ROUTINE 1, 2 AND 3

A lecture given on
5 June 1961

Thank you.

If this were a formal lecture, I would be wearing a jacket and a bow tie. But I find I'm not able to talk well with a bow tie on. Keep restimulating all the people I've hanged in France.

Well now, there are a few questions before the house, I am very, very sure. So give me a question here, quick. Yes?

Male voice: You talked about what it means when a preclear comes in, a different tone arm reading than he went out at. Well, what happens if the pc comes in at about the same tone arm reading but his sensitivity has changed sharply in the meanwhile.

That's an interesting point to notice. If the pc comes in with his tone arm out, you would, of course, at once be suspicious. You always check a pc's tone arm when he leaves session – it's on your reports – and you always glance at the last reading so that your next reading, when he comes back into session again, you can check against that. And that is about the first thing you do between sessions: You look at that difference of tone arm reading; and if you find a vast difference of tone arm, you of course want to know what happened between sessions – practically even before you start one. You got the idea? It's of that order of emergency.

Now, the things I have found on pcs happening between sessions are quite interesting What do we mean "between sessions"? We don't mean overnight; we mean solely, strictly, completely and utterly if they get out of the auditor's sight *at any time* – during a break, I have known pcs to instantly go to the phone, call South Africa, or something, and tell the husband, "I have just decided you are a louse and we are through," clang, you see? And having expended forty-five quid or something like this to deliver themselves of these sentiments, come back into session again feeling very self-righteous, but won't run.

You got the idea? It didn't take them very long, but that was it, man. They got a brand-new overt. And every time a pc is having trouble with a case, this is a subject of overts and withholds.

So, now the question comes up, "What if the sensitivity knob goes out?"

Well, this would be very strange and peculiar indeed, because it would mean the whole E-Meter had turned a dial or two. You know, it might have gone all the way around the dial. It would be an accident almost that it would come up with the same reading, but you had better check both sensitivity and tone arm. That should be added in, so thank you for the datum.

You've got a considerable importance now – just speaking and carrying with that – right along with that goes your rudiments in. Definition of rudiments: what it takes to get a session running and the pc in-session. Definition of in-session: willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case. Are rudiments a process to get the case on the road? No, they are not. You run rudiments with a third-of-a-dial drop. Why? Because you've got a Joburg Security Check these days, and you don't have to be too sniffish for those withholds. And if it's a big withhold you'll get it on a third-of-a-dial drop if it's going to stop the session. The rule is that if the needle does not drop a third of a dial on the squeeze test, and at that setting no rudiment clanks, the pc, you will find rather consistently, is perfectly capable of being audited. Got it? So you don't use rudiments to waste auditing, because the processes today in the rudiments are so much weaker than any other process we've got that you are wasting time. Got it?

However, as you're going through with a third-of-a-dial drop setting, the needle does a twitch, *kerbango.* When you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and it goes twitch – third-of-a-dial drop – you've got to handle it. Now, how do you handle it? You say, "Now, what was that?"

And "What was what?"

"Well, I had a little drop here when I asked you about a present time problem."

"Oh well, I suppose that's my... I've got to phone... uh... I've got to phone New Siberia" [the American Medical Association address]. "I've got to phone New Siberia at three o'clock and report," or something of this sort.

And you say, "Well, is that a present time problem to you now?"

"Mm . . . no, no." And it doesn't twitch.

You don't run it. Also, that is the extent of two-way comm. Two-way comm that goes four questions, turns into a process. You understand? And there are processes much neater for all two-way comm situations than you're going to two-way comm.

The American auditor has this frailty more than the auditors in other parts of the world. They'll run two-way comm for two hours. Don't do it, because there's just too many processes now and Prehav is too hot. And even the rudiments processes are hotter, you see, than two-way comm.

But two-way comm does give it an opportunity to blow. And that's all you do. is give the pc an opportunity to as-is the situation. He doesn't as-is it, process it. Don't two-way

comm it out of him. See? Give him a chance to as-is it by saying what it is, and the fall disappears, and you're all set. You can ask him as many times as you want to the same question or some variation of the question. You know? "Are you withholding anything" "Are you keeping something from me?" "Are you embarrassed because you are being audited today?" "Have you had some nasty, cotton-picking little unkind thought about the Director of Processing?" "Have you suddenly decided Ron ought to be hanged?"

