

The Clearing Congress Lectures
Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.

CLEAR PROCEDURE: CCH-0, HELP

A lecture given on 5 July 1958

Thank you. I've been informed we're having a Congress down at the Shoreham and I just found out about it, and I'm a little bit late, but I wanted to come down and tell you a couple of things I've learned lately, if you want to hear them. That's what's known as running the Effects scale (laugh). The next two hours are going to concern themselves, now that we have led up to it rather carefully, going to concern themselves with Clear Procedure and this I trust, if you're not Clear already in the next few months, this will concern you intimately. Okay? I want to give you the rundown, the exact processes, and the commands, in order to Clear homo-sap. Okay? Alright!

The first things are the conditions of auditing: First requisite – a preclear. Next requisite – an auditor. Next requisite – a place to audit. Even if you have to make the space, you have to have a little place to audit in. If you're doing this out in some other universe, why remember that. It might be a universe around with no space in it. The State Department, I think, has a universe with no space in it (laugh). They're in Germany all the time, or some place.

Now the auditor, as I have talked about in the last hour, should have a pretty good idea of this thing called the Auditor's Code and he should be pretty well drilled on his TRs. This is particularly so of Clear Procedure because you're using processes which have teeth. and if you flub on this one, why it's a little more important a flub than it is, "Well, recall a time you communicated with someone. That's fine. Recall a time you communicated with someone. Recall a time when ... er...you talked to somebody...ah...er, oh I forgot to acknowledge you the last time, didn't I? Ahem...well, recall a time, recall a time, let's see...what's the command, recall a time when you said something". You'll still get away with it, you'll still get away with it, running that process. "How could you help another? how could....what was that command?" .. ssssst... (hand rising up), PCs temperature (laugh).

Now the first process, of course, involves the session itself which is CCH-0. You must remember that there are some sub-processes that are sometimes necessary in Clearing someone. CCH-1, CCH-2, CCH-3, CCH-4, what are those processes? CCH-0 of course, simply opens the session. It's the various things that you ask. You say, "What goal do we have for this session?", "Is it alright if I audit you?". These various preliminaries such as start of

session, you know a lot of people forget that. They forget to start a session that's been going on for three or four hours, and they all of a sudden say, say you know, I never started this session. Let's start the session now (laugh). Of course, you've never done this (chuckle). Some people talk and talk and talk and talk and never do start a session. But CCH-0 is merely the techniques involved in starting a session. That's the only thing that is involved in CCH-0 except one, and that is Present Time Problem.

Now we get right down to auditing a person to Clear and this one we have to confront and take up. All procedure being good, all agreements being established and everything, we take up this one, present time problem. We take it up at the beginning of every session, no matter how many sessions there are in Clearing. I'll tell you why. Because the one thing that can keep a profile from changing or IQ from rising is present time problem. Present time problem, by definition, is some disturbance viewed by the preclear, which is occurring in present time or the physical universe right now. Now, you say his present time problem is the fact that he has a birth engram in restimulation. Oh no, that is not a present time problem because he's not being born right now. You get the idea? You say, well the present time problem is he's been divorced several times and so forth, and this is his present time problem. This is what worries him. Well don't get the idea that what worries the preclear is a present time problem. Present time problem is a particular item. It's something that's going on in the physical universe right now. It has terminals, it has location, it's disturbances are actual, and the preclear can be so involved with it that he never gets into the auditing room and therefore he never gets any benefit from the auditing and you're wasting your time as an auditor because his profile, demonstrably, will stick right where it was until that present time problem is out of the room.

A person has actually been audited for five consecutive intensives, without the auditor clearing a present time problem, with no slightest gain in processing. That is the chief reason why there is no gain on profiles because the preclear had a present time problem and it was constant, going on all the time auditing was happening, and the auditor never straightened it out. Well the preclear is out there at the oil factory or some place or another, he's not there in the auditing room. Now there's, there's an interesting fact, that you could absolutely stall Clearing an individual by not handling a present time problem. You might be able to break the Code here and there, you might be able to flub a process, you might be able to run a TR upside down and backwards, and never acknowledge, or something of the sort, you still might Clear somebody, but I'm guaranteeing, you will not Clear somebody if you leave a present time problem in restimulation. That's how serious that one is. It's right there and it's definitely a part of Clearing Procedure.

