

CCHs

A lecture given on
29 March 1962

Well, you know it's very funny. The older students sit up front and the newer students sit at the back and you look at a gradient scale here, you see and it's, a very interesting gradient scale. People on the very front row look like they might possibly, some day, live.

Okay, this is what date?

Audience: Twenty-nine March.

Twenty-nine Mar. 62, AD 12 and here we go. We are going to talk to you about the CCHs.

CCHs. And this is based on the bulletin of 29th of March – HCOB. The companion bulletins are HCOB of November 2nd, 61 and the HCOB of June 23rd, 61. Those are three of a piece and they fit together and the three bulletins, as you look along the line here, are inseparable.

Frankly, it would be not enough to know one of these bulletins. We finally determined when you run the CCHs. That's been a question which has existed here for many a millennia. In the first place, they didn't exist for many a trillennia. And I'll go into a short history of these.

Once upon a time I was in England, that's up north and at 37 Fitzroy Street, West 1, just after they had moved in, it was apparent they were having trouble with preclears. This was a fact. Some pcs, when they walked in, caromed off both sides of the door. Some pcs didn't hit the door at all. Some pcs didn't even have enough sense to hit the street and there were trouble with pcs.

We were having a hard time getting HGC results. Oddly enough, an HGC which is properly conducted, properly supervised, many, many, many years now, has been turning out pretty good results and turning out very superior results. HGCs were first organized to demonstrate that good results could be turned out and to serve as a model to field auditors and then the HGC became a thing in itself. And it was evident at this time, however, that we had hit an impasse in technology, where we weren't getting the results that we should have gotten. And I developed the CCHs. And they've been in the way, underway for quite a little while, little bits and pieces and fragments of them and so forth. And I finally put them together all in a bundle and we had the CCHs.

Well, this gave us a series of processes, which, if properly used, familiarized – now get the difference here: CCHs don't run things out; the CCHs familiarize the pc with control, communication and havingness, which is the source of CCH – Control, Communication and Havingness. And the pc does an upgrade on the CCHs in the teeth of the adage that the pc must be at cause. Now you find out in doing these that the pc actually is at cause, to a marked degree, except perhaps in CCH 1, that's to the least degree he is at cause and then at 2 he's slightly less at cause, 3, he's considerably more at cause and 4 he is rather definitely at cause.

In other words, you get a gradient, here, of causation. CCH 1, “Give me that hand,” he's hardly at cause at all, but these are not, “run out something” processes. The CCHs actually are a method of familiarizing the pc with control, with communication and with havingness. In other words, he sits there and looks at it and finally finds out he can confront it. you get the idea? That's an entirely different proposition. In other things, we adjust – we adjust the pc's thinkingness so that he can cope with communication, control and havingness and a lot of other things.

You see, you say, “Give me a time when you bapped somebody over the head and told him you were controlling him,” you know? “Recall a time you controlled something,” something like this. In other words we do an erasure process. We desensitize the thing in reverse. We get the reason why the pc is allergic to communication, control, havingness and numerous other factors, you see? And we knock out that and let the pc carry on. Well, we don't do that with the CCHs. CCHs are straight familiarization. Pc sees that it is occurring and finds out it doesn't kill him. That's about the whole modus operandi of the CCHs.

Now sometimes a pc can find this out in five or six hours and sometimes he finds it out in fifty hours and sometimes he finds it out in 150 hours. But somewhere along the line, he gets an idea that control, communication and havingness are not necessarily horrible. He changed his mind about the thing But there's some point of case where a case turns to predominately motivator, as you go down scale, your case gets to a level where it is predominately motivator and won't respond to anything else. Whereas a person has an inadequate idea of cause to be causative.

Now above that point, a person's cause can be increased easily. And below that point a person's cause can only be increased to the degree of getting him to confront something that is going on someplace else. Do you follow that?

All right, instead of letting him run motivators then, you see, what you'd normally get would be this kind of a rig You'd have Prepchecking and you'd say, well we prepcheck the people as we go down scale, to a point where the pc is run on nothing but motivators. Well, let's look at this, see. We see this gets noplacement, because, if you want to make a test, if you want to wind somebody up in a bag sometime, prepcheck this Zero question, “What has been done to you?” And it's very remarkable, but we have – we have innumerable – we collected

these quite by accident – but we have innumerable auditor's reports where this has been done and goals and gains is always “No.”