If anybody is going to do anything to me, they better not try to shoot me. The only overts I've got that I'm tender on are hanging They'll have to hang me.

Anyhow, what's the extent, then, of handling these rudiments to get a pc in-session? Third-of-a-dial drop, and right down the list of Model Session, asking them twice, six or eight times – I don't care how many *times you* ask them – to find out what it *is*. That's one thing. Now, two-way comm would be a method of getting the pc to as-is this situation.

"Oh, your withhold is that last night you made love to an ape. All right. Now, how is that now?"

"Well, I guess it's all right."

And man, if that needle doesn't move, take it, man. That's all right. Just because you have peculiar ideas about relationships with apes is no reason to follow this up at all. It's all going to come out in the wash. Furthermore, if the pc is still dramatizing something – now, wave your ears on this one – if a pc is still dramatizing something, it is too deep-seated to be reached in rudiments or by two-way comm. You got that?

So PT problems, ARC breaks, that sort of thing: ask about them. If you see a twitch, find out what that twitch was. That's the first thing, see? Well, that's not two-way comm; that's just interrogation to find out what the devil the auditor-pc relationship is here. All right, now you've found out what the twitch is and it's still there. Ask him exactly what it was. He tells you. Don't follow that up with another question and another one and another one, you understand; put your brakes on smoking right there. You say, "Well, you had relationships last night with an ape. All right, good. Now, how does that seem to you?" *Clang.* Well, you're going to do something about this?

In the first place, it's some kind of a weird overt-withhold sort of a situation. But it's certainly no longer a withhold from the auditor, is it? He told you. He might not have told you all. It's all right for him to tell you *all* of this withhold. You got the idea? But it didn't go away. Now is the time to run a process. Got it'?

This came up on a present time problem. See where I'm heading? You see, you asked him present time problem; you got this kind of an oddball answer. What are you going to do about this? You better find out, if it's a problem to him, well what it is. Get rid of it. Get rid of it one way or the other on the rudiments. That's the best rule. Don't let it go off into the processes. But you're not going to handle the situation as a neurosis or a psychosis or

something of the sort in the rudiments, you understand? You're trying to get it out of the road for *auditing.*

So you say, "What part of that situation could you be responsible for?" or something like this, because it's a present time problem. And he tells you, answers a few questions. You say, "How's it seem to you now?" You don't get a fall. On to the next one, man, quick. See?

If it doesn't as-is with two-way. You can ask him all the ways you want to. It's a misdemeanor on your part, arrestable in the "Court of High Council," for you not to ask him something in several ways to find exactly what it's falling on, you understand? That's a misdemeanor not to do that.

But now to go on nattering on two-way comm, trying to get this thing as-ised as two-way comm, is a lousy waste of time on your part, that's all. Because a process would do it a lot better. So you found out what it was and it didn't as-is. Now you run a rudiments process. All right, you've got a rudiments process; it knocks it out; you carry on.

Now this interesting problem comes up. Supposing the person has a big withhold from George. Big withhold, see? So you run O/W on George. Well, in the first place, you've done something a little adventurous. It's all right; go ahead and do it. But you get tone arm motion on O/W on George. Aw, that's too bad. You're running O/W on George. You better run it; you better flatten it. But there are dozens of better ways to handle George, don't you see? This is kind of unfortunate.

The tone arm starts moving from 3.0 to 6.0 on O/W on George. Well, now you've got a process that's biting, you've got a pc that's running, and you've had it. What do you do with it? The rule is the tone arm has got to be a quarter of a division or less for twenty minutes of auditing before you can leave a process. This applies, unfortunately, to the rudiments.

That's why you're always hopeful for a null needle on the rudiments. Because you don't want to audit the case with the rudiments. But at the same time, if you ignore a drop on the rudiments, with a third-of-a-dial drop sensitivity set, you've had it. You won't do anything in that session.

Now, you could crank up the sensitivity to 16 and ask the rudiments. Now what are you doing? You're running the case, aren't you? "Are you withholding anything?" Ladies and gentlemen, fellow students of Homo Sap: Takes seven hours on some people to do a Joburg, and you've asked it in one lump question. Now, what are you going to do? Sensitivity 16 is your mistake. It wasn't a rudiment that fell on a third-of-a-dial drop.

