a whole session, do you see? Not running half and half, but making a whole session. If you're going to CCH, do a whole session of CCH, you see. If you're going

to prepcheck, do a whole session of Prepchecking. But try to bring the thing up to a gain. And I don't care if it tapers off and he's kind of restimulated at the end of the session or not.

But nevertheless he had a win in that session, see? That's fine, well, let's do some CCHs. In other words, gain, gain, gain, gain. you know, alternate on the thing. You'll probably get it fine. you find yourself sometimes doing two consecutive sessions of CCHs and three consecutive sessions of Prepchecking and one session of CCHs and two sessions of Prepchecking and you see how—what I mean? But you're processing him toward a gain and a win.

Now, what direction are you processing him? You're actually processing him into rudiments in. And that is your goal. Now, if you get rudiments in, you're going to get tone arm action. And that's the secret of it all. Not rudiments beaten in, you see, you're not going to get tone arm action. But, if the rudiments are actually in and he's really happy about being audited and he's happy about the environment and he's happy to have you as the auditor and so forth, you're going to get tone arm action. Because you're not getting tone arm action because the rudiments aren't in.

His rudiments aren't in in life. He can't talk to people, he can't—including you. And he can't be in a room, he can't—including this one! See? And people have missed withholds on him, they have. Not only his boss and his wife, but you too. See? And also the cops sometimes.

In other words, the rudiments of life are so wildly out that the person never really can slide into session because they're so out in life. So of course, he can't ever relax enough to as-is anything You know, he can't look at anything else except what he's in.

He's walking around in a mass and he's so fixedly and so constantly in this mass that only the problems of the mass are the problems of life. The problems of life are the problems of the mass, don't you see. He has a certain number of problems. Dogs bite you, wives desert you, walls fall on you, you see? And you've got to tell half-truths, you see, because untruths are vital to the situation, you see? And if you don't impress everybody with the fact that you're sane, why they'll know you're crazy, see. And this is life, to him. And his difficulties are simply a long parade of out-rudiments.

See, they aren't just out in the session, they're out on the street and on the bus and at work and at home and so forth, you see. They're just out. Well, it'd be a pretty good trick if you got the environment quite real to him and got him feeling friendly toward people and so forth. And you'd say, gee, you know, you've just posed, really, the highest goal—actually higher than any psychotherapy has ever had on this planet. They've never really had that much goal. "Get rid of all of these bugs crawling on me" you see. That's about the highest goal psychotherapy has ever had, you know.

He'll go on believing his wife is putting poison in his coffee. And that sort of thing is just a normal course of human events, you see. But to not only get the bugs off of him, but to get the poison out of his coffee, you see and let him actually sit down to a table, you see, instead of having to stand up at a buffet and a few little things like that.

You never thought about this. That would be awfully high for formal psychotherapy. And now, we're posing this—that rooms, environment, people—he's going to be comfortable in all of this? He's going to be comfortable in space? And he's not going to be bugged up all the time, every time he goes anyplace. And he's going to feel all right in crowds and . . . Hey, wait a minute! We're getting up to a higher goal than psychotherapy has ever had. Aren't we? And yet you know you could do all those things with the routine I'm laying down for you here, you see, the CCH and the Prepcheck. You could accomplish them all, not even going very drastically into the case, just doing it by textbook.

Take your Prepchecking and take your Zero questions—are simply your rudiments questions. And any subdivision of them that you happen to care about as your Zero A. And then actually

find a withhold before you go asking him the What. And then ask the What as a chain and clean it as a chain. You'll find out this will work pretty good if you do it that way, see. I'm not asking you to do some extraordinary piece of this and that.

Now, of course this person is not going to have very much tone arm action the first time you do the prepchecking on him. It's going to be very small. But you're going to follow this with the CCHs. You're going to put in that first rudiment with the CCHs, but good! Going to get him used to his environment, you see? That's one of the rudiments. So you got to get that one going. And then you're going to get these other Zero questions sort of cleaned up, particularly missed withholds. But missed withholds is not really part of the rudiments. Missed withholds is actually something you introduce in at odd intervals.