Made no gains, no goals. Isn't that interesting? In other words, if we run the motivator side of it, the pc himself decides, after he is saying how abused he has been for the last trillennia, he finally winds up and tells you that the session didn't give him any gains and it's true. It also follows through, to a marked degree, on profiles and that sort of thing.

So we can't run Prepchecking down from, “What have you done to somebody else?” and as we go down scale, reaching for the pc, as he is further south pc, you see, we can't get down to that level and say, “Well, what's been done to you?” and get anything In other words, we hit an impasse at that point.

Well, there's where the CCHs take over. Instead of letting him run up further overts by saying what has been done to him, you see, which is all accusative and critical and just runs up further overts, we get him to confront communication, control and duplication. Now I've often told you that the mechanics of auditing, all by themselves, carried out on the basis of, “Do fish swim?” would get someplace.

In other words, the actual actions of the auditor, without any guts to the session whatsoever, just the actions of the auditor, will produce a gain on a case. That is why it's pretty hard to understand how, here and there, it can be managed to get no gain on the case and those actions of the auditor must therefore, be interestingly absent. And that's the values of the TRs. You do good TRs, you sit there, just do good TRs and your pc – something is going to happen to your pc, that's for sure.

Well, you've got this factor of duplication. And you might say that havingness is reachingness. Havingness is the concept of being able to reach or not being prevented from reaching. That's an interesting definition and that's probably a fundamental definition. But then havingness is understood also to be continuous. So we get reach duplication of – duplication of reach and of course this fortifies havingness endlessly. The fellow finds out that it isn't a fluke that he could reach that time. He can now reach again. And he can reach again and he can reach again and again and again and again and again and again and again. All of a sudden he takes heart. He finds out there's a possibility here that he might be able to have. you see, he's still doubtful as he comes up the line and you're getting him to reach.

And now let's take CCH 1, “Give me that hand.” It could have possibly also – I am not saying you should run it with this command – but you – “Reach me.” “Reach me.” “Reach me.” you get the similarity here? See, pc really is at cause, see? You could just say, “Reach me.” “Reach me.” “Reach me.” “Reach me.” And make sure that he did and it would be quite interesting.

I don't advocate that you fellows do this, although once in a while, some squirrel auditor develops some technology by which he can use Scientology to make a girl more accessible.

Now personally, I find it difficult to understand this, because I myself, you see, have never needed Scientology! I don't waste a brag, but I just want to point this out. Here you have a situation where that's a poor show. But you actually could take a girl and have her reach your right knee and your left knee and your right shoulder and your left shoulder and your nose and the top of your head and your right hand and left hand. And every now and then, ask her how she feels about you.

And if you don't flatten the process, just about the time this thing goes into the plus state, she'll tell you she's mad about you, she thinks you're wonderful. That's right. And you girls could do the same thing. There's no use being subtle about this – being subtle about this. you don't have to make out that you knew them all of your past life or something like this, you see. Say, “Well, actually we were married once so it doesn't matter,” that kind of thing, that's not necessarily right.

Suzie and I have known each other in the past track three or four times and we are both trying desperately to forget it! Whenever I get real mad at her, I ream her out for the reaming out she gave me one time, you know? That kind of thing. I think we rode without food or water for three days and nights to relieve the garrison, then she says, “What kept you?” I could go on and elaborate this sort of thing, but I wouldn't – I wouldn't found these relationships on past lives if I were you. I'd just be more direct about the whole thing. I give you this particular trick and if you don't flatten it you will find out that midway through, the pc thinks you're marvelous!

It's this Touch Process. “Touch my right knee,” “Touch my left knee,” “Touch my right shoulder,” “Touch my left shoulder,” you know, that kind of thing. You don't even have to be more personal than that, you know, you just do that. Now anyhow, if you flatten it, of course they think you're okay, but they're not in this – this super-emotional state. You ought to try this sometime and make sure you flatten it, because it gets to be very embarrassing. It's actually almost embarrassing if you only run it halfway.

Well, I'm just giving you an idea. Here is a change of relationship between the auditor and the pc and of course, “Give me that hand,” run properly, of course, gets the pc to do the causative action and it is the most simple, the most elementary of the data I just gave you. That is elementary – “Give me that hand,” “Reach me.” And if you were to run this and understand the full sense of it, you would do this other test, that I just gave you and you would understand completely why the thing worked.

Person begins to realize they can reach you and therefore will talk to you and you're getting the “Talk to the auditor.” That's what you're establishing with that.

