

SUMMARY OF MODERN AUDITING

A lecture given on
19 June 1963

All right.

This is what?

Audience: Nineteenth of June.

Nineteenth June, 1963. Thank you for putting me on the time track. I'd gotten off of it. Good thing, too. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. I haven't anything much to talk to you about except modern techniques. And I think I'd better give you a summary of modern auditing as it looks. Might be valuable to you.

There are innumerable processes. There have been processes of all different shapes and kinds up and down the last twenty—five years, and recorded during that period, why, is more or less the work of about fourteen of these years. And these processes fall into very specific categories, of which you have a record in your State of Case Scale. Now, the categories they fall into, however, are processes that handle certain conditions, or—of a case. And if we look this over very carefully, we'll see that cases deteriorate as they go on down along the time track. And they deteriorate against two factors, and the primary factor that they deteriorate against is confront. And the other factor is duplication.

As they become unwilling to confront they become less capable of duplication. Now you should look on confront as a willingness, and duplication as an ability. Now, it doesn't matter that you run "What are you willing to duplicate" or "unwilling to duplicate"—it doesn't matter that you use that in a process too much, but it is not—it's not exactly right. It's not quite right. It's something like the officer of the change of the guards at Buckingham Palace wearing his sword on the wrong side, really. If you were to ask somebody, "What are you able to duplicate?" and, "What do you feel you are unable to duplicate?" you would have a very exact sort of process. And remembering our process rules, and the famous brackets, and so forth, to keep it from damming up a flow, why, you have to get the other fellow in there at least. You know, "What

would another—what would—what would you be willing...”—you see, there are a lot of combinations to it, “What would you be—what do you believe another is able to duplicate?” don’t you see, and, “is unable to duplicate?” That’s your second leg, you see.

Of course you can add up these legs, ad infinitum. And the reason why these legs get added up ad infinitum is the degree of complexity necessary to undercut the case. That’s the purpose of legs. Some case could run practically all the way—he’d have to be a very high—scale case—he’d practically run all the way on a—just one leg, you see. Well, that would be a case not troubled too much by flows. And another case, well you run just what is he unable, and what does he believe another is unable, you see. All right, that’s all right. That’s fine. Because you’ve got two—way flows with both viewed from the same viewpoint. Now, what does another believe he is unable to duplicate? Now, that’s the other flow from another viewpoint. You get the idea? And the whole thing about flows is how much do you need them, for this particular ease, you see. And flows are interesting at this point, because you could always doctor up the flows of a situation, get TA action, when you might not otherwise have it. See, that’s quite important.

There—you see, TA action is not totally outside the auditor’s control, if he remembers flows and brackets. See, all he has to do is study up on brackets, and you add enough brackets to get TA action, that’s the way you handle brackets. And it actually—you see, there is no perfect method of running brackets. There is no absolutely perfect method. If you ran all of the available flows, do you realize that any given instant on this planet alone, there are two-and-a-half billion, or maybe it’s three-and-a-half billion today—it was two-and-a-half billion yesterday, the population explosion—there are two-and-a-half billion other viewpoints simultaneously operating at that exact instant.

So that would make something on the order of two-and-a-half billion legs. Plus all the legs which take care of all the intermediate groups and dynamics present at that particular moment, you see. And it just becomes completely ridiculous. I’m giving you an idea that you can become very ridiculous in the numbers of legs that you use in a process.

Now, the idea of flows is something that monitors all case levels, and for some peculiar reason breaks its back at about level 4. In other words, you can get as complicated or as simple as you like above level 4, but below level 4 it goes in harmonics—so that you get down to the person who is almost—almost at the bottom, and you only have one viewpoint, which is self You see, so it becomes impossible for this person who is well downscale to run more than one viewpoint. You see, even though it’s vitally necessary that he run two, he can only run one.

Now, this is a problem of the dynamics at work, in actual fact. It’s how many dynamics can a person function on. Now that however—and this I’m trying to give you a look at here, it

sounds rather complicated to you—that there are many facets of processing wherein you could match up to an ideal. You could match up to an ideal. What is the ideal process or the perfect process, you see. The one that absolutely matches every single condition extant on a case, you see. Well, I'm trying to make this point with these brackets and legs, you see. The absolute ideal, totally perfect process from the standpoint of—see, I defined “science” today. What was that? Science is a—modern science is a method of precisely determining overwhelming nonsense.

Well, the point I'm trying to make here is that you could go ahead mathematically, you see, and you could figure out some of the wildest combinations that would be absolutely vital to a process. And see, there's two—and—a—half billion people on Earth, so that in any given instant, to run the pc, why, you have to have the viewpoint of each one of these people taken into account, one way or the other. And then there are various other factors such as their cases, so their case viewpoints and modifications thereof would have to be taken into effect. And what we are trying to do, we completely lose sight of. We're trying to cure the pc's burned finger.

So you have this thing called the ideal and you have this other thing called the workable. Now the workability of a process is what determines its complexity. How complex or uncomplex does it have to be to be workable? And that's how you determine what process to use, that's how you determine how many legs there should be in running out brackets and so forth. In other words, how many do you have to have for it to work?