Now, let's look at this. Let's look at this. We take a pc. We don't care if he's been audited or not been audited, except for this: If he's been audited and you've got accurate session sheets on him, you can look at these session sheets and make a guess at whether or not he gets tone arm action on think processes. And if he doesn't get lots of tone arm action on think processes, we know where this case has got to go. This case is going to go into Prepchecking and CCHs right away. But when I say lots of tone arm action, I mean *lots* of tone arm action. This tone arm action is *good*. see what I mean? He really got good, nice, tone arm action. No monkey business about this thing, you see. It's not mediumly fair tone arm action I'm now talking about, you see, 0.5 divisions. Oh, by the way, in doing his past 3D Criss Cross, he might have had times, let's say, in the fourteen sessions he has had on 3D Criss Cross that you have a record of, in eleven of these sessions he got no tone arm action and—to amount to anything, but in three he got good tone arm action. CCHs and Prepchecking for that boy. He got eleven sessions with good tone arm action and three sessions with no tone arm action, probably continue him on 3D Criss Cross and see how it goes. you see? Because you sometimes have cases hanging on a certain line.

The line—you're taking it inopportune. There's no motion on that particular line to amount to anything. It's unreal to the pc and so forth. That could cause minimal tone arm action. But, of course, this wouldn't happen very often, would it? So just to the degree that that wouldn't happen very often that's acceptable action for a 3D Criss Cross, you see? Eleven in which he got fine tone arm action and three in which his tone arm action wasn't worth looking at. See, well that's probably 3D Criss Cross. Let's keep it going. For sure 3D Criss Cross—fourteen sessions he has had with lovely tone arm action on all fourteen. Obviously we do the fifteenth session with 3D Criss Cross. You see? The 100 percent would be the lead-pipe cinch.

Now, this is—this is adjudications of what you run. But I'm talking now about somebody that you would run where you are—are out, just auditing a pc. Pc comes in and signs up, you turn him over to a staff auditor. You expect the staff auditor to audit this on him, see. You'd adjudicate this. You'd see the pc had no tone arm action worth beans. Now you'd say, well, let's get real clever here and let's pull this pc up, first by lifting the right side and then by lifting the left side and then by lifting the right side and left side, even though it's one millimeter at a time. We're going to lift it in a somewhat balanced fashion. We're going to get the think rudiments in, balanced against the environmental rudiments, see? Exterior rudiments are going to be balanced against the interior rudiments.

See, extrovert-introvert—the old formula of ACC 1. And they pull up kind of equally. And you'll find out that they'll both come up then. Of course, his havingness will run down if you make him think only. And his rudiments will start going out more and more furiously. You realize that the more a pc is having difficulty, the more difficulty he has. That's a hell of a thing, but it actually snowballs like mad. you realize the longer it takes you to get a 3D Criss Cross item, the longer it's going to take you to get a 3D Criss Cross item. See, the longer, the longer. Works in reverse—the shorter, the shorter! But the longer it takes you to do a 3D Criss Cross item and the longer it takes you to get an overt or something like that in Prepchecking, the less likely you are to get it. And the more likely you are to have the rudiments go out. See, the longer it takes the more the rudiments go out, is what this is all about. That's because length drifts in the direction of no auditing.

You see, it's more auditing to get an item a week, you see, than to get an item a month. That's obvious, isn't it? Well, if you look at an item a month session going—unthinkably enough there have been them—an item a month session—you never saw such a cat's breakfast in your life. It's the most ghastly looking mess. Down toward the end of the last two, three—about the last two weeks or ten days of that the pc's—the auditor knows the pc's rudiments are out because the pc has picked up the chair and splintered it with a crash, all over the auditor's head, you see. He'd say, "Oh, oh, the rudiments are out."

It's a fact! The longer it takes the longer—the more they go out and the more violently they go out. In other words the longer it takes the less chance you have of getting it. This will become recognizable to you some day. You'll get a big reality on this thing. You all of a sudden do an item up in three days. They're all items with long lists, yes it takes awhile to do an item in a long list and so on. Pcs also go *bang* and other things happen and the bottom goes out from underneath them on some things and so forth, all in the line. It slows it down, you see.

Well, when this stretches out to a couple of weeks, you're already in bad trouble. That's getting nasty. That's getting real bad. Because from here on after, I'd say eight or nine days, the rudiments just go progressively out because you're approaching a no auditing, see.

And rudiments are most out on the least auditing. And they're most in on the most auditing. That is to say, the more the pc feels he's getting audited, the less the rudiments will go out. And as a session approaches this no-auditing thing, the auditor's sitting there and the pc's sitting there but nothing's getting done. And as the session begins to approach that *reductio ad absurdum* of no auditing, why of course, similarly, the rudiments go out in proportion to no auditing, see, until the rudiments are—go more wildly out than they are out in the normal operating life of the pc, see? You know, a session can go—rudiments in a session can go further out than they are out on the person. You see?

