MODERN PROCESSES
(Original Title: Routine 2-H)

A lecture given on
25 June 1963

Thank you.

Well, I see we are increasing in size. We are increasing in size and those few of you who are about to go home are ill-advised – very ill- advised for various reasons.

What's the date?

Audience: 25th.

Twenty-fifth, 25 June AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, there's a very happy note today in processing – a very happy note indeed. The differences of processes as they have come out one way or the other have been regulated by two things. – The name of this lecture is Modern Processes. – Two things. One has been the ability of the auditor to do them and the other is efficacy on various levels of cases – in other words, ability of the auditor – efficacy in advancing the state of case.

Now, that is what monitors, by and large, a process. It's not monitored by how bright I am; but sometimes I'm amazed at how I can overlook some few things, you know? But trying to fit the jigsaw puzzle together requires that these two factors be joined. In other words, these two factors have got to mesh. That's very important. Very important.

If we solely went on the basis of efficacy of processes, on that alone and we went on nothing else, we would very soon find ourselves with no auditors. That's very interesting, because they wouldn't apply this material broadly or generally or uniformly enough to give them wins. And I've meant for several lectures to give you the definition of wins and loses; and this you'll find of some value. What is a win, and what is a lose in terms of thetan behavior?

Now, these are very, very diffident type words, these are – these win, lose – this is terrific *thlah*! Wonderful significance, you know. One of these empty-headed significances, you know, that everybody knows. Well, beware of these everybody knows things because they don't open up to an achievement. So you have to get an action definition to these things before you know exactly what is a win, what is a lose, and then you could get wins or know when you hadn't had them.

It's very funny, but it's odd how you have to take some of these things apart – the *reductio ad absurdum* of an idiocy, you know? And if we don't know the anatomy of these

things, what do we mean when we say an auditor has to have a win or the auditor got a lose or the pc got a lose or the pc got a win?

Well, if you don't know the anatomy of a win or lose, how would you know how to give a pc a win or a lose? You might want to give a pc a lose sometime, you might be – find some – you might find the thetan that started the Helatrobus Implants or something like that, you know, and…

Now, in these two things, win and lose, we find, in actual fact, a very fundamental fundamental on the subject of entrapment, degradation, all the rest of these things, add up into these definitions. But they're idiot – idiotically simple definitions. Took me a very, very long time to find out what they were. And right away, the second I tell you these, you see, you'll say, "Oh yes, of course," and that will be the end of that. So, of course, I have to give it a buildup.

But a win is intending to do something and doing it or intending not to do something and not doing it. And that is a win. And a lose is intending to do something and not doing it and intending not to do something and doing it.

Now, you notice that a lose gives you a disagreement. You see, there's a ridge forms between those two things – nice ridge, sitting right there. You intend to do something, and what is the consequence of this? Not doing it. Well therefore, intending to do it and not doing it are a statement in disagreement, one with the other, and so you get a ridge. That is a bit of entrapped energy, don't you see, and so that will read on an E-Meter. See, an E-Meter registers disagreements, basically.

All right, there are those four conditions. And they are covered even though you intend not to do nothing and do nothing, don't you see. That – you're adding significance, you see, to the basic definition. All that's included in there, see. Intending to do something and doing it, that's a win. Intending not to do something and not doing it, that's a win.

All right, how do these apply in processing. You intend to improve this case and you don't improve it. That gives you a lose. I notice a sad, little black shadow floats across some of the people present. You intended not to ARC break the pc and you did it. You intended not to make the pc worse and you feel you made him worse. That's a big lose.

Now let's look at it from the pc's side. The pc intends to do something and doesn't do it. The pc doesn't intend to do something and does it. Now therefore, those would be pc loses. Pc loses – bang, bang. Let's say the pc sets goals for the session, "In this session I wish to become an OT," and he doesn't do it. Unreal though that may be, that is still a lose, see? Unreal though it may be.

Now, the question of reality and achievability don't happen to be included in the basic definition of win and lose. There's no effort to modify them to that degree. But when you apply them to auditing you get some additional factors which are quite interesting.

This auditor's idea of a win is not to ARC break the pc. And the auditor ARC breaks the pc. And then that – he realizes then that he's had an auditing lose. Maybe that was all he intended to do was to not do something. All right, so there's auditor attitude or auditor

viewpoint of the situation, you see? Get through this session without any ARC breaks or blowups, see, that's an auditor intention, you see. Auditor doesn't make it, gets a lose.