Now, when you start to clear a present time problem on a preclear, very interesting, you say, "What are you worrying about?", "What are you worrying about?" or, "Is there anything worrying you?", or any other statement you care to make or question you care to ask on this sort of thing, quite ordinarily will not be answered, on a serious present time problem, in the affirmative, the first answer. That was very interesting, so you say to the individual, "A present time problem, now, do you have a present time problem?". "Is there anything worrying you?". You say, "Well, that's fine, we can get on with the session can't we (chuckle). If he's really up to here (touching throat) in enturbulance in the physical universe,

he'll say, "No, nothing worrying me, no. I'm all detached from it all. I'm above such things; of course I can go on being audited. I can put it out of my mind". You say, "Well, what can you put out of your mind?". "Well, my house burned down this morning, and my children are still there standing on the street, but that's alright, if I get audited, I can take care of it a little bit better, so let's get on with it." Aw! Sometimes you have to beg for fifteen minutes to find one of these problems and find out what it's all about. That's the truth! You have to sit right down and beg, as an auditor, to get this person to be honest enough to tell you that he's in trouble. A funny part of it is, the present time problem very often will not seem very important. He got a traffic ticket this morning; he's got to go down to court after the session. It isn't anything, so we could let it go, couldn't we? You start auditing it and you find out it's got bite to it and it will clear. But supposing you neglected it, then all during the session you keep asking the preclear what he's looking at now, and what he's thinking about, and so forth, and he says, oh nothing, of course, he says, I see a jail and policemen (laugh). Quite fascinating, quite fascinating.

An individual who gets then involved with plus randomness or minus randomness ... let's get real technical here. What's plus or minus randomness? Well, to people that weren't in the first ACC, that weren't at Philadelphia, you know, they have trouble with this, but it's very simple. Minus randomness is bored stiff with nothing to do and plus randomness is going around in small circles that nobody could possibly do the banks of (chuckle). In other words, there's too much going on or too little going on and the preclear considers it an abnormal state of motion. Either too little or too much, and either one of these things is a present time problem. There is something going to happen. Well, of course, there's something going to happen if he's going to have dinner that night, but he doesn't happen to consider that a problem. So, it's what the preclear considers it a problem after you've beaten his silly head in to get him to admit he got one, and it's better to be very careful and very insistent, much better to be very careful and very insistent than it is to just brush it off because the direction you can err is neglected. You can't err in the direction of beating it to death unless, as some auditor did the other day, and I'd be ashamed to say who it was. I told him there was probably a present time problem on the case that wasn't flat. So he ran it for five hours, four and a half hours after the preclear said it was totally flat, and wondered then why the preclear remained out of session for the next two days. In other words, the auditing session became a present time problem. That's a disobedience of the Auditor's Code. The process was no longer producing change and the auditor continued to audit it, ad nauseam. This is a PT problem run the wrong way.

A PT problem run right is run very simply. There are various ways to run a present time problem. How long do you run it? Until the preclear ... oh, this sounds very funny, sounds very funny to some practical get up and do individual ... until the preclear no longer has to do something about it. That's how long you run a PT problem.

I remember I was talking to you about spheres of influence in an earlier lecture. The great oddity is, if you flatten a present time problem, it quite often ceases to be a problem in the physical universe, not only does it cease to be a problem where the preclear is, but it ceases to be a problem over here. It is so much the case that we have one on record where the wife was a dipsomaniac, that's where they keep dipping into the old man's pocket book to run down to the liquor store, and the preclear was audited on present time problem. Why? Well

definitely, it definitely was a present time problem because the wife, at the time the preclear was being audited, had just got through busting up most of the furniture and so, a bit of a PT problem. The pc was rather disturbed and the auditor sat down and beat this thing through, "On what part of that problem could you be responsible for?" That is, by the way, the optimum technique to run a present time problem if it can be run on the preclear. Sometimes it's a little high for him. "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?", is the exact auditing command and the only auditing command for clearing a present time problem. That's the optimum. Sometimes you have to get into, "Invent a problem worse than that problem", or "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem". But these, these are ... these are things ... sometimes you have to run merely locational processes, "Notice that wall", "Notice the floor", "Notice the ceiling" to get the pc into the auditing room. They can't even audit this PT problem, it's so strong, it's so fabulous. But the optimum one, and this will work on practically any case your working on, if the person's conscious enough to talk to you, it usually works and that's "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Well, in this particular case, the preclear was asked what part of that problem, his wife, could he be responsible for, and he was run until he no longer thought he had to do anything about. to, or with his wife. Quite a little while, it took about three hours to get this one shaken out. A couple of days later the auditor asked him, "well, how's your wife getting along?" "How are you getting along with your wife?" "Wife? we're getting along alright, yes". "Well, just how it going?" You know, pots and pans had been flying out of the window, and furniture had been breaking up, and bottles crashing on cops heads, the last time we heard about this, you see. "Oh, she's doing alright, she's straightened up now." This was reported to me, so I became interested enough to check into it at regular intervals for the next three – four weeks. She stopped drinking. She wasn't audited – he was audited but she was in his sphere of influence and she stopped drinking.

