PROGRAMMING CASES, PART 1

A lecture given on
29 May 1963

All right. This is what, the 29th? Twenty-nine May AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. This is a lecture on programming cases – a subject that you don't know anything about, never heard of before. Oddly enough, it's the least understood – you've heard of it, but it's the least understood activity in Dianetics or Scientology.

The antiquity of this subject is as antique as the discovery of the engram, because there's hardly any time at all intervened between the original discovery of the engram and the discovery of the mechanism of basic. So these are hand in glove. But because nobody's called it something different, nobody really separates it out or pays enough attention to it.

Programming is the overall action taken to resolve the case, regulated by the state of the case and the necessary steps. Possibly not a very neat definition – I could get you a neater one, and probably will. Let me expand it a little bit more; a guy has a stubbed toe. You're going to give him an assist. You give him assist. You get those steps now. He has a stubbed toe. You're going to give him an assist. You give him an assist. You got that?

All right. The stubbed toe is what you're directing the auditing toward in order to release it or benefit the case. The fact that you said, "I'm going to give him an assist" is the *totality* of programming. See, all of the steps of programming are inherent in that one little statement, "I'm going to give him an assist." And then you give him an assist and that is auditing. And you must separate programming out from auditing. And if you don't understand these as separate subjects, you're going to lay some ostrich eggs, and it's very hard to support ostriches.

Now, what goes into this statement, "I'm going to give him an assist"? How much adjudication goes into it? Well, one of the first adjudications is time. Time. You only got a half an hour to audit him, see.

Your next adjudication is "What will he stand for?" That is, "What will the case accept as auditing?"

Your next is "What will the case progress on as auditing?" In other words, "What auditing will make this case progress?"

Your next one is, is your order of actions. And it comes back again to time – "When are you going to start the auditing?"

Now, programming could be relegated to this dismal a cutback: "I start my sessions at two and end them at four. Now I have programmed the case."

Well, you'd be amazed how often that is the totality of programming. Just time alone, that's all. "I've only got a half an hour to audit him, so I will – ." See, totality of programming. Time limits it so that you can't do very much. So that's the monitoring factor in programming and so on.

Well, all this is all very well, but before you're going to make any Clears, you have to have a very good grip on programming and there's a lot to this business of programming. It's all right to have a technique that will make a Clear. If you don't program it, it won't make a Clear.

People can walk up the front steps of Central Organizations, all be run on the exact technology; if programming is omitted for each case, you're going to get yourself 60, 70, 80 percent, and you're going to lose 20, 30 percent of the cases on gains.

Simple. This is a simple fact. This is one of these idiot facts – "I mean, everybody knows there is such a thing as pavement, so you walk on the pavement." Because it's an "everybody knows," the next thing you know there's no pavement and you're not walking on anything. You see? It has to be put there. The programming has to be put there. And one of the primary jobs of a Director of Processing is programming, not yakking with the auditor on what technique is going to be used.

Now, the funny part of it is, it tends to stay on automatic, because I know this subject so well, handle it's factors so rapidly, that I've never bothered to put a sidewalk there for you where you don't know of it. It's one of these things that's very easy to do. You too will find it easy to do. But unless you know it's there to do, you won't do it. And therefore, you will miss on a lot of cases and you'll say, "Well, technique XZ 77-HUP doesn't work." Why? "Well, we ran it on eighteen cases and it only fixed up about fourteen of them and that's not good enough," and so forth. But was it programmed? There's the question to ask: "Was it programmed for the case it was being run on?"

Now, that's very important. This is something on the order of saying, "Aircraft. Aircraft. We're going to fly aircraft, and so forth," and we just take for granted forever that there's a sky. So we don't bother to learn anything about the sky. Sooner or later we get into space opera, and we find out we've run into the limitations of that, and ho-ho-holy cats now, we'd sure better know about the sky! See, we've got to know a lot about the sky now.

Orville and Wilbur, fresh out of the last space opera society they were with, and anxious to get up in the air again – having been well restimulated by theta traps, which has the

basic symbol, an airplane… Oh, you didn't know that? I thought that was interesting. See, an airplane carries the symbolic message that a thetan needs mass to rise, which is a lot of… Well it's… So the airplane becomes a symbol of gravity, having to bear on a thetan. Do you ever notice how fly boys tend to put on mass when they get up around their thirties, and so forth? It's quite an interesting fact, but it's just that the airplane is a symbol of theta traps.

All right. So they fly around in the sky, and they go out and they make a flight of a hundred yards, or something like that, and it's all up in the air, and they don't crash when they landed, and they must come down in a place which is not lower than the place they took off from. In other words, they made a flight. And believe me, they sure took the sky for granted.

And boys have been going on, now, taking the sky for granted, and so forth, and they just – it got this far – they program to this degree: "It's raining and cloudy, so we won't fly." Get that as World War I programming for flight. Idiocy, see.