Now, that factor goes on in to the number of processes you have. Now, there could probably be an infinite number of processes. And sometimes I feel that I have developed an infinite number of processes and you in studying bulletins undoubtedly feel sometimes that you've had to study an infinite number. Well, let me assure you that many more types of processing have been dropped, by a factor of thousands times, of oh, thousands of times more processes have been dropped and discarded than have been retained. Why? They are pretty, but do they work? You see, that's the criterion. They're pretty, but do they work?

All right, so that limits then the number of processes which have survived. And the number of processes which have survived are those processes which have not just workability, but which have very broad workability. And now we come up against this factor: that there are types of cases. Cases aren't GI issue X case, see. It's not always an issue case. So we have to determine the common denominators present in all cases. See, what are the common denominators present in all cases? Well, they happen to be ARC, they oddly enough are the mid—rud buttons, and certain types of incidents common to everyone's time track. Which is to say, the general history of all cases is quite similar.

The reaction of the case, though, to this history, is quite different, because the combinations of history make differences of cases. And when we study differences of cases, we again could get out into the most overpowering library of textbooks you ever heard of. We could have Kraepelin's chart, multiplied by five or six thousand—you know, everybody thinks that's a phoney gag of mine, but you know, it isn't, you know, that chart really exists and it's really called that, and... But this vast number of cases. He had a vast number, and they took it over to America and they added a vaster number. And this became one of the—one of the finest lists of gobbledygook anybody ever had anything to do with. It's totally meaningless. Because they got up—they were getting up to two idiocies. Either there was one case that was supposed to represent a—one case type, that included all cases, see, that's one type of idiocy. You know, everybody is a schizophrenic, you see. That's the way they establish cases these days, is what institute he was sent to. That's actually what they use for ease classification. And if he went to Walnut Lodge and they treat schizophrenics, then the guy's a schizophrenic, you see. Simple. This—so that everybody is a schizophrenic. Or, there is a case type for every case. See, these are two idiocies. One case type for every case. There's five thousand patients, so there's five thousand case types in one institution, see.

Well, this type of approach to the problem is completely unreal, because it's not workable—it's not useful. An auditor has no use for it at all. You might as well say, "My pc's name is Betty, so therefore I am auditing a Betty case type." Well, funny part of it is, it has some truth. See? There is no other case that is exactly like this ease. But there are other denominators. There are other denominators which are similar. This ease has in common certain things with every other case.

Now, you can divide case types up, but again, just for use. You can divide case types up into a few case types. But what is the meaning of this? It would simply be for the purpose of matching them up to processes. That would be the only reason you would get different types of cases today. So you can match them up to the processes. Well, a great deal more work could be done on this than has been done, even. But we would get again probably an excess of what we needed. We'd be getting too complex for what we were trying to do.

So you can go in two directions and err in two directions in trying to classify types of processes. You can get so many ease types that nobody under the sun would ever be able to use that scale or chart in handling any ease. And the other one is to have one case type without any Variation whatsoever.

Now, the first way would lose quite a few cases, because you couldn't find their ease type on it, or something. You see, it was not quite a Beta, and was really not an Alpha, so it's a

Beta—sub—Alpha case type, but there is no process which has been aligned for this particular type, because it doesn't belong on the chart, or something, and nobody would get processed, you see. And on the other side of the picture, we just sit somebody down, and we say, thud! "This is what you are going to run," and every so often the auditor has a horrendous loss. Because he's got a case type that just doesn't quite fit that process. It's a little bit too grossly out. We can't fit this case type into that exact process. But we have to do something else.

So what we need is a finite number of ease types, based on behavior in an auditing session, not behavior in life. See, make it quite real. And then match up processes which do handle and raise the case up that scale. And that is what is needful here, for our purposes.

Now, you can't expect auditors to memorize and perform more than a few auditing types perfectly. If you expect them to, you get a slop over, quite rapidly, whereby they mix auditing types and styles and it gets to be pretty much hash. So you try to keep these things separate. Not because of the limitations of the auditor, but it takes quite a little while to get experienced and grooved in on a type of auditing. Takes quite a little while to do this.

Now, probably repetitive command auditing is so familiar to you that you don't look on it as something that is very difficult to handle. It's pretty easy. There it is and that's all there is to it. Ah, do you remember the first day you ever started to do a repetitive process on somebody? Well, the reason why you look on that easy is you're so familiar with it. For instance, it bears no great qualms to the vast majority of auditors to sit there and give the same auditing command over and over and over and simply acknowledge it, on and on. They look on that as very easy auditing. That's a long sleep. And that's all there is to it, is bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, you see.

So this particular thing is that it is a lesson in common to all types. You have learned it, so you don't regard it with any great horror. Now the CCHs—you take somebody who has never done the CCHs, and you give him CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. And they can get further afield with this than you could easily imagine. In fact the whole of auditors have gotten completely afield. Over a period of years, it had gradually drifted down to a grind, and there was no such thing as a flat point in the CCH, you see, and regardless of whether the fellow was doing an auditing command or not, you just kept on running the auditing command, don't you see? Actually, repetitive processes has slopped over into the CCHs. When did you end these CCHs? Well, it's much more important to end the CCH properly than a repetitive command properly.