By definition now, what is meant by "a rudiment out"? One of the rudiments are out and the case is being run with a rudiment out. Now what is meant by this? It means there *is* a reaction with the meter set at a third-of-a-dial drop – a visible reaction on the needle when the meter is set at a third-of-a-dial drop. If there is a visible reaction on the meter with it set for a

third-of-a-dial drop on the can-squeeze test, that rudiment is out and you've got to do something about it. You got it?

Now, what about these cases – what about these cases that keep trying to go Clear on us? And I suddenly realized the other night, although I've given you advice that you'd better get your sensitivity knobs fixed, you know you're never going to get them fixed? There is no sensitivity knob that will turn off far enough. When a person starts going into a floating tone arm state, when they're up about Release, it'll just float further and further and more and more, and you'd have to turn the sensitivity off further and further. And at some point the meter is going to become nonfunctional. So you would be going toward the same situation as simply turning your sensitivity knob off. Well, if a pc insists on dropping three dials on a third-of-a-dial drop can squeeze with your sensitivity all the way off against the off switch, see, I'm afraid there's only one other sensitivity cutdown that you could do. and that's just turn the meter off.

So what happens to this rule as the person goes Clear? Well, the rule is not very important as the person gets loosened up to that degree. How do you like that? It is not very important. Because what is the behavior of a needle as the individual gets more and more up toward Clear? The needle swings less and less on heavier and heavier charges. That's interesting.

I had a D of P ask me fairly recently, '«Well, I don't think this is correct about this third-of-a-dial squeeze and the sensitivity and that sort of thing. Because people that are coming in here with loose needles are obviously in very bad condition, because they don't get much needle reaction when you ask them about ARC breaks and things of that sort." Naturally it's not a charged question to them.

But on somebody who's plowed in, down on the borderline of the nether regions, you ask him if he's got an ARC break and you get *wham, wham, wham, wham, wham, wham!* And you say, "Well, what was that?"

And he says, "You lighted a cigarette while you were lecturing"

Free floating needle, as the cases advance on up the line: Well, this is about three-dials can squeeze, see? You've got it – sensitivity as low as you can get it – three-dials can squeeze. That's all you can do about it. And you say, "You got an ARC break?" And you get a one dial-division drop. See, there's a very loose needle and you get a one little dial division – one of those little tiny things that's about a quarter of an inch long, you see? And you ask him that and you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, actually I was withholding it from you that I just wrecked your car last night." Only this same person would be also in this category: You'd say, "What!" you know, and explode all over the place. And you'd say, "Well yes, I also took it into the garage and it's now been repaired and is sitting in your garage." You get entirely different action. Of course, he probably wouldn't have wrecked the car.

But look, you get some kind of a reaction like this: "You lighted a match while I was thinking," you see? Three-dial drop.

Now, you see a twitch on that, see, you just see a twitch. Of course, you can only really read him in twitches on such a case. And you say, "What was that?"

Say, "Well, I wrecked your car last night. It's still lying out on M1. Police are looking for you as a hit and run driver. But I didn't do anything; it wasn't my fault. Actually, *you* left the keys in the ignition." And you generally will get a smug smile following it. You get an entirely different set of reactions for the same existing situation. Is that clear?

I'm covering over rudiments with you and what rudiments amounts to and what meter reactions amount to and so forth. We go over these things quite often, but they are the most important thing, because if your pc is not in-session, you're not getting any auditing done. But we have to define what is meant by a rudiment being out. It means the rudiment is out; you have to correct it.

Well, you can always find a rudiment out. How do you like that? Just by turning your sensitivity knob up to 16 and say, "Are you withholding anything?" Or "Do you have an ARC break with anybody in the whole world anyplace?" "Is there anybody anywhere in the world that you have an ARC break with?" And of course, you're going to get needle reaction. So your auditing is totally reduced down to doing nothing but rudiments, nothing but rudiments, nothing but rudiments, nothing but rudiments, nothing – and they're not very good processes.

So of the two hours and a half that you have for an auditing session, you spend two hours and fifteen minutes running the beginning and end rudiments, and you spend fifteen minutes on the process, see? And that isn't what's getting the case there. The rule is the case cannot be audited with the rudiments out. What is meant by rudiments out? A visible reaction on the needle with a third-of-a-dial squeeze setting on the sensitivity knob.

Does that mean that a person who has a very loose tone arm, then, could have allowances made for him, so if he gets a drop on a present time problem, and you know he's got a very – he drops about a dial, and you can't set it down any further than a dial – does that mean you ignore his twitches? No, he's in for it. But this is okay, because he'll blow them on two-way comm.