All right. They get up to World War II, why, they're flying *above* the weather, and they're doing all sorts of interesting things, so they have to have *a prediction* of what the weather is *going* to be. Taking off and landing in rain didn't bother them so much anymore. But targets and that sort of thing – they got more and more involved in what they laughingly call meteorology here on this planet. The prediction of tomorrow's Weather Bureau mistakes. Actually, this whole subject is not in its infancy; it hasn't been born yet on this planet.

I can take a look at my desk barometer any day of the week and get a better weather forecast than I get over the Telephone. The – I'm being hard on the boys. Every year they get a little bit better. They're finding the sky too.

And then all of a sudden we get into passenger traffic left and right across the Atlantic, and we hear "above-the-weather flight," "radar-spotted weather," you see, and so on. They're still finding clouds. They haven't found the sky yet, see. Then they shot off a few cosmonauts, who became naught in Russia with great rapidity, and they found a great deal there called "the sky." And five dead cosmonauts later, the Russians must have decided that they should know something about it. But because they had lots of cosmonauts they probably haven't bothered.

But the point is, they send people up into the Van Allen belt – named after Van Allen. Who the hell heard of him? And – I don't know, maybe he was the fellow who invented radiation fallout or something. In other words, they shoot people up into these areas, and they get scorched or something happens or something of that sort, and they're in the big vagueness of "There is a sky." They're still on this thing here, see.

In other words, they're just gradually, one by one as they run into this, getting aware of the fact that there's something out there called "sky," and there's a lot to know about it. And actually, they haven't even got the seven-year-old-child's version of crime detection text-

books, you know, or something like that. It's just from nowhere yet. It's a tremendous amount of technology. Yet they might know how to fly airplanes, see. They might do a pretty good job.

These cosmonauts or astronauts – you notice all of them are getting slack-jawed, you know, from this spinning around. Watch the pictures of them. They spin them around in circles until they get slack-jawed. How do you become a space jockey? Well, you spin a guy enough in a wide circle to accustom him to being slack-jawed, as near as I can figure out what man was about there.

Everybody knows he'll get terribly sick unless you make him sick. You see, they're well up on this kind of thing. And they can fly these little capsules and jet planes, and guided missiles are beginning to land here and there, and so forth, so they probably think they're pretty sharp.

But what sky are they flying in? What about this sky?

And that's just about the same relationship that auditing has with programming. You can fly the pc through most anything, see. But is there any sky? And if you don't know there's none there, you're going to have an awful time. And a perfectly simple case is just going to go *bzzt* in your hands, because it isn't programmed.

And you can take this bird; he's sitting right there. You can get almost anything to fire. You can get almost anything to run, and at the end of fifty hours of auditing, you've got a pile of junk on your hands. Something went wrong. What went wrong? You did all of your auditing perfectly. You did it exactly the way you were supposed to be taught and yet the pc crashed. Why? Programming, programming. It's a fine art. It's based on rather fantastic principles, and it isn't any guesswork. It's based on some of the oldest auditing principles we have, and the most neglected.

It's very doubtful if there are very many auditors present who know these data, and yet they're some of the most aged data we have. It's – some of this data is onward to sixteen years old. Pretty creaky.

But these are the criteria. "Yes," you say, "I've run into that in Book One, and I've run into it here," and so forth. But you haven't run into it as a huge beacon in the middle of the sky. You've run into it as a little fact you might trip across, and that's this: The behavior of the time track and the disabilities of pcs in relationship thereto and the abilities of pcs in relationship to the time track. And that is what forms the bulk of programming. It's just contained in those little data right there.

What is the time track? Well, there's a long bulletin on this subject. Most – I've spoken to you about it recently. Actually, it's a lineal 3-D record of all the activities of a thetan, potentially in 3-D, full color, with fifty-two perceptions. It's a long movie. And as the film

goes through, some of it you could call an engram, and some of it you could call a lock, and some of it you could call a secondary, and some of it you could call this. But it's all the same movie, but some of these incidents are more powerful than others and some of them have a capability of destroying the movie or appearing to destroy the movie. So that you pick up reel sixteen and apparently the next consecutive picture is reel eighty. What the hell goes on between reel sixteen and reel eighty? This is no way to conduct an entertainment, everything missing between those two points. And yet with improper programming you will never find sixteen to eighty. You go ahead and audit with great industry reel eighty, reel sixteen; where's the rest of it?

Well, just ignore that and don't undertake any programming that will arrive at that. He – your pc – somehow or another he's getting lots of auditing, but nothing is happening to his case because the programming is missing. Why is it – why this tremendous effect? Well, actually what's wrong with him is between reel sixteen and reel eighty. And you're assiduously auditing, let us say, reel eighty to reel one hundred, and you only audit reel eighty to reel one hundred. Quite interesting.

Well, the word "programming" is something you should remember, because a time track can be likened to a very long motion-picture show. So therefore, there's nothing better than calling it programming.

But *how* do you get this thing exhibited? Now, if it was just a piece of film that you put in a projector and ran through and you only had to patch it up occasionally, you'd be in clover. But that isn't the kind of film it is. This film can have a total effect on the pc. He *lives* this movie. When somebody gets shot in the picture, he feels the bullet.