Now, the CCHs have also the frailty of auditing people who are lower on the Tone Scale, that is those who are really going to require nothing but CCHs, something like that. These people are lower on the Effect Scale and therefore are much more easily boxed about than—you know, knocked about. Bad auditing has a much worse effect on them, than it has on somebody else who

is upscale. So therefore, it's a type of process which at once looks brutal on cases that react brutally, but is a kid—glove type of process. Well, by the time you've absorbed all these factors and time you've gotten used to all this and time that you can successfully and adequately run the CCHs, why, you've learned quite a bit!

I remember I had to study very hard to learn how to run the CCHs. And I eventually got quite good at it, and went ahead and became quite comfortable running the CCHs. And after a period of about five years—I hadn't done any CCHs—I uncorked the original CCHs as they were done, and as they were getting case results here at Saint Hill, and put on a television demonstration with regard to it and everybody thought that I was running something else, and they had never heard of these CCHs. Vast revelation to me. That they weren't getting results with the CCHs, they were overlooking. But these were the original CCHs. And they were quite calm, and quite delicate, and everybody had gone into the effort band, you know? Boom! You know, and you grind it out, you know, and that sort of thing.

Well, these things can slip. These things can slip. Well, how many—how many types of auditing do you care to keep in line? Let's say you're an Instructor, D of T, or something like that, in some district area—how many—how many types of processing do you think you can keep in line? Keep policed and keep well done, if principal types go out? In other words, it's a small number. It's a small number. And by the time you got one of these things all boxed up and written up and delivered and being done, every now and then you have to unpeel the thing and get it reviewed, because it shifted and is no longer producing results. It's Variation which knocks out process types.

We stopped accumulating process types when I learned that. People shifting from the original type of process would then apparently bring about a need for a new process type. And that has plagued you more than you'd believe. Because all I would see, that auditors were no longer getting results with the CCHs and I would tend to drop them. But then I got very, very eager beaver on this, and I went into it, because of this experience here at Saint Hill, and I found out that a process type shifts very badly and it shifts out of workability over a period of years. So it has to be put back in again. And you'll find out you don't need a new process, you need the original process type, again. Refurbished. Polish up the old teapot, and get cracking, and you're making tea again, see. Tends to go to pieces.

Now that, by the way, is more of a limiting factor than you would believe. The—how to keep processes in line, how to keep them working, and so forth. It's an important factor. You say, "Well, they used to say that they got results with this process, but we don't see any results in it now. It's called Duplication Processing. Don't see any results with this processing these

days. Well, get clever! And go dig up a bulletin from the year zud, see. And you'll find out that the auditing command is not as it is modernly—you'll find out the auditing command is modernly—is, "Duplicate nothing. Thank you. Duplicate nothing. Thank you. Duplicate nothing." You'll find out that wasn't the original auditing command. And as an auditing form, you don't always interrupt the pc when the pc answers the question. The thing is to get the pc to answer the question, not to prevent the pc from answering the question. These little variations will creep in. You mark my words, man!

Now, I don't mean to be sarcastic. You'd be surprised, how technology can vary over a period of years. For instance, we haven't a clue what Buddhism was all about. We really don't have a clue! There might have been some very good processing in there, you know? And just now, I'm almost certain that the planet builders, a couple, three hundred trillion years ago, had some technology. They must have had some mental technology of some kind or another, see. And one of these days when I've got some time casewise, I'm going to get run over that area very carefully, so I can winnow out any technology they might have had, in its original state. And it might have been the planet builders—if they had technology—went downhill, only because the technology got varied out of existence.

So in other words, process types are then also limited by how many you can keep in line, see. So therefore, the simpler process types tend to survive better than the more complicated process types. Now, but even the simpler ones will drift out of line.

So that's a class of processes—the CCHs. The CCHs are sufficiently marvelous that old 8—C was elected as the best case booster by the field auditors in the United States, on a query by me in 1958. It won hands down over anything under the sun. I don't even know how they were doing it today. But it must have been fairly correct, because it was only about a—it was only a few years from its inception. Must have been fairly correctly run during those days.

Well, there's a case type. What is this—what is this case type? Well, it's this ease type where you get a duplication going with another person, and a duplicative physical order followed by another person. Another person has a great deal to do with this. You're following the instructions from another person and you're directing your attention at the physical universe and so forth, and this is all quite important to it.

Funny part of it is that as you drop one level, you tend to drop that out. And you get the reach and withdraw processes. Now these are still duplicative processes. These are still following the orders of a person. But you should look on those as limitation. That's a limitation of the process. That is no longer a benefit of the process. The process works on the lowest—level cases in spite of these things.

Now, there's a whole band of processes, which are so simple and so idiotic that everybody would tend to overlook those processes entirely. And here's another reason. Nobody could possibly see that the process would have very much use. So the process dies. And with it dies the lowest—level cases that you attack, and so you get loses. You need that process. So here's another way a process can go out—is because it is seldom used. Seldom used. Actually, it's the only known way to process a cat or a monkey—and you'd be surprised what happened to Don Breeding's dog one day, when he started to run a sort of a reach and withdraw. He was trying to run 8—C, which was too high upscale, and the dog passed out. That's right, the dog passed out! It was too high upscale. What he needed was the reach and withdraw processes. And you can do remarkable things with the reach and withdraw processes. It's probable that you would not really carry one forward far enough to flatten it. Because it's—another thing is the process works so slowly, even though it works positively, that it tends to be neglected.