You'll say, "What is this ARC break?"

And he'll say, "Well, the cook sneered at me this morning. He put a sneer on my shredded wheat biscuits, you know."

And you say, "How do you feel about that now?" There'll be no further reaction.

You see, the looseness of a needle at minimum setting is a direct index of state of case – the most direct state-of-case index there is. This is your diagnostic switch, right here, this sensitivity.

And if you, to get a third-of-a-dial drop, have the guy sitting here at sensitivity 16, and even then don't make it, you're dealing with a CCH case, brother, and don't think you aren't. We've broken our hearts on enough of them. CCHs they get. You understand?

Now, that doesn't mean that all cases that are run on CCHs are instantly in this horrible condition. But it does mean that the case has not been showing adequate gain in processing. Processing over a long period of time: We have a record of this processing; they haven't been showing enough gain; there must be something haywire someplace. We check them over: We can't find present time problems, ARC breaks, withholds. They just don't seem to have anything here anyplace. Well, you've got the CCHs, so you return the case to it. Got it? Just like you can turn an SOP Goals case back into a Routine 2.

Now, you're going to get that bulletin in very short order, if you don't have it right this minute. I imagine we're pretty stacked up in the bulletin department; we're getting out the Secondary Scales.

But you got three routines these days. Routine 1 is CCHs and Joburg Security Checks, and CCHs and Joburg Security Checks, and CCHs and Joburg Security Checks on a one-for-one ratio. (Experimental at this moment that it's one-for-one.) Why?

The CCHs boost up the individual's responsibility for his environment. And then he blows his head off because he's now all of a sudden got withholds that he's – now feels responsible for. So you have to pull the withholds off to keep from killing the case. You got it? You raise a case level, he runs into his withholds, begins to be more responsible for the world around him, and all of a sudden – crash, he's had it.

He actually feels like somebody is running over him like God Juggernaut is letting him have it, you know? Complete with the stone wheels. He feels *terrible.* You've increased his responsibility, he realizes he's guilty of many things on all dynamics, and you give him no opportunity to get rid of them.

And that is the only thing that has ever been stalling cases in Dianetics and Scientology over the last eleven years. That's the thing that stalls them. That's why they hit a ceiling and halt.

They halt because it'd kill them if they got any better. Because if they got any better, they'd be more responsible for what they've been up to on the whole track. You got it? All of a sudden they realize they have overts and withholds, and it damn near kills them. And this would work out with almost any case. So you run the CCHs to increase their responsibility, and you pull off their withholds with a Joburg. And that's the routine.

Now, I don't know quite what the optimum ratio between the CCHs and a Joburg is. I don't know if it's one for one, one for two, one for three – who knows. Hour for hour I'm talking about. What do you do? Security check them for three hours and CCH them for one? Or CCH them for three and security check them for one? Well, we're just taking it out at even level and say, well, we're going to start in at one for one. So that's what it is right now: one for one. One hour Joburg, one hour CCHs.

All right. That means that you don't suddenly stop a CCH process that is terribly unflat and give the Joburg after one hour, you understand? But if you've been five hours flattening this, you can be totally prepared to spend five hours on Security Checking *Got it? It's* however long they've been running the CCHs up to a temporary flat point.

One more mention of this. CCHs are run in strict accordance with Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code: A process must be run only so long as it produces change – this is not a direct quote; this is an interpretation of it. It's a breach of the Auditor's Code to run a process that is not producing change. It is a breach of the Auditor's Code to *stop* a process that is producing change. Got that? What's change in the CCHs? Well, you run CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4. Let us say that all during the running of 1, the test is twenty minutes. The person, whatever they're doing, must be no change of reaction in twenty minutes. Got it? Twenty minutes, no change in the pc.

Now, what's that mean? Well, the pc is a meter. What would the pc be reading on a meter if the pc were trying to leave? Come on, what would it be?

Audience: Theta bop.

That's right. The pc is the meter. You don't have the pc on a meter; you can look at the pc, see? Got the idea? All right, now let's get another one. You're trying to run CCH 2, and there they go, and you're getting them all set and so forth. And all during the time, they're just running like a wound-up doll, see? There's no change of reaction, there's no change, no comm lag, no nothing for twenty minutes. Man, that's flat as far as you're concerned. It isn't biting or it's flat or we don't care what; you go on to the next one. You got the idea?