Now, the next one up is this individual has been running a body on a machine for a very long time, CCH 2 – old 8-C – has been running a body on a machine. It's quite interesting then to what degree people do not move their bodies around. The body just ambulates and perambulates and walks and bends and sits down and the thetan is back there, saying, “Well, what do you know, look at that,” you know? “It sat down, it stood up, I wonder where it's going?” It's fantastic you know. It's just as a total outside spectator, you know?

Sometimes, “Isn't it cute, it walks. It walks. It's talking now, I wonder what it's saying?” And it sometimes comes as a considerable shock to a thetan, on CCH 2, that he is moving the body. And he has something to do with the body. That was why we put the you in there. “You look at that wall” and “You walk over to that wall” and “You touch that wall and turn around.” That's why the you came in there.

We wanted to emphasize this thing. Wanted to get the fellow in the notion that he was doing something with the body. And there we'd get almost a purely control mechanism. You see your CCH 1 is a reach-me communication mechanism and your CCH 2 is a control of the body mechanism.

In other words, it's trying to assert to the individual that you are in control of that body.

Now CCH 3, Hand Space Mimicry, was developed originally to get the pc in the same communication time span as the auditor. We found out that a pc at this level only understood tactile and they had to practically be touching something before they were in communication with it. And it's an effort to get a gradient. How far away can the pc be from the auditor and still be in a visual communication with the auditor? That's what this is answering. Can we introduce some space into this idea of hard and fast.

You'll get – you'll get some people working in an organization, you'll get some people that never can put a despatch in a basket and have it delivered. They've got to bring a body with the despatch. There's always got to be a body with the despatch. They've got something – if they're going to write to you and tell you that the laundry has arrived – why, they can't do that.

They've got to come in and present a body and so forth. That's just because there can be no space in a communication. That's all that is.

You see, their cause-distance-effect is minimal distance, see. So it's just cause-effect. And these things, they are more or less understood by them, to be occurring at exactly the same point, with no distance in between. Now, if the pc were in the auditor's head, the pc could be audited. See? That's for sure. Everybody would agree with that. Well, this is an effort to not have the pc in the auditor's head and still get some auditing

Now we introduce the idea of communication by duplication. We've got some space in the communication. We've got some duplication going on and eventually what do you know,

he finds out some more that he can talk to the auditor. Or better, at this stage, can understand what the auditor is telling him to do.

Now, the only mistake that could be made – all of this material, by the way, that I'm giving you here is coming out of the November 2nd, 1961, HCOB – the only mistake that could be made at this stage of the game, is to get too darned complicated.

You could get far, far too complicated at this stage of the game, you see, and give the pc some loses. So keep it – keep it real simple. You want the pc to be mimicking the motion. But it's a “contribute to the motion.” See? We're just gradually bringing him around to the idea of *cause*, with that word “contribute.” “Contribute to the motion,” “Help it out a little bit,” or something like that. And you ask him, you ask him now and then, “Did you contribute to their motion?” (hands, see?) “Did you contribute to their motion?” And the pc says, “Yes.” And, of course, the odd part of it is if he says “No,” that you don't do a thing about it. “Yes” or “No,” it doesn't matter what the pc says, you're just planting that idea as you go.

Now, we get up to CCH 4 and we're actively asking if the pc is satisfied. Now, looking over this particular write-up of this CCH 4 – hmm. Yes, auditor asks pc if he is satisfied that the pc duplicated the motion. That's quite interesting because you keep doing it until the pc says he's satisfied and that is the only criterion. This is the only mistake you can make with CCH 4, besides making it too complicated.

Sometimes auditors make it so complicated that they themselves can't duplicate it. And this is a silly position for you to get into. And I do not advocate your getting into this position. There is a level of simplicity-complexity at which the pc finds comfortable, but sometimes – sometimes you have seventeen consecutive different motions, as the thing which you want him to . . . And then the pc says, “I didn't see that, could you do it again?” Of course you're sunk!

The other action which the pc makes here: It's the pc who is satisfied that he duplicated it and you know, that'll drive an auditor sometimes halfway around the bend. He picks up this book, you see. And he lifts the book up level, puts it back down again and he says, “All right, did you – you satisfied that you duplicated that motion?” you see, anything that he cares to say like that, these are not verbal commands. That is, it doesn't depend on verbalness. And the pc takes the book – has taken the book, you see, and he's gone... And the auditor said, “Well, you satisfied that you duplicated the motion?” And the pc says, “Oh yes.” And the pc thinks he has. And now the auditor – and now the auditor falls into the pit of being sneering about it or being critical about it. And you know the pc can just roll up in a ball, I mean, he'll just quit right at that point. You can defeat that whole CCH. Carefully examined it in use and that is actually the only way it really defeats everything. Is if the auditor insists that the pc didn't and starts getting new motions to contribute and does it again.