Now, I think you could probably get a cat to talk with the reach and withdraw band of processes. I mean it. I mean it. I think you could get a cat to talk. But how would you go about processing a cat, you see? Well, the same way you tend to process children. Sloppily, hunt and punch, no regular sessions, not treating it with the dignity that auditing demands. Don't you see?

You know, a lot of Scientologists' kids are going to be practically unprocessable in a few more years, if people keep hunting and punching processing on them, you know. Grabbing them off as they pass by, and running an assist, don't you see, and never flattening the auditing command and so forth. I'm surprised, every once in a while, one of my kids will yelp when I say I'm going to give them an assist, you know. They yelp! They're usually very pleased, but once in a while I will propose something like this, and I'll get a protest. And I don't know, something's going on, has something to do with it. And they just don't happen to want anything to do with this thing called processing just now. Well, what is it? It's some hunt and punch processing they've had without the dignity of an auditing session or anything like that and that's practically all they get. Well, that's all a cat would get either. See, you wouldn't say to the cat, "All right, all right with you if I begin this session now?" "Any goals you'd like to set for this session?"

And yet in actual fact you'd have to put the session in some kind of a frame, and you'd be surprised, after you gave the cat about four or five sessions that the cat would know the frame, see. "Start of session," "End of session," you know. They know during that period between those two commands they were supposed to stand there and do whatever you were saying.

Another thing is the idea of power of choice, overwhelming power of choice and that sort of thing. Probably be mishandled. Cat starts to walk off and you say to hell with that, you know, and you herd him back into session again. But in actual fact, if you observed—if you observed

these very straightforward rules of auditing, that a session had to have a frame, had to begin and had to end, and if you weren't trying to overwhelm the pc and so forth, and if you were willing to give the cat as much time as you would give a human being—give the cat a fifty—hour intensive, don't you see. It's very hard to do, because the attention span of the cat's probably ten minutes. Have to be fifty hours' worth of ten—minute sessions, don't you see? Wow! And then remember that that cat, as a cat, is going to come up Tone Scale. That's another thing that auditors neglect. Oddly enough, a properly processed cat will not claw up his auditor. He just starts clawing up everybody else.

So you get—you get a situation here, what will reach and withdraw processes do? Well, actually, you don't know and I don't know. Our experience with them is something like: Joe has been sick for a long time. So we take his hand, and we say, "Touch the pillow," and "Touch the pillow," and say, "Thank you." And we say, "Touch the sheet," and he touches the sheet, and we say "Thank you." You know, we take his hand and make him touch the sheet. And we do between two objects here, back and forth and around, make him touch various things, more randomly than that probably. That is to say, "Touch your forehead. Touch the sheet. Touch the pillow. Touch the shoe" (that you put up on the edge of the bed or something). And the end product of it is, is his eyelids flutter, and he comes to. And then we decide we'd better give him some processing.

So we have another source of the disappearance of processes, which you can put under the head of "disrespect." We don't respect the process and so it tends to vanish from ken. See, it's a process which we use diffidently, in certain ways. Actually, old ARC processing disappeared on that route.

Now—so we really don't know what the reach and withdraw band amounts to because we have almost never carried through a reach and withdraw process. When you were doing Book and Bottle—which is a reach and withdraw process with duplication, it's a band process; it hangs right between Reach and Withdraw and the CCHs. When you were doing that, did you ever flatten it? I almost have no Scientologist I've ever run into, has ever flattened this. They say they've done eight hours of it or ten hours of it or eighteen hours of it or twenty—five hours of it, and I've heard thirty hours of it being done or something of this nature. But I never heard of it being flattened.

And yet, do you know that nearly everybody exteriorizes under that process when it's run over about ten hours? That's something to think about. Now, have any of you ever had the sudden illusion that you forgot to raise your arm from the side in touching the book, but put your theta beam arm up, or wondered what was happening here? You got a Confusion between your

body and any—excuse me for using the word—astral body? Now, what—what’s this all about? Looks to me like that’s neglected sphere of processing—not respected. It’s to make an auditor capable of doing a repetitive process, and that’s what we believe it is.

There are enormous numbers of processes in that particular band. Lots of them. One of the most fruitful bands of processing there is, is reach and withdraw. Practically unexplored. And some respectable percentage of the cases which you try to push all the way up are not going to move until they’re run on Reach and Withdraw. They won’t move on the CCHs. Isn’t that an interesting datum?

Now, as I’ve been winnowing out processes, then, I have come to the conclusion that we have the processes which undercut all cases, which you can lay your hands on, but as we have moved down the lower lines, because we are always pressuring at the top, we kept forgetting the bloke who was at the bottom. And through disrespect of the process, because of its limited use, had not much cared to develop it. All of this is very vital in a summary of modern processing, is to realize why processes disappear. And what processes are all about. Rather than process A, B, and C have survived, period.