All right, supposing on one of these CCHs the pc is simply 1.5ing the entire time. Just madder than hell, you see? "The idea of running such a process on me. You realize this process is only reserved for psychotics?" Actually, it used to be; it isn't now. "Process is only reserved for psychotics, and you think I'm a psychotic, and who do you think I am?" And they keep this up for twenty minutes – process is flat. New look, huh? Supposing the pc lies down in the middle of the floor and can't be made to rise for twenty minutes – process flat. You got it?

So the process is run in strict accordance with Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code: Run a process only so long as it produces change and no longer, and don't stop a process that is producing change. You got that?

Well, that means – doesn't mean by the way that you have to audit him all night. But that means in the next session you're running the same process. See? That process has got to come up to a flat point and the flat point is twenty minutes without a change – *whatever* the pc is doing. Pc insists every time he walks up to the wall that he turn around and with one foot, kick it, and he's been doing it for twenty minutes – he's had it.

You are no longer critical of what the pc is doing and no longer trying to force the pc to do the process. You just carry out your Upper Indoc-type CCHs and carry on as much as you can, but you're not trying to *force* something on the pc particularly, you understand? You're trying to do what he can do. Obviously he's *incapable* of giving you his hand during that period of time.

Now, you say, "Well, normally he would get over that sooner or later." Yes, he'll get over it sooner or later; go on to the next process. And when you finish up 4 you come back to 1, and you'll find out he's incapable for a while of giving you his hand.

In the first place, you're auditing a valence out and the pc up, and the only thing you get a reaction from *is* the valence. So if the case is progressing, why, this valence is acting up, because a valence fights for survival. You got it? There's comm lags; there's various things occurring, all the time, all the time, all the time. Well, for heaven's sakes, it's not flat so you carry it on. You got how to run them now?

That, by the way, is the original CCHs taught in London in 1957. We've gone right back to base on it. It is not for a psycho. They were originated ordinarily just for cases that weren't getting results on various processes. Case wouldn't get results on higher processes so we just kicked an awful lot of pcs over into this particular category, and London has had a great deal of success with CCHs up through the years.

At the same time, I didn't have much of a chance to straighten out the HGC as to how you ran CCHs, and they weren't running them very good. And they were, you know – I don't know – be perfectly happy to sit there and ask somebody to give you their hand, and they give you their hand, and do it just for twenty minutes. No. Six hours, twenty-five hours – the individual is simply giving you his hand. They just run it for twenty-five hours. It's a breach of the Auditor's Code. If he gives you his hand for twenty minutes on a stretch, that's it.

Furthermore, the CCHs are not run in Model Session. You say, "Here we go." "That's it." And that's the beginning and end of session. "I'm going to audit you now. This is the first process. I'm going to say 'Give me your hand' " – you can tell him anything you want to. You can even say, "Well, it isn't going to hurt you." Anything you want. I don't care what you say. But it's not run in Model Session. You don't pick up the ARC breaks; you don't pick up any of these things.

Why not? Because obviously if you're running that, the person doesn't easily blow these things. So you can just become completely involved with the case, see? Completely involved. I'd say the criteria would be this: If you did a long assessment, and finally the goal

of the pc is to get even with the janitor – who is a momentary, present time terminal, and this is the only goal you can find on the pc – I'd say you were probably assessing somebody you'd have got along faster with, with the CCHs. See, the terminal has backed all the way up to PT. Got the idea?

Now listen: It is not that you couldn't win with the other routines on the same case, because we are no longer doing *routines* because of case levels. That's a new surprise for you.

See, we've always had low cases get Routine 1, and the next cases get Routine 2, and the next cases get Routine 3, or something like this. Have you got the idea? It was always graduated that way.

Well, it isn't now. It's what is the fastest case gain you can obtain for the least amount of auditing. Got it? And it is all in the interests of saving auditing time, because all of these work, by the way – all three routines that we have – work on the same level of case.

You could take Roddy Green and find his goal, and find his terminal, and assess it on the Prehav Scale and run him. You'd get there. But your auditing ratio may be something on the order of about two to three per one. Takes you seventy-five hours to get there whereas you could have gotten there in the same period of time in twenty-five hours. You got the idea? So it's just in the interests of saving auditors' time that you do these things.