You'd be surprised how often that is the auditor's single intention. The basic most quivering intention is to somehow or another get this pc smoothly through this session and out the other side – not to do anything to the pc or anything, but just not to do anything damaging to the pc, see. "Just somehow or another in spite of this stuff get the pc to the other side of the session – *uhhhh*. Made it! Pc didn't have an ARC break. Whew! What a win."

Well, actually, that's kind of unreal. But nevertheless it's within an auditor's frame of action. All right, that's in the auditor's frame of action, see. Short of processing you're not going to do anything for this auditor. Well, this makes a demand of a process that it works regardless of that intention. Well, that's a heck of a thing to have to demand of a process, isn't it? But these are factors which I work with all the time, factors as oblique as this. The process has to work regardless of the intention.

Well, that's sure putting a strain on an automaticity, if you want my candid statement. And you would be very, very surprised how often that is true – how often that is true. And I have eventually begun to carry that as one of the crosses my mock-up has to bear, see. Process has got to work regardless. Now, that's an awful strain to put on a process, isn't it? If the auditor will just do certain actions and not exceed those actions, then certain results will occur. And that is just about the safest base on which you can lay a process. And any process you have today is based and constructed on that base.

Now, that's interesting, isn't it? In the first place, that might seem at first glance to be a downgrade of you as an auditor. But it actually is not a downgrade as you as an auditor. Your skill is in completing an auditing cycle. Your skill is sitting there handling and keeping the form and running the session. You actually do have somebody sitting across from you who has oblique and crisscrossed ideas. Well, I figure it's just about enough for you to do that without inventing a process as you go along. I find that's too much.

Now I myself auditing many, many, many years ago used to actually dream up the process and handle the pc all at the same time. Now this is feasible. This is feasible but is only necessary if you don't have the answers. And I found out that the moment I had the answers, I laid that aside – dreaming up the process while auditing the pc. I laid it aside because it was unnecessary to approach the problem. It put an awful strain on the session and it basically gave me too many loses. See, I ran too many sessions in which there was no vast gain on the part of the pc.

So therefore, I started reducing, even from my own auditing viewpoint, the number of factors of cases and the number of difficulties of cases down to a near-irreducible minimum. And having reduced them, then, adhered to them. Don't you find me today working out a process carefully and then, when I have some confidence in it, using it in an auditing session? There's a great deal of test goes into processes.

Now, the way to get around this problem is to know the fundamentals of cases and to have processes adapted to those fundamentals. Now, there are differences of cases just as there are differences of auditors and what we expect of an auditor is to be able to complete an

auditing cycle – you know, with the question and the acknowledgment and so forth – hold the session form together and take care of this particular pc's session unformness. See, all pcs are trying to bolt out of a session one way or the other. You know, they do something else besides the auditing command and they fail to do the auditing command and you've got to have the good sense to know when to straighten out a session that is running badly and leave a session alone that is running fairly well, see. This is all in the field of an auditor's skill.

And that happens to be the irreducible minimum for an auditor. You can't go any lower than that – can't go any lower than that. You get any lower than that and you haven't got an auditor.

More, then, of randomness will be introduced into the session and into the pc than order. There's a tremendous importance to this thing called the auditing cycle. It is too often overlooked. If an auditor, (quote) (unquote) "auditor," cannot perform the auditing cycle but absolutely must Q and A – must do this, must do that, gets all scattered and dispersed, gives the auditing command in seven different versions, in seven different commands, you see: "Have – What affinity has been rejected? What affinity's been refused? Has any affinity been refused? Would an affinity be refused? Well, would emotion be refused, then? Well, what would be rejected anyway?" That an inability to duplicate.

All right, that's perfectly obvious to you, that a person who could never master a repetitive statement of the command couldn't ever classify as an auditor.

Now, that doesn't mean you – when you're upset and tired, something like that, and busy auditing like mad – you suddenly flub, you skid, you skid on the bank, you know? You're supposed to be saying, "What affinity has been rejected?" and you suddenly say, "What affinity has been refused?" See, correct it and so forth. But you notice that the mistakes you make in that department are absolutely minimal. They're very, very few.

We've mastered that in auditing so that you think it's even ridiculous to be touching on that. Well, run a co-audit someday!