You very often find this sort of thing taking place, so much so that we still have a little test running, running problems of comparable magnitude to hydrogen bombs. We haven't completed this process (chuckle) but we're running this one on some people and some day, why somebody will ask the Defense Department, "Where do you have the hydrogen bombs stored?" and they'll say, "Hydrogen bombs, hydrogen bombs, what hydrogen bombs?" See, there's some dim possibility that if you audited this on a couple of OTs, why atomic warfare would disappear. Now, I don't want to give you any ideas and I don't want you running on anybody (laughing).

Now here's, here's our, here's our we've, we've entered the field of magic and mystery right there as to how this sphere of influence can adjust around. But the reason you audit it is so that it won't keep banging at the pc. Now, you don't solve it, you simply get the pc disentangled from it and evidently, when he is no longer a party to it, it loses the power to bite him. In other words, every time you have died, I hate to go into that, I mean the undertakers already have, but every time something very bad has happened to you, you had to consent to it first. You had to consent to get getting a finger cut off before it could be amputated. Sounds very funny, but perfectly true. It requires anyone's participation and consent before anything can happen to anyone anywhere. That's why, when we say Clearing is freedom from, you certainly do get freedom from if you run out your consent to be

shocked, maimed, diseased, and so forth. If you're no longer consenting to these things, they don't happen. Isn't this interesting?

An interesting broad look at life that we get out of something we've had for years and years and years, we've had this thing, PT problem. I don't think I've mentioned it very widely or very strongly. I don't think it's come up very often (chuckle) but a PT problem is something that has more to it than simply getting a session started. You've stopped some portion of the physical universe from banging at this pc, and it isn't so much that the pc would sit there and continue to worry about it, as the fact that this enturbulance still, evidently, has the strength and power of entering the auditing room, see, from elsewhere. If you get that, as well as the fact that the pc would continue to be worried about it and be out of session, you have more or less the truth of the condition that you would be trying to audit against, if you're trying to Clear somebody who had a present time problem. So, this one you must handle and as I say, the auditing command for it is, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?"

The first part of the process, of course, involves isolating the problem, finding out what the problem is. What is this problem? Now that, that takes some doing. I had a fellow who was very nervous and very upset. I looked at him; I found his auditor; I said, hey, what goes on here? This person, this person seems to be quite upset, he isn't often that way. Well, the auditor said, I checked for present time problem. I had him on a meter and I checked for present time problem, I didn't get any registry at all. So I grabbed a hold of the preclear and I put him on a meter. Of course he didn't get any registry, the meter was totally stuck, just like it was frozen. You could reach over and kick the pc, which I did (chuckle), you got no wobble on the meter. Well I guarantee that if you can get no wobble on the meter, the meter isn't going to tell you anything because it is stuck on what it is stuck on, and you guess from there on out. The only real liability a meter has, is you know something is wrong if the needle is stuck, but the needle doesn't cooperate with you anymore to tell you what it is. It just sticks harder, but you can't see something that is motionless get more motionless (chuckle). Now, the pc didn't have much of a PT problem. He was merely going to be operated on the following morning and didn't want to tell anybody in the organization. It left me with the problem of sitting there and having to take thirty-five minutes of my valuable time and get rid of the necessity of an operation (laughing).

This Thank you. The, the situation with regard to a session then does require that one Now, there's another thing that creeps all the way through a session – it's a sneaker. I've had a rather experienced auditor argue with me on this one. The only thing that will make a preclear drop a profile ... it's a funny thing, I say the only thing, it's the only thing I know of though, that will make a profile drop during an intensive while you're trying to Clear somebody, is an ARC Break. There's been a break of communication. The preclear no longer believes the auditor is on his side. There's been a breakdown of their affinity, their reality, their communication, and when that breakdown exists, whether it's real or imaginary, the preclear believes it's real, and auditing continues long beyond that point, you get a depression of the profile. In other words, present time problem makes it stay the same, but the ARC break with the auditor, makes it sag.