You’ve got ahead of you times when you will practically be in tears over a ease. For some reason or other the case has done an off the top of the springboard down to the bottom of the State of Case Scale, for some reason. They’ve had a catastrophe or something occur in their lives, the problems are too great for them or something has happened, and you just—tone arm action ceases, case stops moving. You say, “All right, we’re going to get problems straight. This ease obviously has got problems, you know—the ease has problems. After all, anybody who marries three wives and so forth and burgles the banks is liable to have problems. So all right now, let’s just cut right into this and let’s get rid of these problems; we’ll be able to get on with our engram running where we were before,”—cheerily, cheerily.

Ah! You’ve overlooked something. Problems belong at repetitive processes. And the bottom of repetitive processes are at case level—at case level 6. That’s the absolute bottom of repetitive processes. And this case of yours has done a temporary surge, you see, that your auditing (not your case but your auditing) has done a temporary surge, or a temporary collapse and is sitting squarely at 8. You can’t run problems on the case. Yes, it’s true that the case has problems. But the case does not respond to running problems.

So our next division in processing is what the auditor knows is wrong with the case and what can be done with the case. And these are entirely different things. So your common denominator of all easings is very well to know in theory, but paralleling this, is what can be done with these cases. What can be done with them.

Yeah, all right, so you say we got a thetan here, and he's got—he's in a body, and he's got a time track, which has got lots of engrams on it. It's got the Helatrobus Implants on it, and goals of that particular character, and it's got—and he's got certain types of things that he's refusing to duplicate, and we've got all these things. His ARC is low, he's been ARC broken. We can say all these things. Yes, that's what's wrong with the ease. Yeah, absolutely right, there's nothing wrong with anything we have said. But let's get over to the other side of the thing. What can we do about it? So we get over into the category of what I'm referring to as modern processes.

Modern processes have nothing to do with what is wrong with the case. Unlike therapeutic or curative procedures or something like that, you have nothing to do with these things. They're sort of hand in glove ingrained, because of the Aesculapean school and other schools of medicine as they come up the line, you see. The case has lumbosis. Therefore we give him some trumbosis powder, see. See? See, that is a level of thinking. That is a certain thinkingness and it's a very, very easy method of thinking, it's very comfortable, it's very lazy and very ineffective. We're not in the business of curing things. But we nevertheless tend to, because thinkingness tends to go along the line of "what is wrong with a case has to be righted." And that's not true in Scientology.

You see how idiotic it is—you say, "This case keeps saying 'Vomica, nix vomica. Vomica, nix vomica.' That's all the case says." We say, "Very good, stuck in the Helatrobus Implants. Good. He's got a goal 'to vomica.'" Well now, let me assure you of something: If this case is dramatizing something, that something is not real to the case. And you can put that down as one of the guiding rules of running processes. Yes, sir! If the case is dramatizing something, it's not real to the case. And right away, he's got lumbosis, so we give him some antilumbosis powder, instantly folds up. You've got to bypass that type of thinkingness entirely. The only observation you have to do of a case is *does it respond to the process which is being run on the case?* You can put that down, that's the other guiding rule. Very simple. Does it respond to the process that is being run on the case? That is everything there is to it. Does it respond to the process that's being run on the case?

What do we mean by respond? Well, we're getting tone arm action. Now there can be one thing wrong with this thing called tone arm action. Tone arm action can cease because session rudiments aren't in. Very definitely. Tone arm action can cease because session rudiments are out, so therefore we have to assume in auditing that something like session rudiments are in, or that we run a process which undercuts session rudiments, such as the Reach and Withdraw or CCHs. And to some slight degree Sec Checking undercuts session rudiments. And also are flows getting out of line.

Now let me give you an example. The Helatrobis Implants, and most of the engrams you dig up are motivators. I don't care how else you look at it, they are motivators. There are some overts running down the line, the nasty things you think or the pc thinks while he's running these motivators. But they are motivators.

TA action will probably cease, sooner or later, on the case. Oh, you run out six or eight goals and you run out fifteen, twenty engrams, and you all of a sudden are looking at no TA action. Where's the TA action gone? It was there, the ease was getting TA action on this type of processing, so this really applies to *ceased* TA action—those processes on whom, on which, TA action had been observed. This only then applies to processes on which TA action has been observed.

If TA action has been observed on a process, then TA action will cease only for three reasons: The session rudiments are out, the rule of flows (under which we include the overt—motivator sequence) and the situation is not in accord with the case's forward progress. The case has not got—has not any ability to move on forward because the process is flat. So they're just your three conditions there: Session rudiments are out, flows (under which we include also overt—motivator) has been upset, or the process is flat. And it's for one of these reasons TA actions ceases, but that's for TA action which has existed—TA action has existed.