Now, your next action of the auditing cycle is to be able to acknowledge. And some auditors get on a very thin edge on this line and they think all you have to do is say, "Thank you" no matter what the pc says. They don't bother to understand what the pc says. They think if they interrupt the pc and make the pc say it again because they didn't understand it, it will upset the pc. They get a lot of considerations of this particular character and vary this, or when the pc says something they're startled out of their wits and justify what they just did, you know? The pc's saying, "Well, I thought you were awf – you looked awfully bad today." And the auditor says, "Well I-I really don't look bad, I-I just didn't have much sleep last night." You see?

Now, he's actually broken down the auditing cycle at that point and the session will suffer to that degree. Again, that isn't very serious and again, every now and then, you make that break. No auditor, including me, is proof against being startled – not absolutely proof against being startled. Because a pc says, "Well, this is why I tried to commit suicide last night," see, something like that. You say, "What!" Outside of your zone of reality at once, you

see, you didn't know anything about this and you've been running half a session and didn't find it out, you know? Blow your brains out, see. Something like that.

And sometimes you're auditing somebody and something awfully personal comes up, or something like this, and you hear yourself – with some horror – suddenly justifying it or something like this, you know, grab yourself tight and… Well, these things happen. We can continue to seek for perfection in these things and we know how it should go, but it doesn't disqualify an auditor as an auditor. That sort of thing will go along.

But if an auditor can't cure himself of Qing and Aing, it gets pretty serious because this is very damaging. The pc volunteers – pc – well, I'll give you the most common action. Meter echoing. The pc volunteers a suppress. "You know, I just realized I just suppressed this engram." And the auditor says, "In this session, has anything been suppressed? Has anything else been suppressed on the engram?" Well, blow your brains out, man. That was an origin: TR 4. Flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk, see? Nothing drives a pc round the bend faster than this echo metering, see. Works in dating. The pc says, "You know, I think the incident was five minutes long." "Oh? Oh, was the incident five minutes long?" That's a Q and A, man. It's an invalidation. The pc says, "I think the incident's five minutes long." You say, "Okay, the incident's five minutes long." That's that. That's the end of your dating. The most precious thing your pc's got is the ability to estimate time. And you'll find out that a pc who's smoothly audited on engrams after a while gets out of dating entirely. Give him a lot of hours of very good auditing on the new running engrams by chains, and he all of a sudden will be – he'll be saying, "Well," and he'll say, "well, the incident's at 84,964,643,972 and one minute – at!" and look at his watch. And you've got to be quick on the ball, see, write it down. Sometimes it takes you by storm. You don't really – you say, "What'd you say again?" Too bad – too bad – that pc might not be able to repeat it in exactly that order and he'll start questioning it. So you have to be on the ball.

You're here – you're over here on your meter, see, you're over here on your meter. "Now, is it more than a hundred trillion or less than…" "Well, it's eighty-four trillion, nine hundred sixty-five billion…" and you've got to be right there, man. The pc – that's one of his most precious abilities. The other one is the ability to go earlier and to return.

Now, that's very interesting, but any echo metering is a Q and A. Pc says, "The duration is – duration's about 725 years. I think it's around 725 years." Well, now you get to the borderline question. Do you now verify it on the meter? No, you don't. It is around 725 years, that is – that is a period. See, it is around 725 years. Makes a difficulty. And you say, "Move through the incident to a point around 725 years later," is very imprecise.

So you get around this by saying, "Move through the incident to a point 750 years later," which puts him well beyond the end of the incident. You get the idea? Or you could even say 725. Doesn't matter, as long as you don't Q-and-A.

That's all under the heading of the auditing cycle. That's how far the auditing cycle goes.

You've asked the pc, even though you were dating on the meter, how long ago was this incident. If the pc says how long ago it was, no matter what you're doing with the

machinery, the pc has answered the auditing question. So that all you have left at this point is a record and an acknowledge. That's all you've got left. Otherwise you're Qing-and-Aing and you'll be injuring the pc's ability to date and you mustn't injure that.

It's like in mid ruds, pc says – you're running, you're running protest on the big mid ruds, see. You're clear on out to Protest and the pc all of a sudden says, "You know, I just suppressed – I just realized I just suppressed the whole thing a while ago." Ah! Interesting question. You'll find the auditor who cannot do an auditing cycle asking, "Is there anything else you suppressed?" That is a Q and A. The auditor's action is TR 4 only and go on with his protest. See, origin.