I had an auditor recently say, "Couldn't have been one, couldn't have been one, couldn't have been one, I checked it over carefully, thoroughly". I said, check it again. The auditor checked it again and something on the order of four years ago, out of session, this auditor who was auditing the same pc that many years ago, had said something the pc considered at that time, an ARC break and auditing, subsequent to that time, was depressing the profile. That's how silly pcs are (chuckle), but it was there. This auditor being a careful auditor and a good auditor, of course checked it and checked it until it finally revealed itself and we had an advancing, I'm sure, an advancing profile after that.

The point is here, that you could do something or the pc could feel that you did something or said something which was hostile and it breaks up the ARC of the session. In The Original Thesis, the first book written on this particular subject, the first published book on this subject, 1947, it gives three equations, so called: The pc less than the reactive mind, that's number one, cannot solve or handle the reactive mind. The pc is less than the reactive mind. Number two: Auditor is less than the pc's reactive mind and therefore just can't solve it. Auditor plus pc is greater than the reactive mind and so they can unravel it. Get the idea? So, as soon as you drop the auditor out ... in a present time problem we drop the pc out as a participant, you see, and with an ARC break we drop out the auditor as a participant as far as the preclear's concerned, and the reactive bank, and so forth, does not get handled. That's elementary. So these two things must be maintained: The preclear's cooperation must continue and the auditor's ARC with the preclear must continue and when these things don't continue then we get the whole thing going to pot. The funny part of it is, it is more important really, if anything, to have the auditor continue in ARC with the pc than it is to have the preclear handling his own reactive bank because, evidently, the auditor can do it better than the preclear. Because, when you drop the auditor out of the session, and yet auditing continues, you get a reduction of profile, a reduction of the factors of capability of the case, but if you just drop the pc out with a present time problem, you just get the profile staying the same. Now that's fascinating. I consider it a considerable commentary upon the necessities of ARC in a session.

Now, another thing that you must do in auditing, of course, is flatten these processes. You have to flatten them for this reason: The universe and the people out there will sooner or later start flattening them or restimulate the unflattened process – see how that could be? – and we get an unstable gain. The pc was way up and then he went out and walked around in the society, about four or five blocks, and he went way down. What would cause that? The gain was unstable and it comes about because processes have been started on the case which have not been finished and the environment runs them, only the environment isn't a good auditor, and so we get a reduction of case. In other words, an unstable gain, a gain not holding up is apparently caused by just this one thing of unflattened processes on the case.

Only Scientology can undo Scientology. Quite interesting. A person has to be audited down scale to be pushed down scale, but when a process is half way finished, was dropped when in full restimulation in an auditing session, and then the preclear walked out into the environment and tried to do his job, tried to work when he went through all of these things, something clicked that process, and it will run it the wrong way too, and he gets bad auditing on the same process, you see, and the auditing is unintentional, and it can reduce the profile. It

doesn't, however, go below where it was in the first place. Now, with these conditions existing, auditing can exist on Clear Procedure. Without these things well, there's no reason to get super-optimistic because just auditing won't happen. What does it take to make auditing happen? It, obviously, takes a good auditor and a preclear who still thinks the auditor is on his side.

Well, how do you repair an ARC break? I ran an interesting session once. This was the test session which established what havingness was in its manifestation. For half an hour I ran a process which was guaranteed to cut to pieces the mass and havingness of a pc. It was chosen with malice-a-fore-thought, as something that choked to pieces the preclears concept of mass, his concept of possession, his concept of being anything, anywhere, anyhow, and in view of the fact of being among friends, I can tell you what process this is, "Look around here and find something you could go out of communication with". That's a guaranteed killer. Now listen, please promise me you'll only run this on psychiatrists (chuckle). Now this was guaranteed to just cut everything to ribbons but I ran it for half an hour on this basis. Every time the pc would twitch, or squirm, or start to go a little bit anaten, I would say, "What have I done wrong?" The pc would say, "What have you done wrong?". "You sure I didn't do something wrong?". As a matter of fact, a couple of minutes ago there, you, when you made that noise, it upset me." There had been no noise, but each time the pc could find something wrong, and the session would come back to battery, the pc would wake up, the nervousness would drop out, the twitchy feet would go. You see how this is? In other words, I was patching up havingness with just one auditing command, "What have I done wrong?", and the pc was then permitted, little by little, to continue ARC with the auditor, even though the auditor, although the pc didn't realize it, was cutting the pc to ribbons. The auditor really was doing something wrong. The auditor was running a process guaranteed to kill anybody, and so, it becomes important then to keep the pc in session and one of the best ways of doing it is to ask the pc, when he appears to be upset, "Has something gone wrong with session?" or "Have I done something wrong?"