The degree of responsibility he's accepting for an environment shows that he has to put on a good show while he's walking down the street and riding in the bus and that sort of thing. And in a session he hasn't got that degree of responsibility restraining him and the rudiments go out further than they're out.

Now, if you inspect this carefully, you'll see then, that there is every reason to audit in the direction of wins. The pc at first is giving you extraordinary and extravagant goals. You can almost tell the state of a pc by reading the goals he sets up for the session. Not the goals for life or livingness, the goals he sets up as his session goals. Sets up as a session goal "Well, I'd like to be able to make the sun spin faster." Yeah, that's his session goal. That isn't an LOL, it's a session goal. Perfectly all right as an LOL, but that's what he's set up for the auditor to do! Now, this pc has got the *overt* of setting *up loses* for the auditor. Do you see that? And the pc equally will absorb *loses* from the auditor. See, it's the overt-motivator sequence at play. Not that he has set up a lose for the auditor, but that he would, as represented in the goals, you see, shows that you have somebody who is just a sponge for loses. Now, we get down to the feather brush for the win. This person would at first believe that a good effect, you see, would be the basis of the house dropped on his head. Then he'd know that happened. And he actually will beg to have the house dropped on his head. He wants the big effect. He wants it all to happen now. Got to be instantaneous and it's got to be big.

And do you know, when you get a pc like that the only effect he can have is the feather brushed gently back of his head; not in front of his face, but brushed gently back of his head. He can—he can just get the effect of the wind of that feather. And that will be all the effect he can have. But the funny part of it is he can have that effect.

In other words, the worse off the pc the tinier the gradient of win. And you're actually raising him up little by little. And be perfectly content to raise him up little by little, because you'd be surprised what they consider wins. But they won't actually—you could change the pc that he

had the form of an angel. Wings complete! Halo in neon! Just give him an *utter* complete change in the session, where he was in *terrific* euphoria, everything else. Pc would never find out about it. you think I'm kidding, but the pc couldn't have that much effect.

The pc's told you that he has to have that much effect. Don't ever buy it, because he couldn't have it. Pc at the end of the session is absolutely glowing. He has some feeling in his elbow and he hasn't had any feeling in his elbow for some time. Feeling in his elbow. He can feel his fingers on his elbow. Terrific. It's a big gain. You'd be surprised. Terrific gain.

He has actually remembered back below the age of twelve. He has actually remembered something before the age of twelve—terrific win. Of course he tells you he wants to clear up the whole track in just this session. He can't have that effect. Just the fact that he has said that he's got to have that in this session tells you he can't have it as an effect. It's before the age of twelve. And he finally remembers a car that his father had when he was eight. And he comes out at the end of that session, Prepcheck session, absolutely glowing! Marvelous session, you see!

You—you were trying to find a missed withhold on him, you know? You were trying to get something done! No, no. It's that little tiny effect, but he could have that effect. Ah, he's winning. It's all confidence. Confidence. Confidence. And if you continue to be consistent and not surrender to this demand for the tremendous effect. And go on and get—give the pc the effects you know the pc can have and go on and give the pc his wins on the environment and go on and give the pc his wins in his thinkingness, why, man, they'll come up by those tiny little gradients. Millimeter on the right and a millimeter on the left, millimeter on the right and that's how you build the Empire State Building You've got to put up one block at a time.

Pc comes in and says, "I want this building sitting here 13,764 feet and 3 inches high, in this session!" And you get a broom and you sweep off one corner of one sidewalk block. And he says, "What do you know, maybe someday there will be a building here." He didn't ever think so before.

All right, so the best adjudication is win on the one, win on the other one, win on the one, win on the other one.

Now, the worse off a person is, the longer it's going to take to get a win. But I sure wouldn't try to prepcheck the pc session after session after session and then CCH him session after session after session. See, I wouldn't stretch it out real long. I'd settle for little tiny wins, you know. And it might be—amount to a session of Prepchecking to a session of CCHs or a session of Prepchecking to three sessions of CCHs or two sessions of Prepchecking to one session of the CCHs, you see. That's what it would maybe settle down to. But it would be what it would be for that pc. You'd see these little wins stacking up.

Next thing you know, there's two things going to happen. The pc's going to get tremendous confidence in his auditor if his auditor is consistent. He's going to get tremendous confidence in this auditor. And then you're going to see tone arm action. Because he's going to get confidence in his environment. He's going to get some hope that something can happen. What you've done actually is sell him some hope. Done no more than that. He sees that the auditor's consistent, he sees the environment doesn't all of a sudden go out of plumb. This pc's been expecting all of his life for all the corners of the room, you see, to get into a rhomboid tetrascrewdrone! And he knows that it probably won't happen as long as the auditor's there.