Now, you can recover TA action on something that has had TA action one way or the other, unless—by remedying one and two of what I just gave you, or the third one is true—process is flat. Now all this is very well, but when you're taking a case apart, putting it back together again, if your goal is to cure a malady—if you're idiotic enough to use Scientology to cure somebody of something—you are going to have probably the easiest run of it you ever heard of. Modern processes result in dropping somatics and that sort of thing with great rapidity. You're running a fellow over his head, he'll have a new sickness every day. A new set of somatics, if they were to be medically adjudicated and diagnosed, would wind up in some of the most horrendous Latinizing you ever heard of Teeth hurt one day and his skull hurts the next day and he's got spears in his stomach the day after and his bones feel like they're falling apart and terrible exhaustion exceeds the next day. Well of course, for each one of these things—under terrible exhaustion, well he's obviously short of iron. And you get more melody—maladies than you could easily keep catalog of, just in the line of processing; if you processed somebody very badly over his head, these maladies would be quite acute.

This is not important then. Health has nothing to do with the situation, if you mean by health “care of the body, care of the body,” and that's just a bunch of balderdash. The only thing we're interested in—the only thing we're interested in is the continuing forward progress of the

case. Is the case more and more capable? And if you want to look at the reduction, and not worry about what—not worry about the capabilities of OTs or anything else, but just look at it—well, is he more and more capable of being audited? That’s the shortest look. That’s a very unreal look, but it’s, you know, more and more capable of being audited.

If you just count case advance on the fact the case is easier and easier to audit, why you’ll have it. Because why.? Well, that means the case is more and more responsive to exterior orders, which is one of the things he’s most allergic to. The case is more and more capable of viewing his track and pictures. The case is getting into less and less trouble; the ease is more and more capable of locating bypassed charge. All of these various capabilities show up in auditing sessions. So if you wanted a good yardstick that didn’t strain your brains any on case advance, well, it’s just—is the case more capable of being audited? I mean, that is not your end view, but it’s certainly a good yardstick for the auditor. Because if the case became more and more capable of being audited, and responded better and better and better to auditing and was easier and easier and easier to audit, you’d find out they’re making faster and faster changes per session and you’re getting more and more and more done per session, you’re having less and less and less trouble and that’s a good index.

And one of the ways of looking at it, on a case that’s on a long haul... Auditors get very dull to the progress of the case by the way. They do. This is one of the short—sightedness of auditors and one of the things that monitors processes and so forth. You can’t ever believe an auditor that a process isn’t working. It’s not that he’s being villainous or anything of the sort. But he’s looking at a slow gradient and it’s just he’s there, he’s auditing, and the gradient is a slow gradient.

I’ll give you a trick for this. This is—it’s—there’s nothing wrong with an auditor, I’m not being critical of auditors at all. It’s just something I’ve noticed as a frailty that auditors have. They don’t notice that a case is winning and gaining. And they sometimes get impatient and want to do something more heroic or something of the sort. They get to pushing and shoving. And the case is already going along just gorgeously. I have a basic rule, by the way, I never change anything on a case’s auditing unless the pc squawks. I find out I always squawk before the pc does. I always get more impatient than the pc does.

So I’ll just give you—just a short one, to counter this particular fault in other auditors, or in yourself. How was this case a month ago? See? And you can just say that in a snide tone of voice and if a guy says, “Well, I—well, you look at it like that, he couldn’t get up the front steps.” Something like this. They remember that this case used to have fifteen ARC breaks per session, now only has one or sometimes goes a whole session with none. See, case gains. That’s

case gains in the direction of auditing. And by the way, that shortcuts a lot of very fancy mental tests and case tests and all that sort of thing. It just puts a complete shortcut on the lot. Case auditing better? All right. There it is.

So much so that regardless of any other rule of auditing, if a case is proceeding satisfactorily and is very interested in what he's doing, I won't disturb the case. I won't do anything else. See, case is happy, so on. And the only objection I'll have to this is sometimes I see a process, particularly a newly started process, and it hasn't produced any result for a whole session and so forth and the pc seems to be happy with it, I come off of it. Or, the pc got some tone arm action on a process and ran it quite successfully for a session, that in the very next session, in spite of session ruds, nothing—I can't get that process to produce tone arm action again. The pc is fairly happy with the process, but I'm not.

But that, of course, is actions that you take in establishing processes. How long does it take to establish a process? Well, that's quite interesting. That's an interesting question. How long is a piece of string?. Sometimes you won't establish the pc's level of processes for several sessions. You keep hunting and punching around on a case and all of a sudden, why, the ease starts winning, you get TA action, everything is running. You sit down for the long haul. And you wait for that Condition to cease to be ideal before you do anything else. Just keep on with it. Actually, don't even pay too much attention to tone arm action. So it's—so for a series of five sessions the tone arm action's been minimal. It was good, it was good for quite a while, and then now it's minimal for that many sessions and so forth.

I wouldn't do anything desperate with the case, I wouldn't start tearing the case to pieces because he wasn't getting tone arm action. I wouldn't pull a case off a single engram, for instance. Let me show you the *reductio ad absurdum*. Pc doesn't get tone arm action in the last half of the engram. Well, so—you better not let him run that chain any more. See. That would be the most absurd type of thing, you see, that you could do. Pc got two divisions of tone arm action, during the first half of the engram, but didn't get any tone arm action during the last half of the engram, so it must be the wrong engram. See, it could become idiotic with this, you see—TA action.