Well now, there's something you don't do. You say, "What have I done wrong?" and then the pc says, "Well a moment ago there when you said that command and made the mistake, and didn't give me an acknowledgement there, and dropped the book, when you did that it, why it upset me a little bit, it distracted me." I'll tell you what the auditor can do wrong at this point, what he can do wrong. He can fail to take responsibility for his action. He can say, "Well, actually the book was just teetering there and you put it there when you came in the auditing room (chuckle), and you've got a sort of an emanation coming off you that makes it very difficult for me to remember the auditing command, and it's totally natural that I would make that many mistakes". In other words, the auditor starts to shift responsibility from himself to the preclear, removes himself from the session. The second he does that, why you got it. Now he can run, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" The one shot command that doesn't work, by the way is, "What part of that bank could you be responsible for?" Isn't that a nice command? Apparently worked like mad, "What part of that bank could you be responsible for?", "What part of the physical universe, creation or destruction of, could you be responsible for?" He just went unconscious for some reason or another (laugh). Obviously, it was the perfect command. Very often we have perfect

commands originated, and then without checking them, of course, we can always be right. When we check them, we're sometimes wrong (chuckle). But, the auditor has to retain responsibility for the auditing session while the preclear recovers responsibility for his past, present, and future, and that's really what happens in this combination.

Now, given all these things, the auditor gets to the most important process ever developed in Scientology. Easily the most important process, and some of the sharpest auditors around have not heard all there is to know about this process by one awful long ways, and sitting right there, will be very surprised with this process. HELP – the most important process ever developed. Why? Because running this process – Help – will put into session, and make auditable, people who formerly weren't even vaguely auditable. Now that's just one test of it. It splits valances, it heals psychosomatic illnesses, it moves ridges out of heads, it exteriorizes preclears. It does almost anything as a single panacea process that you have ever asked of any process. Nobody's ever tried it that far. They think it's just something you audit in Clear Procedure to get it out of the road so that you can get on to something important, like step six.

Somebody said to me very, very recently, "I didn't have any idea help had that much breadth." It makes the most lovely assist you ever tried to assist anybody with. Lovely assist. A person comes in, in a normal state, homo sap, you know, got a terrible hangover – hives, you want to get him back to battery, something like that, run help. The test of help is that it shouldn't really be run on a condition, it should be run on terminals, but if you can get away with running it on a condition, which is quite interesting, gives you the command value of the process. It handles something like TNT. If you don't handle it right, your pc has had it, he's had it. Now, what are you trying to do for a pc, you're trying to help him, and the pc that never got a gain in auditing is simply wasting this commodity. That's the only thing he's doing. He came to you for help, didn't he? He said, "Oh, I'm so bad off you know, I have these horrible pains and these awful aches, and I can't see, and I can't smell, and I can't talk, and I want you to heal me all up, and so forth, and I'll pay you a lot of money if you will do this" and get all this nonsense going on. You sit down and you audit him, he sneers, and does the very things he shouldn't do, and he fakes the process, and so on. What is he doing? He's just wasting help. He cannot be helped, and Herr Doctor, Sigmund Freud, at the end of his 28th lecture, I think it was, said, "And these by us cannot be helped." "And these by us cannot be helped". This is the one thing that made him sad. There were several types of case that couldn't be helped by him – he included the sane, the insane, the (laugh) but he said, "These by us cannot be helped". Now, that becomes fascinating, when you look this over carefully, because it tells us definitely, that the case that could not be helped, is the case of course, that can't be helped. So you run help on him. (chuckle) It's one of these horrible simplicities that is just painful in its stupid simplicity.

Now, the auditor who goes along and he audits somebody, you know, out of a book, and he says, "Now, what part of this problem could you be responsible for? Thank you", "What part of this problem could you be responsible for? Thank you", "What part of this problem could you be responsible for? Thank you", and the pc says, "What did you say?" "Oh you heard the command" (laugh). So, we have an auditor who cannot help a pc, really. What's wrong with his auditing? He can't help preclears. Now in view of the fact that you run into an

awful lot of preclears who are anxious for just one thing, to convince you that you can't help them, you are liable to get the idea, after a while, that you can't help them, and this is what gets wrong with your auditing. The only thing that gets wrong with your auditing, is you can't help people.