Furthermore the auditor doesn't get bogged down or upset because his case isn't winning, because he's being yakked at. You understand? Makes a smoother look all around.

So all three routines work on all cases, which is riches indeed. And you could expect sooner or later, when we hit the jackpot and pull that old one-arm bandit's hand and the gold sovereigns started pouring out of it all around the floor on technology, that this is what would have happened. You would have had at least a couple of routines that would have worked on all cases. Now we've got three routines that'd work on all cases.

There isn't a person here, by the way, who wouldn't pick up on some – the CCHs run in this fashion: CCH 1, 2, 3, 4, you see? 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4; just run as long as they're flat. It's very rapid running.

And we looked on the CCHs as being a very slow grind. Well, I point out to you that in 1957 they were not a slow grind, and they were being run in the exact style which I'm telling you about now.

See, we got it lost, because I couldn't quite grasp what was going wrong. We put it mainly down to the fact the auditor's intention wasn't getting across to the pc. That's not true. That has something to do with it, but that's not the answer. The answer is a much more clean-cut answer than that: The auditor was disobeying the Auditor's Code, Clause 13. Okay?

He was not running processes as long as they produced change. Pc *fighting*, you know? And say, "Well, I'm not going to run this damn process a minute longer. I'm not going to run

it...." And the pc would keep fighting him for three hours, four hours, five hours, six hours, whole intensive.

He'd say, "Well, I got to get someplace with this pc. I got to get someplace because the pc's fighting," you see? No, the pc's fighting is no change – no change by reason of the process.

But you can say, "Well look, the process wasn't being administered." Oh, you're looking physically at what happens to about 75 percent of the cases you have trouble with, is they never *do* the mental process that you give them. Except now you've got it physically. He's not *doing* CCH 2; only, you can *see* he isn't doing it. I've had a pc come up to me and say, "Well, you thought that auditor was pretty good that you had there, but *hu-hu-hu-hu-u-huh-huh-huh-huh* I – I just had a twenty-five hour intensive from him – *tuhhum-hu-hu!* Didn't do a single command he said. Ha! Ha!"

And I thought, "Why, you dumb bastard," to myself, you know. "You dumb sap! You mean to say that you wasted twenty-five hours of auditing time and gave the fellow something on the order of fifty quid, or something of the sort, just so that you could have the wonderful opportunity of never answering a single one of the auditing questions, but fooling him for twenty-five hours." Oddly enough, to the pc that would be eminently logical.

Well, you've got it out in plain, broad air that the pc is not about to do your auditing commands, haven't you? Well, so if – what if you had him on a mental process on the meter? What if you had him on a mental process on the meter, and he wasn't doing the auditing command but appeared to be? You know, saying, "Mm-hm. Mm-hm. Mm-hm."

You ask him, "What are you thinking about?"

"Oh, I'm thinking about the process. Mm-hm, mm-hm, mm-hm." Got a machine. Got a machine set up like a clockwork toy and every time you say the question, he goes, "Mm, hm-hm." Hasn't anything to do with anything you've said, see.

You say, "Do fish swim?"

He says, ("The auditor is trying to probe my secrets.") "Mm-hm." Got the idea?

Now, it's just an extremity of alter-is. Now, how much alter-is is there on the case determines what process runs him the fastest. So let's run CCHs and get any alter-is out into the clear, or anything of that sort. But anybody could gain on any of these routines.

Now, I'll go over these other routines with you very rapidly. I'll just tell you what they are.

Routine 2 is a general run on the Prehav Scale, Joburg Security Check, and the Havingness and Confront Processes all run in Model Session. I think that's the extent of it, isn't it? Is there anything else in there?

Mm! PT problems of long duration are assessed for terminal on that routine. You find a present time problem of long duration, you know? Keeps banging present time problem or something of the sort, and you run that. You assess that on the Prehav Scale. You find the terminal, and you find a terminal about the problem that drops the most; and you assess it on the Prehav Scale, and you run it flat, and you assess it again, and you run it flat, and you assess it again, and you run it flat, and you assess it again, and run it flat. That's a PT problem of long duration. Fastest way to run one for auditors at large. Actually you can get someplace just running engrams on them, Presession 38, but this other one is very, very easy to do and reaches all cases without any difficulty. So why not do it. All right?

That's the extent of Routine 2. What's Routine 3? SOP Goals Assessment – assessment for goal, assessment for terminal. And this is run flat, level by level, on the Prehav Scale, with what? Second step, Joburg Security Check. All three routines have a Joburg Security Check in common.