Well, this is really a very fantastically personal sort of motion picture that you're running. There's nothing impersonal about it unless the pc is halfway around the bend, and then he can be so detached, you see, that it doesn't have any effect on him. He doesn't get well either.

In fact, it goes so far as you can only run those portions of this motion picture which are totally personal to the pc. And the moment you start to run things which are too impersonal to the pc, you have a hard time of it. And that's what is known – "You run the pc at his reality."

Well, you'd be surprised how far you can *exceed* the pc's reality and get something run. You grab a Helatrobus Implant and start running it – glugh! He's got no reality. He's lived but once, see. Here he is living but once, huh-ha!

Every life he kicks the bucket and lives but once again, and blind as a bat on the subject of what he's done yesterday and can't do tomorrow. And oh, he's having a hell of a time, you see. Here he goes.

And sometimes a pc absolutely gets down and pounds the desk. See, he's so infuriated at your terrible doctrine that people have lived before and something Scientologists "believe," you know, that sort of thing. You could take this character and throw him into the middle of a Helatrobus Implant; start running the implant. Some time later (however fast you run the RIs), he suddenly looks up and says, "I've got news for you. This didn't happen this lifetime, and it happened to me." And that's what's so interesting about the Helatrobus Implants – the personalness of them.

So your programm is not monitored – this is the other mistake you can make – the program is not monitored on what the pc has a reality on *before* you audit the pc, but is monitored by what the pc can obtain a reality on during auditing. And that's what we call the reality factor of programming. What can you run on him that he can *obtain* a reality on during auditing? Not, what is real to this lunk – this guy.? You know, he's been going around saying, "Well, everybody is a machine. And if I don't implant this pc in present time, then he won't be able to run back to early incidents, you see, because he'll have no impulse to do so."

In other words, you omit the volitional factor. You omit the factor of change in the pc. See, you say, "The pc can't change. The pc can't assume a new viewpoint. And the pc has very little volition in which to assume a new viewpoint," and so forth. Well, if you neglect all of those things, – then you would only run what the college faculties on this planet at the moment would permit. See, I know what they would permit. They would permit the student life of the student body to be audited. See, that's all. They would only permit to be audited on the pc that which they themselves fully and thoroughly agreed to be reality.

So never fall for that trap in programming. You want to audit in the direction that the pc can obtain a reality. But you always want a new reality on the part of the pc, not the reality the pc has.

Well, it does you no good, actually, to say, "Well, the pc has a very good reality on this carpet, so therefore we will audit him on this carpet for the next four or five intensives." You see, that's idiocy.

No, let's audit the pc – well, let's just make a forward program on this. Let's audit the pc up to being able to have a reality on the composition of mest into carpets. Ah well, that would be a different trick, wouldn't it? Oh! Just look at the number of complexities you'd have to run into to get a total reality on a carpet. And you probably could devote four or five intensives to it. See?

Now, we don't, then, take off with the pc's reality as an accomplished fact. This is – yesterday's mental sciences made this mistake all the time, all the time in their programming; made this mistake continuously and they shouldn't have made this mistake. They audited or processed or treated from the viewpoint of their own immediate reality and on no other viewpoint and therefore came to the conclusion nobody could change.

It's something like tying a horse up and tying every hoof to the ground and then announcing to one and all that horses won't run. And stand there and beat the horse, and the horse doesn't run, and you say, "You see, it proves itself. The horse can't run."

You've audited the pc, then, only and totally from the platform of the pc's current or extant reality and have not permitted the pc to exceed that in any way. Bum programming, absolutely backwards.

Now, a lot of remarks could be made along in this particular direction, and mistakes that could be made in programming, but it is not quite as esoteric even yet as you might think. It is much more concise and much more scientific.

Programming is based one hundred percent upon these exact things: The capability of the auditor (that is number one, not number two), the capability of the pc to receive auditing, the amount of time available in the auditing and the maximum result to be obtained – given those upper factors that I just gave you – the maximum result to be thereby attained. That's programming.

In other words, it takes into effect what can be accomplished. And you can add one more line to that end one that you put down: Increase of *A, R* and *C*. In other words, that's the maximum result that can be obtained is always measured in increase of A, R and C, not just in the increase of ARC. Increase of A, increase of R and increase of C. That's different, isn't it?

See, we've gotten so portmanteau with ARC, we forget that it's a highly technical action. In other words, given those earlier factors that I gave you there – the capability of the auditor, the capability of the pc and the amount of time available – we can then determine the last factor, which will be an increase of affinity.

Now, what the hell is an increase of affinity? Well, there's the Gno [Know] to Mystery Scale, and the wusser [worse] somebody is off, the lower he is on the scale. The *whole* Tone Scale is part of the Know to Mystery Scale. That's why I use the Know to Mystery Scale rather than say Tone Scale. The whole middle guts where it says "emotion" and so forth, and so forth, that's actually your forty tones in there and it goes below those, see?