“Well all right, you didn't do this, so, I mean you say you did it, but let's look at it a little more carefully here” and so on. What I normally do in running it, myself, is when I see that the pc is making some wild, wild duplications that he thinks are duplications, I try to find one that the pc will actually duplicate. And will duplicate sufficiently well that it doesn't make him a liar every time. And then I'll do this one sometimes, is I give him a motion, raise the book up and down something like this and then he sits there and he scratches the back of his head with the book, you know. Puts it back on his lap and then you say, “Did you duplicate that?” And he says, “Oh yes.” Why, I'll do two or three more and then I'll raise that book up and down again. And you know, the pc will eventually see it. It's not done in a critical spirit. I just know this is one he needs drill on badly. And he'll eventually improve it and you'll see him get a little bit better at it. But it's, is the pc satisfied with it? That's how you keep the pc at cause through the CCHs.

Otherwise there's no reason, beyond what I have just told you, why they would work. It's odd that they work at all. It's odd that there are levels that you could audit, where the person does not have any opinion of what you're doing, thinks everything you are doing is bad, sees it all backwards, wants no benefit from it, would rather blow your brains out than follow any of the commands and that you can audit straight through and have the person come up with a gain. That is what is very peculiar about the CCHs. But it is true.

It actually doesn't even require the pc's permission. It's nice to have it, but if you haven't got it, so what.

Well back there in 56 – back there in 56, they were laid out more or less like this. There've been very few changes, except I think the “you” in CCH 2. And very few changes and yet by 1958 the CCHs weren't working. The CCHs weren't working by 1958 and they definitely weren't working in 1959 and they weren't working in 60. The technology had been lost and yet the auditors (one of whom I am looking at right now) got trained back in 56. Actually, really didn't want to audit CCHs very badly. I made her run them on a doll, get ahold of a doll and shake the doll's hand, you know, and run them on the doll, and so forth, and she did real well. she got so she was getting fantastically good results on the pc. Just marvelous, did marvelously. And as time went on, much less able auditors – even more able auditors, they made no results.

Well, where'd these results go on the CCHs? We're already old enough to have had a routine varied and buried and skipped and altered and messed up so that it didn't work. It's a good lesson. It's a good lesson. 1956 they worked and part of 57 they worked. And then they didn't work the rest of 57, 58, 59, 60 and so forth, until I all of a sudden said, “What's this all about?” And I realized that we used to do them differently. And people had stopped doing them this way. That is to say, they were doing each CCH perfectly. But they were not doing them as a combination.

In view of the fact they weren't doing them in relationship to each other, they didn't work. And these CCHs don't work if not interrelated to each other.

There's a certain way of handling the CCHs, in relationship to each other, quite independent of how each CCH is done. And that piece of technology is as important as the individual CCHs. How do these four work together? That was lost. So we get a reissue of that. Short, sweet and succinct. June 23rd, 1961. It's preserved in this particular form. It's taken from a telex sent to Johannesburg. It's not that Johannesburg has a harder time, but that this was – had just been picked up on course here and so was sent down to Johannesburg.

“You run a CCH only so long as it produces change in the pc's general aspect. If no change in aspect for twenty minutes, go on to the next CCH. If CCH producing change, do not go on but flatten that CCH.”

“Run CCH 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, etc. use only the right hand on '1'.”

We're not trying to clean his hands up.

See, all these complications entered into it, you know, all kinds of complications got born up out of these things. You are right back to their simplest form and this group use of them.

Any pc on Routine 1 and so forth, is completely irrelevant. And another point here: CCHs not run in Model Session – not run on E-Meter. I'll take that up with you in a minute. But it's a code break of Clause 13 which is, “You must not run a process which is not producing change” and “You must flatten a process which is producing change.” Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code – not to handle the CCHs this way. By the way, on running a child – on running a child, three times is flat. There is a variation of this rule. They do it well three times – that's flat. Do the whole CCH three times. That's flat. Otherwise, a child will get loses. And this will also work out, you will find, with the worse off cases, so the twenty minutes that we state here, is a maximum time. Maximal time.