Whatever it is, you build this little thing up, stack by stack by stack and the next thing you know, why, your pc has got enough confidence. When you see he's got enough confidence, he'll actually start to look around. He will see that he doesn't have to be all of the things he is being in order to survive; that he can look at one of them. See, out of the 8,000,000 things he

is being he can now look at one, while being only 7,999,999 things, you see. That moment you will start to see tone arm action.

See, your tone arm action occurs when he's able to observe. He'll find out that it's safe to look at the auditor. So you'll see tone arm action. This isn't as—isn't either difficult nor complicated and you can make it easily much more difficult and much more complicated than it actually is, because the processes you're using are absolute killers!

I mean Prepchecking just used as Prepchecking, I mean—I mean you're—all you're going to use it for is to build up a little bit of confidence of talking to you about his difficulties. Thing is totally capable, if you dug deep enough and so forth, of practically resolving his case. And you're going to use it to straighten it up so he can talk to you about his difficulties, huh?

And the CCHs which can blow a psychotic straight through electric shocks and bring him up the other side bright and smiling and so forth—you're going to use them so that they can tolerate the auditing room. That isn't asking very much of the process, is it? Something like shooting grasshoppers with atom bombs. You see? And all you have to do is do the processes right.

Now, in this particular class we have not had the consistent case win going up the line that we had while we were doing a lot of Prepchecking. See? We were getting more gain proportionately, while we were doing quite a bit of Prepchecking. There's two reasons for that. Prepchecking gave the auditors a great deal of experience with the E-Meter and getting rudiments in. It had that virtue as a training mechanism. And it also tended to give the pcs a lot of wins of the very small win nature that they could accept. Now, you're running into the difficulty that the pc doing the CCHs is getting his rudiments out. So you better fill that gap with the Prepchecking. That isn't just for training reasons, that's for the case's reason, don't you see.

Now, how often you prepcheck this pc and how often you do CCHs on this pc on this course, we won't adjudicate totally at this moment. But the auditor's suggestions on any particular pc he or she is auditing, you see, are definitely invited on the auditor's report—what they think they ought to be doing next. Be monitored perhaps by space, by room—tend to get routinized more than it ordinarily would be.

The reason we get off of that sort of thing, is we like to have a unit for what is going on. We like to have a CCH unit and we like to have a Prepchecking unit and we like to have a 3D Criss Cross unit, don't you see? But the difficulties of this is, is some people are all ready to do, as cases, 3D Criss Cross. And some people are all ready to grind along, you see, on a—on a Prepcheck-CCH routine of some kind or another.

If we could just get this person's missed withholds off on the number of things which they've done to pcs, you see, and other auditors have missed on them, he'd straighten out and run like a bird, you see, on the CCHs or something. You know? It's the case put-together. Or he'll actually straighten out and run like a bird on 3D Criss Cross. So you can't have a total relaxation of this thing, because all auditors have to have some reality on CCHs and 3D—and Prepchecking as well as 3D Criss Cross, you see?

You're going to run into tougher cases off this course than you will find on it. So therefore—therefore, it's actually comprised of two auditing units. And the two auditing units consist of the CCH-Prepcheck unit and the 3D Criss Cross unit. So that people are—can be in those grades and pushed from one to the other. And regardless of whether they had tone arm action or not, could be expected to find themselves in the Prepcheck-CCH unit early in their trainings.

Now, what would happen if a pc went all to pieces on 3D Criss Cross and we got no tone arm action? They were all tied up and we didn't know which end this thing was going we couldn't keep the rudiments in. This would be in your own practice or here in this unit, so forth. The

only one thing that you could do with him is put him back on the other routine, isn't that right? You could transfer these things around.

But if you remember the lectures on interior-exterior, introvert-extrovert and so forth, you will see that there is good reason in theory and apparently in practice here, to use the CCHs and Prepchecking as a pair. There's good reason to do this. And I think it would speed up the progress considerably.

Regardless how it's used on this unit, regardless of what you'd walk into on this unit in this particular direction, that is, at the moment, how I would recommend that a pc be processed in an HGC. That's without any training considerations involved, without any auditor skill considerations involved. If we had all that perfect and set up, I would see that pcs were audited just the way I have described in this lecture. Okay?

Thank you.