This you should know about the Tone Scale: That a person has no personal reality, but may have an intellectual reality, on those tones above his position. He has reality only on those tones *below* his position. That's – his tone is known as *chronic tone.*

Now, there can be chronic tone as a body plus thetan, or there can be chronic tone as a thetan. And chronic tone of body plus thetan can be apparently at enthusiasm, whereas tone of thetan is at unconsciousness and is off the Tone Scale. Do you get these data?

This is not brand-new data, but it's quite interesting because I'm punching it up to you hard. This is not just nonsense data that it's nice to know; this is the breath of life when it comes to programming.

Any level *above* the chronic tone is susceptible of being dramatized. Dramatization is a thetan or thetan plus body performing evolutions not under the thetan or thetan plus body's control. Nonvolitional action.

Older mental studies so concentrated on nonvolitional actions they thought there was nothing else but nonvolitional actions. So you just have to omit those particular studies because there are volitional actions and they lie below the chronic tone of the individual on the Tone Scale.

Now, you've got the volitional actions, then, of body plus thetan – see, a chronic tone of body plus thetan. And then you've got another position which is the chronic tone of the thetan which is *lower* than that of the body plus thetan. So that tells you very often that you have to process the body plus thetan like mad to finally bring the thetan off the launching pad.

And they dramatize – the body plus thetan is susceptible of dramatizing any level above the chronic tone, but is most susceptible to the half-tone above. That goes in harmonics as you go on up.

A – we have just covered A. See, that's A: affinity of the A, R and C, in that last one. What do you mean, then, by "increasing the affinity"? Well, you mean definitely raising the person so that he is *less* susceptible to dramatization and has a reality on more tone levels below him. See, if you raise him up one tone level, then you've added one more level on which he has reality and you've subtracted one level that he may dramatize.

See, so he'll dramatize one tone level less, and he'll have reality on one tone level more. You get the idea? He's just gone up one slot on the ladder, so therefore, you've put another rung under him. He won't dramatize the rung where he is, and previously he was the effect of this rung.

Now, are you processing a body plus thetan? All right. If you're processing a body plus thetan, then this gain is on the old finite scale that only goes up to about four. Body plus thetans never cycle above four. That's *apparent* tone. Apparent tone.

That means that someday you're going to get an awful surprise. You're going to have this boy really flying man! Just flying. His affinity is way up there at four, see. Affinity right up there at four, enthusiasm; everything's fine. Rah! Rah! you know. Get the show on the road. Bang! And all of a sudden he comes down and he crashes – apparently crashes – and drags himself into session man. "Trrrah!" Tone arm hasn't even gone up. Nothing happened between sessions. Had a good sleep last night and yet you can practically see the degradation dripping off of him.

Degradation is kind of oily and greasy. And you can practically see it drip off of him. And he may go along like this for a little while and then he may realize or you may realize – he'll get, eventually, reality on it – you've processed a thetan up to degradation. And maybe

there were some intervening levels, but he didn't notice and you didn't notice. You processed him from unconsciousness to degradation. Only degradation is so spectacular that somebody noticed. You're now processing a thetan; you're no longer processing a body plus thetan. There's where he takes off if you're eventually going to go in for Route One.

How far up that scale does he have to go to perform Route One? Well, he has to go as far up that scale as the chronic tone of the thetan has to go up that scale. You see that?

So there is your portmanteau picture, just an offhand sort of picture, of an increase or gain of case as you call it – case gain in terms of affinity.

That's a case gain. So given those earlier three factors I gave you, why, you've got him up along as best you could there to that. But you did not achieve a case gain unless you did something with A. Got it?

Body plus thetan had to come up in tone or a thetan had to appear or something had to happen here, don't you see? That's a case gain. That's a real case gain.

R – reality. Well, everything was pretty unreal to this fellow. What do we mean, "unreal"? Oh well, that's a nice, wonderful word – unreal. That's just a dirty word. Undefined and unclassified in any way, it's just a dirty word.

You know, you can measure the reality of a person so fast it'd make your head swim. There is matter, energy, space, time and significance. Those are the five elements which really compose a universe. And you can always use significance as a measure. Even though you haven't affected the matter, energy, space and time, you can tell the – I mean, you haven't observed them as changing – you can tell an observation of the significance.

This person, when you start to process him, cannot *understand.* His life and conversation is full of "cannot understand," see. He cannot assume any viewpoint but his own and his own is nonextant. He's – easily gets very reasonable about the most unreasonable things. You can test somebody's reality rather easily, simply in a solution of problems. All of psychological testing is directed, whether they know it or not, in the direction of observation of significance, the realities of significance, and they measure their changes that way.

It's at that little bridge point where these two subjects collide that we can thereon use this, because it is a measure of the significance. You'll find out this fellow is capable of understanding a little more. Now, this is measured, sometimes, in terms of appearing overts. His overts will appear. He'll realize that certain things he did were overts. Well, why is this? Well, that's because his understanding has increased. He is more capable of taking the other fellow's viewpoint. And taking the other fellow's viewpoint, he realizes his overts can now knock his own block off. See? And therefore, one of the symptoms of this is a fellow begins to suffer. An increase of reality – the fellow begins to suffer from his overts. He suddenly realizes that something he never thought was so bad before was not quite so good!