Sometimes a CCH doesn't bite for a few minutes. Runs for a few minutes and it doesn't bite. Well, this gives it an adequate time to do so. If you are running somebody who is having a hard time with their attention span: three times. “Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand.” They did it three times. Fine, that's flat. Got the idea? Otherwise, they start to think that you're punishing them and they start to think – you're getting loses. So the auditor has to make an adjudication on the state of the case and the attitude of the case, you see? Never less than three times, you know. Don't pull that down to once, see. And never more than twenty minutes. That's in your reasonable range expectancy. And if the thing is running with ragged differences, it's not flat.

You can watch a person doing CCH 2 and they're doing these things very raggedly. They walk over to the wall, sometimes they look at the wall, sometimes they don't look at the

wall. They shuffle their feet, sometimes they don't shuffle their feet, they lean on the wall, sometimes they don't lean on the wall. Comm lags in the length of time necessary to touch the hand, comm lags in the length of time it takes them to turn around. Differences of resistance to direction and so forth. These are all differences, so those are not flat. Then they finally do it three times in a row, three whole sequences in a row: flat. Go on to the next one.

It's the times through. And as long as it's producing a difference in timing, a difference of reaction in each time it's done, as long as it's being different, you want – you want to keep on running it, because it's not flat. But as soon as it smooths out, why, so that you get a – they are all about the same and particularly the person doesn't seem to mind doing it – that's an interesting factor. Probably a more vital factor than the perfection with which they do it.

Yeah, well, that's time to push on to the next one because you're going to catch this thing again anyhow.

Now it's quite interesting. You'll watch the CCHs behave in this particular fashion. You'll do CCH 1: “Person does it standing on their head.” Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. Nothing to do with me, you know. CCH 2: “What wall?” Bang! so on, so on. Just all doing on the auditor's determinism. CCH 3: “Yeah, yeah I can totally do it.” Everything's fine, give them a book. You raise the book, they raise the book. Raise the book. . . Go back to the beginning of the thing. You say, “Give me that hand.” “*Why should I?*” Just now something is biting, *ooh!* Yeah. There ensues a wrestling match people would pay admission to see. Not flat.

You go ahead and flatten it and go on and up and you find the next one is flat or not flat. In other words, you find these unflatnesses and flatten them, is what you're trying to do. Now frankly, if you attacked it from another way, from another approach, the approach they'd begun to attack it with in 58, this would be all messed up. you just get ahold of the fellow and you're going to flatten, “Give me that hand.” And the individual has no peculiarities or differences in “Give me that hand” and you just run “Give me that hand,” for the next 150 hours. There's nothing happening, just run it.

It goes on and on and on and on and on. There's not enough variation or randomness or different things being addressed in the case to make any difference at all to the case and the case just doesn't get anyplace. And nothing happens. So the CCHs don't work. you get ahold of some people, they actually can't tell anywhere from nowhere and you say, “You look at that wall” and they look at the wall. “You walk over to it” and they walk over to it and then, “Touch it” and they touch it. And they turn around. And they come back and “You look at that wall” and they just go on and on and on and on. And you give them a test to fill out, so that you can get their profile and you come back and you find these horrible pictures of waterfalls with bones at the bottom, you know. And you don't even find the answer to test, you know. This is very puzzling I mean how come they can do this? It's actually just on the

auditor's determinism. Doesn't mean anything to them. The wall isn't anything to them. They're not touching anything. They're not walking. They're just, "Isn't it sort of cute? Look at it, look, oooh!" Hasn't anything to do with them. Very funny.

And you take one of these cases and you can make a terrible mistake. You can start to run "think" process immediately afterwards, you see. Because the person can do 8-C so well, we'll now run a think process and they should be able to get away.. . Think? What think? That's the trouble you get into. That's the trouble you get into, when you just tackle these CCHs, each one all by itself and make it an end-all. They have to be in this rotation. If you don't have them in that rotational sequence, not enough different things, you haven't got enough randomness and nothing unsettles. But you tackle it in that rotation in the bulk of cases you run – of course you don't – will go right on and get gains. You run into these sags and flat points and unrealities and so forth. But the person goes through them.

Now there's one exception to this. Is about the only thing that you can run on an unconscious person is CCH 1. You can't walk them around the room, so you're limited to that degree. And CCHs are workable on unconscious people to just the degree that they would be workable, if you ran just one CCH on a person, you see, not very universally applicable.