Now, we're getting down to some of the weakest points of auditing. What is a Q and A? It's to question the pc's answer. I'll show you how marvelous a Q and A can be; how adroit it can be; how far afield it can be and still be a Q and A.

You've run the engram on the pc – you've run the engram. The pc didn't get anything so you realize there's an earlier beginning. So you say to the pc, "Is there an earlier beginning on this incident?" It's very interesting because you earlier told him to return to the beginning of the incident – you told the somatic strip to – and the fact that five, ten, fifteen minutes later you say, "Is there an earlier beginning on this incident?" questions the action of the somatic strip ten or fifteen minutes before. Now, we're really getting down to fine points of auditing. We're getting very nice. But it still fits within that same framework.

Even a thing like, "Are you sure you answered the auditing question?" see, an invalidation. It's also a Q and A. The basis of this is you've done something about what the pc has done. You said to the pc, "Spit," the pc spat, you say, "Did you spit?" You've done something, don't you see? The essence of all Q and A is doing something because the pc has done something – departing from the auditing cycle with new doingness because the pc has added new doingness. You then, if you understand that completely, you can break yourself of it. But sometimes an auditor doesn't recognize what he is doing in this and he doesn't realize he's breaking down his auditing cycle.

Now, these are very neat points. These are getting very, very neat. And any auditor goofs on one of these every once in a while. The worst one is the pc is trying to originate something and the auditor continues to answer it. "I said, how long is it going to be to the end of the session?" And the auditor says, "Another fifteen minutes." The pc has alr… – this is something that has gone on before, see. And the pc says, "But I said, I only said, how long would it be to the end of the session." And the auditor says, "Well, another fifteen minutes." Eventually it gets through the auditor's head that he's not acknowledged an origin because it sounded like a question. And he stacks up four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten origins right in a row, none of which are acknowledged.

"I said the engram was a long time ago. That's what I said."

"Yes, well, I know. I-I-I know, I know that's what you said. And we're still trying to get it."

"Yeah, but-but I said-I said-I said that the engram was-I just-that's all I said, was the engram was a long time ago."

"I know, I'm still trying to find it."

"No, no, no. No, you don't understand. I said…"

You get the idea? All of a sudden the auditor says, "Oh, my God! I've missed a withhold here, on the basis that he simply meant it as a comment. And he wasn't questioning the dating or anything, he just – and I ever since that time have never acknowledged it yet."

Boy, you talk about something wrapping itself around the telegraph pole, when that one gets going it has many horrible, cunning covert versions that can crawl out of some edge of the session some place and just drop ink all over everything. And you can really get one of these things going. It's wild. And sometimes they are so adroit. They're so incomprehensible that you don't wake up to what's going on and that applies to any auditor. There's always one so adroit that you won't catch it – always.

You're trying to get some items or something out of a pc and the pc makes some remark that sounds exactly like something else and the auditor takes it up and here we go. Just caught off guard, don't you see? It's – that's only unforgivable if you never catch it. You know, you can miss a withhold on a pc – now to show you how important the auditing cycle is, just about the worst situation you can get into is the immediate bypassed charge in the session. Immediate bypassed charge. The immediate. And that's the same example that I've just been giving you. Pc originated something and you bypassed it as charge by taking it up and doing something else – or do it. You do something about what the pc said. There's only one actual way to clarify this – if you think you're [understand…] – misunderstanding it in some way, ask the pc to clarify it, you know, and in some cases it's enough to say, "Is that a request? Is that a request that you're making?" and so forth. That takes it out of the same – of the category, you see, and you get a clarification of it. Because very often the pc isn't making a request. Pc says, "It's chilly," and the auditor obligingly says, "I'll close the door," or "We'll shut the windows," or something. Well, oddly enough the pc didn't mean that. See, that's then basically a Q and A.

Now, remember there's always a certain misunderstanding can occur between an auditor and a pc. The question is: can the auditor put it right? And that is the final demand of an auditor and that's why you're there. If it goes wrong, can you put it right?

It isn't so much as "are you perfect" as an auditor. We can attempt to achieve that. But it's an absolute which is unobtainable. I can get pretty good on practicing a process of some kind or another. I can get pretty good at it. But I would never strain my brains to the point of trying to get perfect. I can get just as good as you can get and then not go to bed and cry all night because I wasn't perfect, you see.