You know, that's a big gain, see. That's a big – that's a reality gain. Get the idea? So you know he had a reality increase because he can understand more, and the mechanism of understanding more, of course, puts him into the line of being more responsible, and he's got a different view of things. And he'll cognite on this and that.

Now, *cognition* is actually the process of a changing reality of significance, and that is what a cognition is and why a cognition is *so necessary* to a case gain. You yourself know by experience that that pc that doesn't cognite, doesn't make a case gain. Well, why – what's the cognition? You think it's properly quantity of cognitions. It isn't quantity of cognitions at all. It isn't that. He's simply giving you a dress parade of significant reality changes, see – the reality of significance.

"I never realized before…" "Say, what do you…" "Say, uh-huh!" you know.

Well, I'll give you an example: I had one black – last night, I said, "You know, the reason black mass affects a thetan is because he's never taken responsibility for creating it. What thetan would ever want to create black mass?" See, I was trying to get rid of some black mass, and I suddenly take a look at it and it sort of faded away with that, see.

But from such an observation – although that seems to be a very – actually, is a more fundamental observation than just a cognition, because I've been trying to get at what the hell black mass is for a long time as a technical fact. But the auditor could have said at that point, "I have just made a case gain," see. Now, you put down the goals and gains of the pc at the end of session. Did you ever look on it that you were doing a sort of a psychometric test at that moment? It's all contained in the significance of reality.

And the pc's few cognitions he's had in the session, that's fine, but he himself understands something more or sees something more or sees that he might or the future may be or – you know, something. That's measured your case gain for you.

You see what that is? So you don't have to say, "He can see mest better. The room all looks brilliantly bright to him, so he has had a case gain." See, you don't have to look at it like that. As a matter of fact, I had people turn brilliantly bright to me one time. I was over in New York in 1950, I was doing quite a bit of research and I hadn't been getting any sleep to amount to anything. And it didn't have any great importance to it, but I stepped off a bus and all of a sudden people went bright as could be. They got awfully solid and awfully bright.

Well, an auditor, if he'd been using that to measure whether or not there was a case gain in progress, would have made a hell of a mistake. What I had had happen was a key-in of the Helatrobus Implants! It was the action of getting off the bus. And for a moment everybody looked terribly bright – I didn't like it. And it went away in the next few minutes. You get the idea though?

That wasn't a case gain, and that, therefore, isn't what we mean by reality. That will come in due course – the ability to mock things up and that sort of thing – but now you're talking about high-scale thetan abilities and those are pretty obvious.

You're going to get most of your reality changes on a pc, at the level you're operating in, are going to be at the level of significance and are going to turn out as case gains or cognitions. And don't expect the pc to say, "I have had a wonderful session," and expect that to be a case gain because it is not – the pc might have been audited down to propitiation.

But the pc all of a sudden says, "You know, I think my mother must have had a hard time." Ahh! Ahh! Not because he realizes he is now guilty or something of the sort, but because he is now a little more capable of assuming the viewpoint of his mother. And you say, "Hey, you know, we've made quite a gain in this session here, quite a gain right there," see.

Now let's take up C. That's pretty obvious; the pc won't talk to you at the beginning of session, will talk to you at the end of session. I mean, that's so obvious that you almost specialize in it. Pc will talk to people; pc will communicate better. And there's where you get your solid walls. Actually, it doesn't belong under reality, it belongs in communication. He's more willing to communicate, so he can see better. It's not that he finds reality more palatable that he can see better; it's just simply his communication is better.

Sight, sound, touch – all of these various things, one right after the other are phenomena of communication. See, the phenomena of reach and withdraw: It's the reach and withdraw of the light particle. It's the reach and withdraw of this and that. It's the ability and willingness to receive. All of this sort of thing adds up into this factor of communication. See, reality can be reality even if you can't see it.

I think you've got a pretty good idea right now that Saint Paul's is pretty solid. Hm? Therefore, you can conceive of the reality of Saint Paul's – see, that it's solid. All right, that's fine. That isn't a case gain. Well, why isn't it a case gain? Well, you just conceived of the reality of Saint Paul's and Saint Paul's is solid. And – but if you could see Saint Paul right now or if you got a mock-up of Saint Paul's or if you could just look at Saint Paul's right now or *see* Saint Paul's right now and *see* how solid it was and feel how solid it was, that's a communication gain. See that?

Now, that can be a fantastic thing. You're taking off, perhaps, with a totally delusory case. He thinks the room is full of polar bears. Well, at the end of session can he see them better? Have they cleaned up any? I'm afraid that would be a case gain. But if you're operating from the platform of reality that the room is not full of polar bears (circa Freud, you see), so therefore you must get rid of the polar bears out of the room, you, of course, have dropped his communication. He can't communicate with you, but he can communicate with these polar bears.

Now, if he could communicate with the polar bears well enough, he wouldn't have to communicate with the polar bears and they'd depart. That's the way to get rid of polar bears.