Now what about this help? Is it therapeutic to help people or is it aberrative? Is it right to help people or wrong to help people, or shouldn't you go along in your own little cocoon, sailing on the sea of idle dreams, and let the rest of all that silly nonsense going on in the world just take care of itself. Is that right, should you help it, or leave it alone, or what should you do about it? Well, these are moral and ethical questions that have to do with you. Whether it's right or wrong for you to help somebody or not help somebody should, however, have no bearing on the fact that you have an aberration on the subject of help. You see, there could be two different things, whether you should or shouldn't help does not at all influence this other factor, could or couldn't. "I can't help him". The person who has a bad habit is always telling you, "I can't help it" (laugh).

Help, you know, is forbidden, it's illegal to help several things. Did you know that? There are twenty-five illnesses that it is illegal to help in the State of California. They are listed by the legislature. Of course, nobody's ever asked this burning question, this frying question I should say, "Is the State legislature of California capable of helping anyone?" That's the aberrative side of the question, don't you see? Capability of help is entirely independent of the duty or obligation to help. These two things should be entirely different things, and an individual cannot make up his mind on the rightfulness or wrongfulness of help so long as he himself is not totally clear on the subject of help.

Now then, fellows who run around and are criticized by their fellow man because they got to help everybody. They got to help this or they got to help that, they're always helping stray dogs, or they're always helping stray cats. I think some lady who can only help stray cats is still luckier than any policeman I ever met, who could never help anything till the end of his days. We are looking at the heart and soul of the upper dynamics when we are looking at help because this is the woof and warp of association. A man is alive so long as he can help things, and so long as he himself can be helped. If he can do this, he's alive and he's dead when he can no longer help anything, and nothing can help him. That is a new definition of death because, really, that is death when carried through to a total absolute. Definition of death, that would be the most absolute death there could be. That wouldn't be death of a body, you understand, just some light thing like that, that would really be dead.

The funny part of it is everybody responds somehow and increases on help if it is run in this right fashion. First you have to know about a bracket. What's a bracket? A bracket is the number of ways, or number of combinations that something can occur. For instance, A can give B a stick, B can give A a stick, A can hold a stick for himself, B can hold a stick for himself, B can hold a stick for somebody else other than A, this person over here, C can hold a stick for himself or for B. You get the number of combinations? You just had an idea of a stick being passed around and handed to one or another, you get the auditing command that this is run in a bracket. I think somebody added up brackets one time, and the highest series of bracket numbers I know about, I think, is 139, I think it's something like that, ways of running

a bracket. What do we call a bracket? That means to cover all possible flows – artillery term – bracket. Throws the preclear out of the water. Now, help is run in that fashion and the auditing command, is again, a very simple command, and it is no other command. It isn't invent a way to help somebody, that's not right, it's an as-ising type of command. It's a command that really erases thoughts and old postulates, and things like this. You don't care whether you're draining somebody's bank or otherwise because every time you increase a potential to help, you increase havingness. So you don't care whether you drain the bank or not.

The optimum way to run this, there's just one way to run it. Funny thing when you say there's just one way to run it, I'm talking now about Clear Procedure. I know what I know about Clearing people. I know you can people to be three feet in back of their heads and they stay Clear for two days. I know you can run engrams until they can get used to running engrams, and handle their engrams, and to have, to that degree Clear, and I know definitely this procedure is producing results when it is used with the provisos which I'm giving you. And, the Help command is: "How could ____ help ____?" Now, the blanks are filled in by the sides of the bracket. In other words, "How could you help mother?", "How could mother help you?", "How could mother help herself?", "How could you help yourself?", "How could another person help mother?" How could mother help another person?". There's another one out there, "How could another person help another person than mother?" We could keep on going out this way, don't you see, and we get these various commands. We get these enormous brackets. There's a five-way bracket, a nine-way bracket, it goes on up, as I said, there's 139 combinations ... (garbled). I think there are more than that. That was (a person's name) in England got that together for me, 139, which was page after page, page after page, and he says, "How many sides does a bracket have?", "Shall I run all these on my preclear?" (laugh). Five, five will produce adequate results. Nine is quite safe. You could get the listings of exactly what a bracket is from an HCO Bulletin.