So therefore, if a person isn't recovering – an unconscious person isn't recovering consciousness – dream up something else, see, don't keep on. There's not a flicker of change or pulse beat or response or anything like that and you've been doing it for two hours and there's no change on it, you're not really getting a response. You're running against Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code. Run a Touch Assist on them. Sounds funny. Person's unconscious, well, run a Touch Assist on them. you also run an unconscious person through an engram. You can also run Havingness on them. Do all sorts of weird things to unconscious people. They very often follow through.

But do something else. In other words, you'd have to dream up a consecutive series of processes numbering about four in all, that'd fit this particular unconscious person. You've got a lot of processes to choose from. one is Havingness. And yeah, "Make that body lie on that bed" and Touch Assists and, "Feel this" or something like that. "Feel the pillow." "Feel your head." "Feel the sheet." "Feel the blanket."

In other words, lay out a pat four that would be the CCHs, simply because you can't run the CCHs on them. you got what I am talking about? Then go cycle through this same four, until you could get some changes. Because it's just – running one thing on and on and on, it's just running into Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code. You're running a pc – isn't producing – on which – whom you're producing no change of any kind whatsoever. And of course, that's just agin the Code. You've got to find a process that does produce change.

Now, the funny part of the CCHs is, once you've found a process that does produce change, *voilà!* The other processes which were apparently flat will now be unflat. The oddity

is that one CCH unflattens the other three. Not always all of the other three. But it'll unflatten one or more of the remaining three. You get a change on a CCH, it'll change the other three. Even if you get no change on it, it tends to unsettle the remainder. It's quite remarkable to appear. That was the original way they were run; the original way that we got very good results with them.

Now, I'd like to call to your attention the fact that they're a Tone 40 process and that the Upper Indoctrination, good Upper Indoc is vital to a good handling of the CCHs. Putting that thought in the ashtray, man, that's very important. You lay these commands into the pc's head. The funny part of it is, that they're not necessarily even verbal commands. But you can overstrain this and wear yourself out. For instance I ended session for a pc, I think, last night and it possibly ended thirty or forty sessions or something. And it required no strain on my vocal chords and certainly didn't require any strain on my postulates. I just told her – just gave her a Tone 40 “End of session” you see. All right. It's not necessarily difficult for the auditor. An auditor hasn't – isn't trying to impress the pc with anything. It's just a direct lay-in of it. It's just directional. It's – you might say it's a command without reservation. And it's not necessarily a forceful command or an impressive command or anything else. It's just a command without reservation. You take the brakes off of the thing, you can practically split the pc's skull down the middle.

One other thing I'd like to say about the CCHs before we go on to the rest of “When?” One other thing I'd like to say about them is the fact that they are nonverbal. And you could run them on a deaf person. It actually could be, you see? It'd take a little ingenuity on your part to cut out the total verbalness, but factually, the verbalness is not the chief part of it. The chief part of it is the action. The solidities involved, the solidity of the reach and all that sort of thing. So the CCHs, the common denominator of the CCHs is solids, not thoughts.

That brings us to where we are on “*When?*” *When your pc does not get any tone arm action on Prepchecking or on 3D Criss Cross, you should be running the CCHs.*

Now the auditor could be at fault, the questions at fault, the list chosen at fault, a lot of things could be at fault. Don't worry about what's at fault. Just put the pc on the CCHs. That's when.

In the absence of tone arm motion on thinkingness processes, do the CCHs. And this will keep a lot of people from wasting time in processing. They all make better gains in processing if you do this.

Now we have a case in point. A list. I know we said on one of the Info Bulletins – you realize 3D Criss Cross is on Info Bulletins, don't you? Because it's not finalized. So when you finally get a finalization of “This is it” (Roman postulates you know?) why you'll get it in red ink, but up to that time it's in Info Bulletins. It permits one to reserve the right to change his mind. And we change our mind on this particular basis. That the pc ought to be on a meter

during listing and differentiation. Except it shouldn't be, actually wouldn't need to be, but frankly, a new factor arises. You want to know how much TA motion the pc is getting. How much TA motion the pc is getting while listing and if'n the pc isn't gettin' any TA motion while listing, you have several choices.

One, if the pc does get tone arm motion while prepchecking, you had better continue the Prepcheck and knock off the list, even though you're just halfway through it.

Now, if the pc gets no tone arm motion, whatsoever, in 3D Criss Cross listing and in Prepchecking, you for sure should have been on the CCHs in the first place.