What are you trying to do with this case? You're trying to unbale this case and get this case up to a point where it is willing to make an advance. What do you mean "unwilling" to make an advance? All right, the case is unwilling to make an advance so long as and continually when the case finds he is turning on powerful and fantastic resistances and somatics and things like this. He doesn't dare get any better, because if he gets more responsible, he's had it.

Have you ever noticed that there are some very pretty girls around in the world who have a high level of irresponsibility? Have you noticed that? Well, actually, if you ran them into the middle ground, their beauty would be less. In other words, you'd audit them for a little while and increase their responsibility, and they wouldn't look so good. Have you got that? Isn't that odd? They'd be better but they wouldn't look so good. You got the idea?

Well, that would only obtain so long as they were stacking up withholds that you weren't getting rid of. So you could take a person who was quite irresponsible but good-looking – nothing they've ever done has any influence on the body. Now, you audit them, it has some influence on the body. They've got to – they've got to shoot the rapids, sort of, up the Niagara River, you know? They've got to go up Niagara Falls backwards, and it's a rather battering experience. Well, it becomes a very unbattering experience the moment that you keep cleaning up withholds, and you're going to see this phenomenon *continually.*

You make a little case advance, and all of a sudden you're on a long grind. What's happened? Well, the pc doesn't dare get any better, that's all. See? Case advanced rapidly and then something stopped it. You know? And then you grind, grind, grind, grind, grind? You've all seen this. Well, what was that point of the curve? I had to find out.

Well, it's the withholds. They suddenly get responsible for their overts and then they haven't any chance to tell you about them or unload them or unburden them in any way, and they just start kicking their heads off, that's all.

You'll find somebody who's had a case improvement, who has improved just a little bit too much for their tolerance, suddenly standing back of a chimney sobbing bitterly. You got the idea? "I'm no good!"

And we've had some casualties with that. That is to say, somebody has blown or something like that, you know? He's been improved a bit, but it was too much for him. Bu got the idea? Because improvement means an increase of responsibility for his past, present and future, which of course includes all the dirty mean, nasty, caviling, little two-bit tricks he's played on everybody.

And how did he get those things – how did he get those things excused? He lessened the overt. The old bulletin on lessening the overt – which by the way should be part of your bulletins. And they lessen the overt, and now you audit them, and they suddenly realize that that person they were so nasty to wasn't probably quite that bad, see? And this overt starts to swell up on them. Now you're doing it with processing and this is now a ten-thousand--horsepower operation, see? And the pc puts his two horsepower up against this thing, you see, and just tries like mad to stop the juggernaut. Only this overt keeps unlessening. Joe was not so bad; God, what's going to happen to them now, you see? So their whole effort now is to keep the overt from unlessening, and they no longer have their attention on the process. Got it? That's the exact mechanism.

So the case improves, you get a fast improvement curve, get the withholds. And you-all of a sudden you get another fast improvement curve, get the withholds; get another fast improvement curve, get the withholds. That's the system. You've three routines with which to do it.

And cases which are having difficulty answering auditing commands or having difficulty in auditing, or who would only run on SOP Goals in some kind of a present time situation, probably will audit faster on the CCHS as a general rule, than they would audit otherwise. They'll make more progress. You got the idea? You can get this person back up over Niagara Falls without so maw chain hoists. It's easier.

Instead of standing in there boxing with the alter-is-which they're not about to take responsibility for or run out. See, don't go on the basis that everybody, just because you alter the alter-is- you might not be able to find it exactly. See, the alter-is might have something to do with "have" and "would be". You know, any kind of a Hobson-Jobson situation where they're fitting one substitute with another substitute. And you might not hit it exactly. And you'd have to keep hitting it exactly. And it's very expert. Requires a lot of expertness to do that thing. You get their mind going off like a firecracker almost continuously and you can *do it*! It can be done, you understand? But it's probably slower. Certainly, for average auditor, slower.

All right, so the combination there is that this is the best thing to do for a case that might hang up otherwise.

Now, your next general run, your next general routine, is actually basically there. All cases could benefit from it, and it would be faster than Routine 3 in a lot of cases. But I – I have found out that auditors who are specifically being coached at long distance from us – which is very difficult – actually are able to do what is now Routine 2. They can do it. They can kind of dub around and make it work, you understand? But boy, you get them on goals and they're over the hills and far away like a bunch of white-tailed antelope. And you just see these little spots of white in the distance. Man, they don't grab that one. I've got it on my comm lines and from HGCs and from every place *ad infinitum*, and they're just-no latch.