Now, "How could ____ help ____?" You understand, you didn't ask him to dream up a new way, you didn't ask him not to dream up a new way. You just asked him, more or less, to tell you a way. Now, if you're allergic to people talking while you're auditing, and it gets you upset too much, there is an alternate command, which is still workable providing you can police it and you've got him there on a E-meter good and solid, and you're watching the E-meter. You could say, "Think of a way to help mother", "Think of a way mother could help you". You could actually run "Think of a way ...", but there's not any particular reason to because I don't think the preclear's conversation is going to aberrate you more than he ordinarily would be if you were worried about it (chuckle). If you were worried about it, it probably won't aberrate you any more than the (garbled). How could mother help you, this sort of thing that's a Now, how many ways, and different combinations, and so forth, how many things could we run this on? Well, you could say, "How could you help bacteria?", "How could bacteria help you?", "How could atomic particles help you?", "How could you help atomic particles?", "How could atomic particles help another person?", "How could another person help atomic particles?". You get the idea? "How could atomic particles help themselves?" You can actually run that and get away with it, of course probably burn up the

preclear, but you could get away with it. You get the idea? – Help. You have to settle this idea of help.

Now what happens, what gets wrong with help? Well, there are probably many other things get wrong with it, but the main one is, you tried to help somebody and failed, and after that you could think of only one thing to do, and that was kill him. Probably all savage impulses derive from a failure to have assisted. Anybody you want to kill, you couldn't help. In other words, something gets wrong with the balance of help. There is no hate so pure – not the hate of a woman scorned – but the hate of a woman who wouldn't let you be helped, or wouldn't help you, or you wouldn't permit to be helped. In other words, there's going to be something wrong with help for her to hate you. Now, maybe it was so wrong with the person in the first place, it was already wrong before they met, but certainly something happened to key it in. You wonder why you're having domestic troubles. Wife comes in, says "dear, wouldn't you like me to get your slippers?", and you say, "boy! is she rubbing it in – get me my slippers, hah, I suppose this is a fast touch for a five spot", something like that. You say, "well, wife shouldn't do that sort of thing, she's been busy all day, I feel self-conscious, the idea of her " In other words, you got an aberration on the subject of help. So you say, "no dear, no thank you". "Well, couldn't I get you a drink", she says. "No, no, not thirsty, don't bother yourself, you're tired and you've been working all day", and so forth, "just go sit down some place , you're tired, and be quiet". "Well, what would you like for dinner?" "Oh anything, anything". A few minutes later why you sit down at the table, and she throws this plate of food on the table and says, "Well, I don't know where you're going, but I'm going over to see mother for a little while", and you say, "What's wrong?" and then she and you are liable to figure out something else that's wrong, see, some other squabble. It has nothing to do with this other sequence. This other sequence was totally hidden, this causation, and you can remember that, that morning something or other happened and you refused to let her do something of the sort, or you accused her of something, you know. It will all build up on some tremendous Oedipus here that had nothing to do with the actual activity which began with a pair of slippers.

You watch it, you watch it. If you want to take your life in your hands, just as an experiment for any given twenty-four hours – make out your will, give us your next of kin – refuse every help offered you by everyone for the next twenty-four hours. Now that, that's pretty Wow! There's some stories about people doing other things for twenty-four hours, but this one would be suicidal. Everybody would be mad at you, if they didn't practically destroy you. You just refuse all help offered you. Actually it's one of the more, it's one of the more interesting things to do (laugh), and if you feel tired of life, why I advise it strongly.

I have, unfortunately, on two different occasions, not meaning to at all, having no understanding of what was going on, and not at that time having this process ... This process, by the way, was evolved for the HCA manual which was never published and probably never will be. I wrote the opening gun of it and I had to find the basic fundamental of auditing and the basic fundamental of auditing was, of course, Help. I wrote it down very glibly and wrote a nice little essay and got it all set up, and I got down to the end of the essay and I said, just a moment, let's look this over again. Oh, I said, it's not important and let it drift for three whole months before I really clamped on to it and made a thorough going test, and then,

psychosomatics started flying off, and valences started breaking up, and all sorts of miraculous things started happening with the use of this thing – Help. I only had to work for about a week to find the command it should be run with. It was quite remarkable though, it developed out of auditing itself.