Now, if a pc has been getting good tone arm motion on Prepchecking, but suddenly just ceases to get tone arm motion, this just means you got – you've hit a bad question line. It means you should improve your question line. you know, but this is already against a history of tone arm motion. In the absence of such a history of tone arm motion, getting no tone arm motion of course, you have the CCHs.

Now if the pc on other lists has been doing beautifully on tone arm motion, you all of a sudden hit a list without any tone arm motion, of course, you could just skip that list. you say, “Well, this is getting us no place,” and junk it. Start out on another line. Obviously doesn't mean anything to the pc. Don't you see? No TA action. All right. This is saying when you run the CCHs and what you do, Prepchecking, 3D Criss Cross, so forth, according to the amount of tone arm motion.

Now, there are a couple of additional tests that you can make which are taken up in this bulletin of March the 29th, 62. And these tests are as follows:

Do not confuse a pc's settling-into-session tone arm motion with the tone arm motion being created with the body of the session. Now a pc can come in at 4.0 and you clean up some rudiments and you start listing or something and the pc settles in and goes down to 3.0, in the first few minutes of play. And just sits there at 3.0 thereafter. Well, that's getting the pc into session. And it's the mechanics of getting the pc into session that has brought him down there and given him that sinking arm.

See, the rudiments and so forth, were what was doing it, not the process you were running And you'll find that that adjusts the tone arm. So leave adjustment of tone arm by reason of rudiments and by reason of the pc getting a bit used to the session, leave that out of it. Just be sure that the pc is getting tone arm motion because of what you are doing, not because of some other factor.

Of course, you realize you could sit there and kick the pc in the shins every three or four minutes during a session and possibly produce tone arm motion. You recognize that?

Now, that's a case of no tone arm motion. The pc has a – rather a history of it or has been going on for several sessions here with no tone arm motion. You can't seem to figure it out. Don't try. Just put him on the CCHs.

Now there is a case where, when you get tone arm motion, you put the pc on the CCHs. And that is every time a discussion of auditing produces considerable tone arm motion you had simply better put the pc right there into the CCHs and that's it.

That's a converse to the rule. I call it to your attention. But we've – already have obliterated that from the first tone arm motion, so it's not the same tone arm motion we're talking about, you see? We say the tone arm motion – the lack – if we get a lack of tone arm motion during the body of the session, that's a CCH.

You don't care why, it's just a CCH activity. You should put him over on the CCHs. All right. But that's the body of a session, isn't it? Now, if you get – always get – a tremendous amount of tone arm motion in trying to get the pc into session: CCHs. There's a case that if you get tone arm motion, you put them on the CCHs. You sit there and talk to this pc on the subject of auditing and you get tone arm motion. You get three-quarters of a division, a division, a division and a quarter tone arm motion: CCHs, man, don't monkey with it. Why? Well, you should be able to work it out for yourself because the pc of course, has fallen into the classification and the exact category of why the CCHs should be running. The pc is insufficiently familiar with control, communication and havingness to be able to be held in-session. So you always find yourself in trouble trying to get rudiments in.

And you spend three-quarters of every session trying to get the rudiments in, in order to get one-quarter of a session done, during which nothing will get done. Won't get done. The person obviously is so concerned with the fact that there's a session going on that *durrh*, he's not getting anything done. you get why?

All right. Now the other one is – another one case where tone arm motion indicates the CCHs is, if you run tactile havingness on the pc and you happen to notice that you get tactile havingness and you get tone arm motion, but you prepcheck and you don't get tone arm motion: or you do 3D Criss Cross and you don't get tone arm motion, man, that's where tone arm motion directly indicates that you should do the CCHs. That's what you should do. It's obvious, isn't it? All right.

Now, here's the case where you run Havingness and get nice tone arm action and you prepcheck them and you get no tone arm action. Oh man, that's CCHs. Why? Well, it comes under the same heading as tactile havingness.

You read the tone arm, see. And the tone arm sits here – our tone arm sits here at 3.5, sitting there very nicely. And you say, “All right, put down the cans. Good. Now touch the table, touch the chair, touch your head,” you know. “Touch this, touch that,” and so forth.

“All right, pick up the cans.” Tone arm is reading up here, 4.25 – CCHs. That tells you their best avenue of improvement for the case.