It's horrible, some psychiatrist picking bugs off of some patient on the basis that the patient doesn't have any bugs and therefore, before he's got the bugs he must get rid of the bugs. See, that's operating from the platform of reality of there must only be *this* reality, and unless we can hold the status quo of this reality, we have not won in processing.

And I stress that – not because it's funny or that I want to clobber our poor, sick brothers – because it has been the criteria in all mental activities for the many trillennia. And an auditor may be holding on to it with both fists and not realize it, see, that our only gain would be from the platform of where we are. See, if we can continue the alteration to making things more like they are, here, now, then we're getting case gains. I'm sure that's the wonderful way to clobber people. See, because then one of the things you're doing is holding him on the time track.

Now, I am afraid the other side of where you're going and the other side of the coin lies through a lot of hell and a lot of dark canyons. It's whether or not the pc can get a reality and can get reality enough on those dark canyons in order to get through them. In other words, whether his communication factor *rises* sufficiently to go through. Can he communicate with these things? Well, it requires quite a bit of him. So there's your communication factor all contained in that fourth one that I just gave you.

Now, that's long and lugubrious, and this is a long and difficult subject, programming. It's not something that you could wind up. But there's what you're trying to achieve by programming. And if I just tell you "Well, program everything," you know, and then not give you anything you're trying to achieve in programming, why, it'd be almost as bad as barking and condemning at you, you see, left and right, for not doing something you're not told what it is.

See, here's what you're trying to achieve: You're trying to achieve a case gain. Therefore, I've gone at long length to tell you what's a case gain. How do you achieve that gain? Well, the technical facts that have existed over these long and many years are very few. You can almost put them in a thimble. They're outside of the technology of auditing and therefore get forgotten, overlooked, because they belong in the subject of programming.

And that is these hard, fast, technical data, and they are: *unburdening, basics, and disentangling basics.* And it's in those actions that programming is done. Unburdening. Now, I'll amplify it a little bit. Discovery of basics and eradication of the basic by discovering what basics can be found before basic that disentangled the basic you're trying to untangle. Ah, I thought you'd wake up.

Basic on a chain contains in it elements which are not basic to the basic.

You've got the basic engram that gives you the absolute basis of all laryngitis or FDA-osis or something. I'd better be careful to use healing things because they don't want…

By the way, you know, we're going to have to have the FDA arrested. Do you know why? They're the only people in the United States that are claiming that an E-Meter can heal and cure things. And they mustn't maintain those things, you see. It's a criminal offense. So we're going to have to have them arrested, since they are the only ones maintaining it. Poor old FDA. Remember to whisper a little prayer as you – that they all go to heaven at the time…

Now, you're running this basic and you run it as an engram. It is basic on the chain that you're running. Let's say it's automobile accidents, and goddamn, it's got an elephant in it! Well, it *is* the basic on the chain for automobile accidents and will release and everything in it will release except this confounded elephant! So what are you going to do, run this engram and leave an elephant sitting there, saying, "Well, that's not part of the basic, boy, so we can't have anything to do with that. You just go on and live with this elephant"? Is that what you're going to do? Your pc's going to ARC break. Why? Because when you found the elephant you found a more basic chain, not on automobile accidents but on elephants.

So you're running the engram through quite happily and then you run into an elephant – you've got to slip this elephant's basic. That could be done rather readily. You can do it almost with dating. You can find the first elephant. And the amazing part of it is, is the elephant will disappear out of the basic that you're running. You've gotten rid of him, he's gone. Do you understand?

The actual operation of running basics is not the same operation as running any other engram. You run a basic by finding everything basic to the basic. And by the time you've got through, you've practically cleared somebody, unless you've got him so tangled up and lost your place in the book! But you take a basic apart in terms of basics, if you really want to take it apart.

Oh yes, it's basic on the chain of automobile accidents. Yes, that's fine, but it happens to have a wife in it and an elephant and a motorcycle. Now, it's less complicated than it looks, because it's also got pavement in it, and it's got emotion in it, and it's got suppresses in it, and it's got everything else. And if you went *ne plus ultra ad absurdum* on the whole thing you'd find a basic for everything that was contained in the engram. But even if you did and even if you found the basic for each one of those basics it would blow up! It isn't that you can go too far, it's just simply that you can sometimes become too ridiculous.

By the time you've found basic on motorcycles and basic on a wife and basic on an elephant, this thing has went. Run what engram? See, it's too in – it, as a basic, will blow if the basics are blown of it. Do you understand? Because a basic will almost blow by inspection unless it's held down by an earlier basic. But an earlier basic on what? On something contained in the basic. Oh yes, you can get the basic theta trap, but it's got particles of energy in it and

the pc goes nattering about these particles of energy. You haven't got basics on particles of energy. Well, you go, *bzzzz, bzzzz, clip, tip, pow, pow…* The pc's very interested in it, is your test of whether or not you'd handle it. And you go *sloop, doop, bang,* "Basics on particles of energy?"