How long should you sit around and suffer with no TA action? Well, it's an interesting question. Depends on the level of pc, depends on what you're auditing and everything of the sort. But if the pc is happy and you're running a fairly high—level process on the pc and you're getting no tone arm action, the worst I would suspect, that you probably weren't clipping the overt side of it, or your brackets were out in some particular way. See, I'd blame it on flows. And if after a while I—several sessions—I just didn't—wasn't anyplace with this and there wasn't

any tone arm action but there had been, and there should be tone arm action on the process—I'd start adding, in the ARC process, for instance, I'd start adding another leg. See? Just to make sure.

The pc for instance is answering it, you know, as “What communication has not been acknowledged?” or something like this, see. Well, he apparently is always auditing it as his own communication that hasn't been acknowledged. And he's stuck himself with a flow here somehow or another. Well, I'd just open up the—this is—the auditor's always at liberty to add legs on process, you see, so I'd just open up my kit, and I'd figure out how to word this process, so “What communication of *yours* has not been acknowledged?” and “What communication of *another's* has not been acknowledged?” you see. Something of that sort. I'd open it up. I'd have a six command process, not a three, you see. And you can make that, by the way, into a fifteen—command process. But this would be rather unusual, and you're getting rather ornate by doing so. But I'd blame that. Pc seems to be happy, pc seems to be getting results, pc seems to be cogniting—just we don't have tone arm action.

And running engrams, I wouldn't bust the pc out of an engram because they weren't getting tone arm action in an engram; that's nonsense. I'd start worrying if the pc didn't get any tone arm action for a couple of sessions. And then the way I would worry is to park the chain that I was running and I'd find the overt of the same chain. You see, because that's another way of introducing flows. Overts flow outward, motivators flow inward. So good. Well, let's run up a—let's run up an overt chain on this. We don't care if it's in the same date periods. You might have a... The overt chain might be back there *myaf—splaff—sprillion—million—brod—quadrillion, hywang—von—zillion—zeeum—zeeumzzmm* years, see. And the chain you've been running is when they were in kindergarten in this life, see. We don't care about the disparity of dates.

But whether we are running overts or motivators, whether we are running overts or motivators, we of course are running with the same severe system of blocking out the engrams by chains. Don't you start departing from that system—I had too much trouble getting that system together. You've got notes on what that system is and I intend to give you a demonstration on it. But I've been working out the exact commands. I've got it down to the exact commands. How do you like that, you know? Exact commands. Interesting. You've got this thing worked out to a point where the pc can predict what the auditor's going to say, he feels more comfortable, too. The only thing you can get in trouble with is you're finding minor incidents inside a major incident. That's what you normally run into when the pc can't see.

Well, there's a set of commands go with that, too. Pc doesn't arrive at the beginning of the incident when told to do so. Use commands A, B, C. You say, “Is the incident we have a small

part of a major incident?" You get a read on the meter, see. Date the major incident by saying... And so forth. It's a very precise operation, this engram running today. And is only effective if it is precise. And I'm finding out the precision of the running engrams by chains is adding to the pc's recall and precision on the track. It's quite interesting. So when you start to run overts, you run them exactly the same way, except you ask for overt incidents, which are the same type of thing. And your chain is always characterized. And you have a tendency to jump that characterization if you don't watch yourself You're running the chain of "sticking to mest." See, that's the chain you're running. That's a good, long, hefty one.

Somebody around here the other day was asking for "the first electronic." They were running the chain of electronic incidents. Oh, blow your brains out, man! The first electronic incident, I don't think you could express it on this wall up here with a microscopic set of zeros following a 1, following from the top of the wall, straight across, next line one millimeter down from the last line, clear on down to the bottom. A thetan is an electronic incident! You have to be fairly careful what you ask for.

Pc says, "Well, I don't know, I seem to go into apathy, every time I try to do anything to these people." Well, let's see. Now, you go start running the chain, "doing things to people,"—there were people in this universe when you arrived at some vast date back. The mest body, the physical meat body, is one of the standard phenomena of this universe. And so there you are. You're going to run down the first time they ever did that? Well, that's too much of a bite for the pc, that's all. Let's be more finite. Let's be more finite about it.

"What are these people doing to you?"

"Well, they're shooting at me."

All right, test it on the meter, let's run back a chain of shooting at people. See, Q and A. There are uses to Q and A, and that's one of them. He isn't going to go back very far shooting at people, thetans don't shoot at people. He'll run along a bunch of wars, or something like that. But you take something that he's worried about, and can reach, and sometimes your TA action on running engrams is suddenly—it's you've just bitten off more than you can chew. You're running a chain on "holding still." Or you're running a chain on "being held still." That would be even worse, see. Well of course you're asking for a bunch of still incidents. Well, that in itself will give you a stuck TA. That's rather elementary.

If you were very, very clever, you could make engram running—if the pc could run engrams—produce almost any TA action you wanted. You run stills, you get no TA action. You run masses, you get a rising tone arm. You get how you could throw the question?