The question is – is can you straighten it out? Or are you going to sit there in a miserable flub unable to make the thing come out right at session end? And that I should say is the final test of an auditor: Can he make it all come out right anyway?

You know, session wrapped itself around the telegraph pole. Well, can the auditor bring the session off anyway? Well, that comes under the heading of technical skill and observance of the auditing cycle. Now, modern auditing has paid a great deal of attention to this, so that today we have a process known as Routine 2H. Now, this is brand-new – at the

moment it's mentioned here. But it very shortly will not be brand-new with you. The main difficulty in the handling of engrams, the main difficulty, is the complexity of the action. It's been reduced now to a very rote procedure. As you see, particularly when you study the steps one by one, you will see that they don't depart into a lot of "Well, there's always a lot of something else you've also got to do," see, as far as the procedure is concerned. It just isn't in that category. It is a rote procedure. It's as rote a procedure as repetitive processes, practically.

Now, that's pretty much something to demand of processes, and yet there it is. Now, it runs engrams better than I've ever run engrams. So that's all I'm demanding of it and that's plenty because I was never able – I would think there's only been a couple of cases that I've ever had my hands on and couldn't run an engram on; or get him through or straighten him out by reason of running an engram. Sounds pretty wild but this runs engrams better than that. Runs them smoother. It's what I'm using with no variations right now. I've been testing it and testing it and testing it. And this is very george indeed.

And that's quite a triumph. That's been some, thirteen-some years in manufacture. Longer than that, actually. But lots of failures. Tremendous, tremendous numbers of failures in getting auditors to do it. And that became so great, as far as I was concerned at one time, that I abandoned it and it stayed abandoned for many years. The failure there was intending auditors to run engrams and not achieving it. And you go give me another failure like that and I'll turn in your thetan to the local headquarters.

A great deal had to be known data to move the thing into this particular category of a rote engram procedure, which is R3R. That is R3R. That is not running engrams, Book One.

Now, one of the things that is necessary is: running engrams on a pc is no place to learn how to run engrams on a pc. Of all processes, that is the one that is not learned by doing it on the pc. If you have no command of the time track, of knowledge of the time track – doesn't mean your own time track, that's just the basics of a time track; what are these things – you're going to tangle foot inevitably even though you're given a rote procedure. You wont have even a hazy notion of knowing where you are.

But more important than that, dating is an interestingly exact skill. And in engram running dating is combined with – as another dating, a meter action, with time in it – duration. The hardest step is duration. And that is the only one that is left in actual engram running to learn while you are running engrams, if you've got dating down first. Duration is hard to get. It is tough to get duration. You will succeed in getting the proper duration for an engram time after time and then all of a sudden you will hit a bearcat. You will lay yourself a gorgeous ostrich egg and get all tangled up and not know whether you're coming or going. And on that rote procedure, duration is everything.

So I should think any nervousness that you have in running engrams should be relegated just to this one department of duration. And your skill should already be very great in the other departments before you tackle it. Some of you are learning this the hard way right now.

Well, I'll give you some problems of duration. Had one the other night – almost knocked me own head off. The duration of the engram was a split second. Please note that that

is not covered by the question, "Is the duration seconds, minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, years?" Please note: nothing reaches a split second. The auditor was working on it for an hour. Meantime the pc skidded into another engram. See? Fantastic problems can occur under the heading of duration.

If your pc doesn't know what the incident is all about, you've got the duration wrong and that's how – that's all there is to that. There are no, no, no variations to that. Why? Now you're right here in present time. Let me call to your attention that you cannot at this moment tell me the total length of your time track. But you can tell me the length of this life. Notice that? All right, very good. You can always see the back end of the incident, then. In other words, you can get the duration of the part of the incident that is pointed toward PT. In other words, the later part of the incident is always durationable. You see that? So, you've got this fellow and you've got this fantastic situation where he's sitting there in the dark and he can see the light coming in from a window. And you run the engram again, by rote, and he's sitting there in the dark with the light coming in the window. And you run it again and he's sitting there in the dark with the light coming in at the window.