Tell him to put down the cans, touch the table, touch the chair, touch this and touch the ashtray and so forth, pick up the cans – 2.5. Oh man, they need CCHs like the western desert needs water! That's what they're going to respond to. you see how you adjudicate. As a matter of fact, you'll find that same pc ordinarily, will go up to 3.26 on a Prepcheck question, then go up to 3.4 on a Prepcheck question and 3.2 on a Prepcheck question and 3.25 on a Prepcheck question. And this would be wild tone arm motion for that pc. But on the tactile havingness 4.25 to 2.75, man! You get this extreme case?

You'll find that's very common. You're wasting your time not to run the CCHs.

Now, let's get back to the bad old days when we relegated the CCHs to psychos. Because it's not a psycho process. That's all. It just isn't. Oddly enough, we're finding cases that have been passing for sane for a long time, even on this planet, do beautifully on the CCHs. And make faster case gain on the CCHs than they've been making on thinkingness processes.

Now, because only the CCHs can be run on a psycho that is an inarticulate, combative, noncooperative psycho and because we were so happy at that time to have something that would run at that level, people started to attach stigma to themselves because they were being run on the CCHs. And it took a – it was a bad thing.

The CCH level is not much lower than we suspected before, but much higher. See, it runs well up, well up. It runs in the cases that would get benefit from 3D Criss Cross and would get some benefit from Prepchecking And they will get much faster benefit from the CCHs in the early stages. How do you like that? That's interesting, isn't it?

Now that's a recapitulation of an old process and this is time tested and very true and where the CCHs lost out was in a change of application. The application of the CCHs you have now is – aside from the “When,” which we have never been able to answer until now – it is severely the first version of the CCHs. We're actually running the CCHs the way I was teaching you to do it and you were going back and forth on the tram and pumping the doll's hand. I remember that very well.

Very funny. Jenny Edmonds – she was in tears practically over this thing. She couldn't confront this person. She couldn't get through, just wouldn't do it and I thought – so I made her pump a doll's hand and make the doll do the CCHs. She had some time on the bus and so forth; and I imagine that helped her overcome a lot of her shyness, sitting there on a bus doing things with a doll with all the other passengers looking on. Imagine that scenery. And for two or three days her pc couldn't have been scraped up off the bottom of the Fitzroy Street sewers and was going down for the last count.

Now all of a sudden Jenny got the hang of this thing and that pc just soared, just as nice as you ever saw. And just came along fine, thank you. Never saw an auditor more proud of a win. Isn't that right? Yeah. That's all in doing them right.

Actually it isn't true that some auditors can do the CCHs and some can't. That's much too broad a generality. There is this: Some auditors will audit and some won't. I think that's about all you could say about it. But the CCHs done under these existing – these rules, they had no bugs in them other than that, if you just do just this and don't do anything else but this, contained in these three bulletins and you'll find out they work for any auditor.

You sometimes get the idea that some auditors can do the CCHs and some auditors can't do the CCHs, because you're not watching some auditors do the (quote) (unquote) “do” the CCHs.

And where you get them parked back of a door and they haven't been too well trained into it and so forth, what they consider 8-C or something like that, has no relationship to any bulletin we have discussed this evening. So your – you see, in view of that fact, we got into a bad opinion. We thought that there was some mystic quality about this, see. Thought some auditors could do it and some auditors couldn't do it. Now it isn't true. Some auditors were doing it and some weren't. The gross auditing error was the omission of the CCHs.

You do the CCHs. They're written up here. It takes a certain degree of certainty. It takes a positiveness of action and so on. But frankly doing the CCHs is the most restful auditing that anybody ever did. you don't have to think of a thing! Except, please notice, when it's ceasing to produce change. And please notice that it's still changing, if you notice those things.

Of course, you understand it's a natural thing to Q-and-A with the fact that the thing isn't changing to go on doing it. you realize that. you know? It isn't changing, it looks like you ought to keep on. you know? And if it is changing it looks like you ought to change. You know that.

Now, an auditor has to swim upstream against this. And if it *is* producing change, you don't change. And if it has ceased to produce change, you change. Which, of course, is going into the teeth of fate, the time stream and eternity. I mean, that's the exact reverse from the way you've been living All right, now there's the CCHs. And you're doing them now. I thought you would like to have a very – a recapitulative lecture concerning them and be reassured that no vast changes have occurred in the CCHs since the last time you did it. I hope you are reassured and I already know that you're getting some wonderful results doing the CCHs.

Thank you.

Good night. Thank you.