“All right, let’s run back to the first time you were afraid of mass,” see. You’re going to get a nice rising tone arm, so forth. I don’t know quite what causes a low tone arm, to tell you the truth, because I’ve scouted it over a few times, but it’s some kind of a negative avoidance type of mechanism of some kind or another, but it’s something peculiar, that you probably could throw a TA negative, you could probably throw it positive, and you could probably run a chain of pleasure moments as all the times you were Clear. You’d probably produce a Clear, you see, just by running incidents when they were Clear. Get this validated.

What you validate, you produce—to a very marked degree, you see. With this exception: You get them to confront what they don’t want to confront, and therefore the production of that then ceases to go on automatic, don’t you see. But if you were giving a limited run, and weren’t trying really to run anything out, but just giving everything a limited run, you could throw the case anyway you wanted to throw the case. You could run the type of incident that would throw the case that way. Don’t you see? I know it sounds weird, but you could. That would be an improper way to run engrams because you’re trying to run the chain that will make the pc snap and pop and make him into good shape.

So therefore, you run what he can confront—almost. You’re running—you’re upgraded his confront. It’s just a “not quite.” He doesn’t know about this, and you find it for him on the meter, but it’s real to him because it reads on the meter. Your best test of “is it real to the pc” is: Does it read on the meter? I mean, that’s elementary

Now, the combination of all these processes are based on the factors which I’ve given you in this lecture. I don’t know whether or not this data has any vast value to you or not in putting together processes. I’m trying to give you some kind of an idea of the woof and warp of what makes up a chart or a scale or a recommendation of, “You run Reach and Withdraw on this pc.” See, the various things that go into this. And how much you’re expected to vary from that or not vary from that or something of the sort. All these things go into action.

So it boils down to the fact that modern processes are built against the degree of withdrawal of the individual into himself and what process will lead the pc out from himself so that he no longer feels so restricted about the thing—Now that’s the most basic action, and that of course is found in Reach and Withdraw. And I told Fred the other day I’d run some of you on Reach and Withdraw from bulletins—been about knocking some of your heads off—not from the significance of the bulletin, just from the bulletin, see. Reach and Withdraw from the bulletin. In one case, why, just wrote the word “Scientology” on a card. Reach and Withdraw from the word “Scientology.” Just about knocked the student’s head off.

Now that, of course, is literal, see. Reach and Withdraw, see, from something like this. Well, the pervasiveness of these lower—scale processes is something which you as an auditor should have cognizance of. You shouldn't go on expecting somebody to keep putting your foot in footprints all the time, see. Somebody's walked this way and there it is. You could have some knowledge of what makes a process a process, see, and why we have these processes, and which way they tend to go, and so forth. We have just a few basic classes of processes. There's a very few of these. But each one matches its own levels of case. And the total criteria of it is the case will respond under auditing to the process—and that's the only criteria.

Now of course, you can always undercut a case too seriously. You take some bird that's perfectly capable of running engrams and you run Reach and Withdraw, see. Oh, I'm sure you can run Reach and Withdraw for a long time, this character can run Reach and Withdraw, he's perfectly capable along this line. He might even get change, he might even get tone arm action. But that isn't a good enough reason. So the one other factor that enters into it—and this is where the art of the auditor is involved, and it's an art—is getting some estimation of where the case must lie and upgrading the ease from that point. And that requires some skill. Because you could run a case too low and give him a lose, see.

And the way to do that is to always run a case a little steep, see. Always run the case just a little steeper than the case thinks it should be run. The reaction of the ease to auditing, as to whether or not the case ARC breaks or protests or something like that has practically nothing to do with what you run on the case. You'll find some cases—now here's where you make your mistake on this—the case will go “*Yow, yow, yow, yow, yow,*” you see. Look amongst that “*yow, yow, yow,*” and find out if the case is executing the auditing command. That's what's important. It isn't whether the case is going *yow, yow, yow*.

You told the case to go to streens—skrillion trillion—kajillion years, see, and the case said, “God damn it, you bypassed about eighty thousand incidents all in one bunch,” and so forth. That's all he said. And you as a—you look at this protest and you say immediately, well, the case hasn't done it. And you'll be surprised. If you carry out your routine on almost a muzzled basis, you say, “What are you looking at?” You acknowledge what he said, “Yes,” and “What are you looking at?” You'll find out that he's at eighty squillion—krintrillion sprinion years, looking at this confounded, cotton—picking camel. Who wants anything to do with this camel, see? And you get the—you get the whole notion on it.

Because protest is the common denominator of the whole track in this universe. And your case goes through phases of protest. Protest is probably more vital to a case than duplicate. It's

how he makes his pictures in the first place and there's a terrific amount of technology mixed up in this thing called protest.

Now, the only level of processing which remains as a wide—open level of processing is Level 2. And I'm working very industriously at Level 2. And making very good progress at Level 2. How you amputate total time track, you know. I've made some good progress.

I've already found a theoretical method—haven't tested it out—but I found a theoretical method, where you locate one point at the beginning of the incident—this is very theoretical, see—if you locate one point at the beginning of the incident, you have the pc—you pass the pc through the incident once or twice so he knows what it is, and you locate one point at the beginning of the incident, have him pick up one consideration toward the beginning of the incident, and the engram vanishes. Isn't that interesting?. I found it so.

But that's the subject of another lecture. Benefit by this one.

Thank you very much.