"Oh, yeah, here's a big overt in glare fight, and I go *brzzzz, maw, glu.* "Good God! Yeah, what do you know about that! Well, how terrible! Yeah, well, that's it and so forth. Yeah, well, all right."

And you say, "Okay, now let's go back and run some more of that basic," and by the way, he isn't bothered this time by the particles of energy. That's gone.

In other words, you slipped the basics out of the basic, and this takes some very slippy engram running. Very interesting. If you can keep track of it, you are very successful; if you can't, why, the whole track collapses and the pc goes mad, but that's all right because you've still got another action.

Now, the first action that you should undertake on a case is the most advanced action – this is in programming – is the most advanced action which can be undertaken in your estimation. In other words, always enter a case more boldly than you think is absolutely necessary, and you will nearly always be right. Just enter a case more boldly than you think is wise. Got that?

Otherwise, if you don't maintain that point of view, you will never find the ceiling at which the pc can operate because you'll go at it at such graduals, and your underestimations will cost so much time. Because going at it more boldly, if you get away with it, you're just fine. If you get away with it, you're way into it now, man, and you're all set. And you're doing that with the Helatrobus Implants. A guy can run an implant; hmmm, go man go. The pc falls on his head and can't manage it and so forth, pull back. Run some implants later. And that doesn't even really depend on whether or not the pc could run the implant. It's – remember it's regulated by these other things; could the auditor run the implant, see, and that sort of thing. It's just those little factors I gave you there on programming are all relative to this.

But always go in a little more boldly! Give the auditor a little more process than you think he can handle if you have to. Always run the case just a little steeper than you think is absolutely wise and you'll head for more gains faster, see. You can always pull back today. You don't sacrifice a case. The case isn't "ruined forever!"

Now, these technical facts – I'll go over them again – are simply unburdening and running basics and taking basics apart. Now, you could say unburdening, finding a chain – and you'd probably be more subtle about this, more orderly – unburdening, finding the chain you want, finding the first basic of that chain and then slipping the first basic to pieces by finding some basics for that basic. You understand?

Now, that's programming. I don't care *what* case you're handling or if you're using CCHs, you're still on that program. Now, it's "What part of that program can you enter?" Now, let me be a little more concise, although I will give you a full lecture on it tomorrow.

What part of that can you skimp and what can you press home on? How many corners can you turn sharply? – all within the reality of the factors of the auditor, the pc and the ARC gains the pc makes. You got it?

But actually, don't think there is more to auditing than unburdening, finding a chain, finding the basic on the chain and taking apart a basic, because there is no more to auditing than that. I don't care what process you're using. Pat-a-cake – famous process; used to be run in the Foundation by people who couldn't audit. Sitting there having a conversation with the pc, being very careful – everybody being very careful, not to go anywhere near an engram. Its old name they used to give it was "pat-a-cake."

All right. They still – they still have some programming. Their program is not to unburden because it's too dangerous. They didn't even think about going to engrams. See, they just wouldn't even unburden, because there's no telling what you might find underneath that rock, see. "Don't pick up any rocks, man! That's dangerous!"

Now, what does it essentially consist of? It essentially consists of taking off charge. And the reason I gave you the first time, unburdening, finding basic and so forth. Because ordinarily you run back a chain and run enough off a chain – run enough off of it so that you can get earlier on it, so that you can run enough off of it, so that you can get earlier on it so that you could lay your paws on the basic. And if the basic is too pistol-hot and the pc can't sit there, well, just indicate that you're going to take care of this shortly and then you go forward from basic very ra – I mean, go later than basic, see, very rapidly and you strip the charge off after basic.

Now let me give you an idea. You find the first GPM implant – here's programming: to find the first implant – that's your goal, see – and to strip it down and knock it out. That's what you're trying to do. Find the first GPM. I don't care what else you think you're trying to do; that's what you're trying to do.

And you get landed with a pc that can't – you can't get a single RI or goal to fire on of any kind whatsoever. What do you do? Well, you have to make – the fact that he might not *have* the Helatrobus Implants, according to the estimation of how goosey he is as a case. You know, "Can you remember yesterday? What did you have for breakfast this morning? Oh, that makes you nervous?" Well, he's got the Helatrobus Implants. You get it? Not that "he was nervous" gave him the Helatrobus Implants, but this guy has just got such a heavily burdened case that he's just too goosey to go anywhere near anything dynamitey like that, see.

So you see, you have to unburden this to get to the implants. Well, how long do you unburden? Well, you unburden until you can get your hands on an implant and not one second

longer. And as soon as you get your hands on an implant, we don't care if it's the last one, you run it. How thoroughly do you run it? Well, you run it thoroughly enough to blow charge of it off. At least one dial wide disintegrating RR per item, and that is the absolute minimum that you can run one.

You can't run one of those items less than that. But you can sometimes run one, unfortunately, more than that. You can grind the rest of it off.