They can do general runs on Prehav Scales. Read one bulletin, do a general run on the Prehav Scale, that's it. Do a Joburg Security Check, miss 50 percent of the questions, but it's still functioning, see? You get the idea? It's still functional in their hands. Do you see that?

But this doesn't say that you couldn't take the person you're going to do CCH on and find his goal. And it doesn't say that the person that you're going to do the general runs and Joburgs on – it doesn't say you couldn't grind in and find his goal. You can actually find the goal and terminal and so forth on anybody that you try. It's just a little arduous, that's all. A little more arduous. It takes more *time.*

So in the interests of swift clearing is what these three routines are all about, and that's the basis on which we're operating today.

And of course, you're here to learn about this so I probably won't see you doing as many Routine 2s. You'll probably get more Routine 1s and Routine 3s than you get 2s. But in some HGC someplace, or out in the bush of – back of North Wallaby, why, you'll see an awful lot of Routine 2 – and you meet somebody back of North Wallaby, and he'd say, "Oh, we're having so much luck on SOP Goals. Esther spun last night."

And you'd say, "What are you running?"

"Oh, we did a long assessment on her – twenty minutes – and we finally decided her husband was what was her trouble, so terminal was a husband. And it was by elimination. We talked it over in the rest of the conference, and we decided that was the only possible terminal. So we ran 'a husband' on her, and so forth. And the next time we did an assessment, for some reason or other the whole scale was live, so we just started at the top and tried to run each one flat on the husband. And you didn't give us all the data, you know, for SOP Goals, and it doesn't work very good either." But you give them this Routine 2, and they go off like a bunch of canary birds, and they get wonderful results. Okay?

Female voice: Yes sir.

Male voice: Question on Routine 2.

Yeah.

Male voice: The general assessment: Is that done purely on a Primary Scale or do you carry – carry it over to the Secondary as well?

No, you can carry that on right on through to the deepest depths of the Secondary. All assessments can be done Primary and Secondary, or just Primary. The worse off a case is or the more Clear they are – the two extremes – both have to have Secondary runs on assessments.

Second male voice: Do you ever switch from one routine to the other?

Yes, you sure do. Case isn't running very well on his goals terminal, or his assessment or something, shift into 2. Be upsetting though to shift from 2 back to 1 because it's invalidating. Make up your mind at the beginning. If in doubt, always run CCHs. If you're in doubt whether he should be running CCHs or 2, run CCHs. That answer your question?

Second male voice: Yes, it does.

All right. The more you shift, changing your mind, why, the less sure you look and the less control you've got on the pc.

Second male voice: Precise running of the CCHs: left, right, or right and left, both hands – then do you . . . ?

Yeah, and on your head. And then there's CCH 1X – there's, CCH 1X. That's a good one. That's a good one: Pc gives you both of his socks! I don't mean to make nothing out of your question but it brings up this humorous point, Ken. It brings up this very humorous point, that the more CCHs I put out for various variations, the less CCH was run on the basics. And actually the variations practically killed the CCHs, the variations did. No, it's just right hand, man. It's always right hand. You're not trying to clean this fellow's life with the CCH; you're trying to improve his case so that he can get off his withholds. You got it? When you've got all his withholds off and he's totally responsible, and he's clean as a wolf's tooth, he's going to be floating, almost floating here on the needle anyhow, when you finish this up, you understand? And he's going to be so free on the needle that you start doing an assessment and he starts blowing clear on the assessment. You got the idea? You wait till you see this. You'll realize why you're running it. I apologize for making a mock of your question. Yes?

Female voice: Would SCS still come in the CCHs? Through the CCHs?

There are no SCSs in the CCHs. CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. There are only four of them that are valid. Now, the SCS does have a high CCH number, but you've got to read your – I see right now, you've got to read your CCHs from beginning to the end, because there are only four of them, and what was known as the CCH Routine is exactly a precise routine consisting of four processes.

And that's the only CCH Routine we mean. We mean no other variations. Okay?

Female voice: Yes, thank you.

Right. All right. Okay, any more questions? All right. Thank you very much, and that's it for tonight.

Good night now.