Now, the individual, the individual is evidently part and parcel of existence only so long as he can stay in an exchange of assistance with it, as long as he can be of use, as long as he can have a game, or goal, or something – common denominator of all these things is Help. Now, help goes over into something very interesting. You really don't have a dichotomy, it isn't that you have help is plus and destroy is minus. This is not true – help goes into destroy, you get a help / destroy interaction, and wherever you have destruction, you had a failure of help. That's just as invariable ... (garbled). Now this dichotomy works to this degree. A fascist regime comes in, of some kind or another, and they know how to make the populace help them – give up produce, and so forth – they threaten to destroy them. For instance, there's one country, I don't know, it's not very far from here, it used to be a great state. ... (garbled) ... cave in. They have income tax, I think, there and this, this country, this country threatens to destroy you if you don't give it some taxes. See, your taxes will help that government, but their threat is to destroy you. That's the only way, they think, they can collect. They cannot help you. They're getting more and more laws forbidding them to help you. You used to be able, you could go in and lean across on the counter and say, fix up my return. Then they scribble on for a while and say, oh that's alright Joe, and so forth, and take a small amount of money, and that would be all there is to it. Now they're running Help / Destroy. Well, help/destroy goes just down to a point where it becomes destroy/destroy; and help/destroy will become destroy/destroy.

So that you get help/help; help begets help and then returns help. This is fairly sane and rather optimum. Then we get help/destroy and then help/destroy the other way, and then destroy/destroy, and clear down here we get a sub-order of insanity the like of which, well, you people in this world of course have never experienced – it's called war. Doesn't ever do anybody any good, any place, and for years afterwards, now a days, the victor is faced with the problem of helping the vanquished enough to wipe out the war, and all you win is the right to help. But that's all anybody ever wins. Now, isn't it silly for somebody to fight for the right to help when all he's got to do is to help somebody, and all he'd have to do to help somebody without liability, is to make up his mind that he was not necessarily destructible. If he assumes that he himself is relatively indestructible then he is capable of helping everybody no matter what they do. But there are people around that all you have to do is offer them some help and they cut your head off. I went into an institution and it happened. Two cases I've seen spin on this offered help proposition.

One girl walked up to me immediately after the first Phoenix Congress and she said, I've been told I should help you, and I said, well, there's nothing for you to do right now, and I just walked off and left. She went out on the street and spun in, was picked up by the police, put into a local spin bin ... (garbled). I wrote that down in the notebook as inexplicable, and only what was inexplicable, I thought for a long time, was there must have been some other event took place between my conversation with her and that spin. No, there wasn't. There is evidently no other thing necessary, I've known two such cases where it happened. They

offered help, it was refused, and they spun right in. They're on such a delicate balance of being part of the human race that they spin right out of it when they get the least inkling of the fact that they can't be of assistance. Isn't that an interesting commentary? This is how much this means to a person. This is how much of a button this is. But to You walk up to a raving psycho and you say I want to help you. Well, be sure there are no axes or ice picks, or anything around, because he'll finish you. Just offering help to him is enough for him to decide that destruction is necessary. Now, you notice there wasn't a single word I said there applicable to a national government (laugh).

Now as we look over help/destroy we begin to understand, so much that for a while as we look over the universe and find instances of this, we tend to be overwhelmed; but it's a good thing to do because almost anything equates into this help/destroy curve, almost anything. It can be added up, some part of it fundamental, can be added up on help. A person gets up in a fairly good state, they can tolerate an enormous amount of help ... Did you ever see a little kid, little Suzette right now is going through a period of not wanting to be helped, she wants to be self-sufficient. That's a good thing, a good mechanism, nothing wrong with it, but I have eventually let her help things enough that I can now help her. I don't think anybody else in the family can help her, but I can help her. Why? Because I let her help me. I don't have to dream it up either, she's gotten awfully good at it. She gets bright and polite and dignified as long as I let her help something. And, of course, there isn't any coordination between America's refusal to let children work and juvenile delinquency – not much. If you forbid them to help for years, you wonder why then they destroy everything – it's inevitable. The way to get teenagers and so forth into an awful state and get them to destroy everything, is to deny them the right to help.

So the biggest right there is, is not the right to vote, is not the right to freedom of speech, or press, or religion, or anything else. The biggest right there is in Human Rights, is the right to help. And now I just want to ask you one more question, looking at this, the index of willingness to help being the highest index in demonstration of Clearing, do you any longer doubt my statement that those people in Dianetics and Scientology are the upper tens of thousands of the population of Earth, because they volunteered to help, didn't they? Thank you!

[End of Lecture]