Grinding out the engram… Well, you haven't got basic if you have to grind, grind. It isn't releasing and nothing's releasing and you grind and you call items. And *urhrrr!* nothing happening and so forth and nothing RRs. (And the pc is awake; that's necessary to the auditing!) What do you do? Well, you've probably got too early an implant. You say, "Hey, we're trying to go early." No, no you're trying to unburden. Well, let's pick up the last one in the second chain if we know what it is and let's run that one with a fast pass. Or let's do something with some Straightwire that gives him some locks, or let's find overts on this thing, don't you see? Let's see if we can chase him earlier and find the first contact. That's all unburdening, don't you see.

Well, let's run the "three command process" for a while and see if we can dish this out and lay open some other things. We're just trying to get our hands on an implant. Why are we trying to get our hands on an implant? So we can run some charge of it off so we can find an earlier implant. Why are we trying to get that implant? So we can run some charge of it off and find some earlier implant. Why are we trying to run that implant? So we can find basic!

Well, what's basic? That's the first implant. What do you do when you get your hands on it? Sometimes it's so pistol-hot you can't run it. You have to come running later and run some charge off some of them later and then lay your hands on it again. You sometimes have to go later than basic, not earlier.

Why? You're asking a pc to walk through a wall of fire back to an area he's never been at before. Between basic and present time there's this wall of fire, and you're saying, "Well, go on through."

And he says, "But I can't find anything in here!"

And you say, "Oh, you idiot, go on," and so forth. What are you going to do? Just spend the rest of session after session after session, well knowing your pc's not getting any gains in ARC, trying to push him through this wall of fire. Why try to push him through the wall of fire? It's the wrong Mission. You're trying to *get* him through the wall of fire. *Hoo-hoo.* How do you get him through the wall of fire? Well, put some fire out, of course!

How do you put some fire out? Well, you just – let's get back here where the heat can be felt and let's get some of that pawed off, and then let's get him a little closer and let's get some charge off a little closer. Finally, he's got a living flame in his hands and says, "Ho, ho!

There it is, there it goes, there's another one and so forth and… I wonder what's back there?" you know. *Scorch!* And retreats, and so forth, and you just take a little more fire off the track. It's all a quantitative charge. It isn't what the pc can confront; it's how much you can get discharged. It's a mechanical fact.

And you get him back through the wall of fire and he finds the fifteenth goal. And you think it's the first one and so does he. But then you get that discharged and you'll get the fifteenth goal. And you get that one out and then you get that discharged. And then you can find the thirteenth, and then you can find the tenth, and then you can find the fifth. And he knows he's got the first goal now because – nothing before it. So you get that discharged. Discharge it RIs. And you move up, and all of a sudden you find yourself sitting there with the front goal, and this is hotter than a *pistol!* And it's got basics.

And you have to take everything out of it that is a basic. There's a theta trap in it that doesn't belong in it. Well, let's put it back on the track where it belongs, see. Let's date it and smooth it up. And let's clean this area out! By taking off prior charge to the basic, all of a sudden the basic collapses and what do you see next? Oh, you may have to run these implants but, heh! It's something on the basis of *bzzzzt!* "Well, that's that one run." Get the idea? *Pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow!* "Yes, I've got that one."

It's tearing up, don't you see? It can't stay there if the basic is still in – is not in place. *Basic* can't stay there if it doesn't have certain *basics* holding it in place – basic elements, not basic engrams but basic elements holding it in place. Basic can't stay there without those basic elements. With those basic elements gone, basic can't stay there. If basic is gone, the rest of the chain can't stay there. You're walking a track backwards that can't be walked backwards, and that's why Scientology is magic.

But it's always done in a programming which will accomplish those ends. Unburden, find the chain you're looking for, unburden that chain, get the basic you're looking for, and then run back the elements in that basic, clip those basics out, that will disappear and the whole thing blows clean.

And that's what you're trying to do. You're not trying to run 8,765 GPMs because George has got that many. You're running enough GPM to let the pc earlier. And you – you'll underestimate how much charge you've gotten off, and you very often are wrong. You have to discharge another GPM before you can move up earlier again. And everything, now, is going *creak!* – the pc can just barely make it, barely hold his position and so forth. That's good enough. Got it?

That's what you're trying to do. Those are technical facts that have to do with the track, and they fit in with programming, not with auditing, because they tell you what you audit. You've always been wondering what you audit. You audit what you have to program. And how do you program? Just like I've been telling you.

And you're going to find some cases – put them down, they go halfway into the bank; you unburden four or five GPMs in the middle of the bank; you can move it earlier. Ho! That's easy. "Why didn't I go up here in the first place?" Well, of course, you couldn't have. Take that one apart, move a little earlier. That's easy. That's easy. Find the first one, bang! That's out, gone, boom! "What's these Helatrobus Implants? What are they making so much fuss about?" Well, that's just part of his communication and reality factors which I gave you in the first schedule of programming.

See how it's done? Without programming, you can do nothing.

That's the "pill system": no programming. That's the dream of every army in the world. This fellow walks up, puts out his hand, they put a pill in it, fellow takes pill – brilliant, trained fighter. Dream of every army in the world. Dream of every civilization that has ever existed.

Let me point something gruesome out to you: Those armies have all lost and those civilizations are no longer here.

Thank you.