Well, fortunately for you, we don't have to depart from rote engram running. I finally got this – I just got this cracked. In all such cases the duration is wrong. He could reach, in terms of reality on meter reading, the last fifteen minutes of the ten-hour engram, which was sitting in the dark with the impression of a window. And this is quite interesting because, you see, that's the part that's closest to present time. So he can see the back end of it. So you get the duration of the back end of it. You get the minor incident inside the major incident which was sitting in the dark looking at the window.

So every time you find the pc sitting in the dark, and having been run through it once, cannot tell you about it, the duration is wrong and you simply redo the duration step. Isn't that easy? You don't vary from rote procedure at all. You don't have to do anything at all. You just redate your duration. You tell the pc, "Go to the beginning of the incident," all by rote, see. All right, "Move through the incident to the point – whatever it was – fifteen minutes later." Bang, that's all. Pc comes up at the other end and he says, "What happens?" – and you say, "What happened?"

And the pc says, "I don't know. I was sitting in the dark and I see this impression of the window."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much." And you say, "All right, we're going to see if we can't get a better duration on this incident now." Get another duration.

All right, you've got a duration now of five hours. Had a duration of fifteen minutes before. Got a duration now of five hours. Don't consider that your first duration was wrong, you've just got more incident now. So, you say, "All right, return to the beginning of the incident," he goes to five hours. He goes five hours from the end. "Move through the incident to a point five hours later."

"Ynnnaaa – some trees and then there was this window and that's all I know about it."

"All right, thank you very much." So much for that. Going to redo the duration of the incident, see?

"Seems like it's about a thousand years." And you say that's fine. Don't nag the pc; don't introduce any other commands; you don't have to do anything else. You just say, "All right. Move to the beginning of the incident. All right." The pc's there – bang, you'll see your meter go when the pc arrives at the beginning of the incident – it always goes bang. Your meter flicks. He doesn't have to say he's there.

And you say, "All right. Move through this incident to a point one thousand years later." Zoom he goes. "Oh, well, you see, it's like this. It's like this: I was an aeronaut and I got tangled up with these astronauts, you see? And they were trying to plant ostriches on this planet." And you finally find out the end of it, he – telling you the end of it – he was sitting in a dentist's chair, he was saying, at the end of it. No, he wasn't sitting in a dentist's chair at the end of the thing. That was a ship spinning quietly down into a very hot sun, you see. That sort of flash that he kept reporting on the end was the crash. Didn't have anything to do with anything he thought it had anything to do with until you finally get the beginning of it. You got it?

All you re – you just redo the duration step. If the pc doesn't know about the incident, you redo the duration step. That's – it's just simple. It's very easy for you and a very good thing for you that it worked out that way, so I can now, of course, release the procedure. And it was – not – wasn't that so much I was waiting for, but I thought we'd have to doctor this up, you know, minor incident inside of a major incident and all this sort of thing. Well, that's too much. Fortunately it works out mechanically to be the pc will always go to the beginning of that part of the incident which he can now reach and he always goes to that. Always. And he always goes to the beginning of the duration from some point at the end. So you don't have to worry about it at all. You just repeat the duration step.

Very lucky for you, says I, says I; and you will say so, too. Very uncomplicated. Of course he's gotten charge off the end of it by moving through it once. See, every time he moves through the end section, just that little end section one more time, he's unburdened some charge. Whether he likes it or not. You could stay there and grind and put him through it about nine times, and you could turn it all bright and he'd have visio on it. Engram running no longer is barred out by the black case. Not at all, not at all.

Now, that's quite interesting. That's quite interesting because it opens the doors. It opens the doors to a lot of things. Been a long and arduous task trying to get pcs to – up the line because the only thing there is there to run is engrams. Whatever else they think there's there, there's only engrams and the machinery and so forth connected with them.

Even a GPM is just an engram of a peculiar type which needs a form to run it with, but it's still just an engram. So all this is very interesting.

The main trouble an auditor is going to have then is dating and curing ARC breaks. Because ARC breaks occur in engram handling and if you don't handle them and if you continue to give the pc orders after the pc has expressed an ARC breaky action, you are going to mess up the case. And that's the only way you can mess up a case running engrams.

I found one other thing that may be of some importance to you, before I tell you some more about that. You know most people think the mind is a very confused affair. Well, IBM

does not build a computer of the same reliability or comparable accuracy of the reactive mind. It just doesn't build one that good. And far from being a confused affair, when addressed by the proper technology, the mind is an automatic card-file system of incidents all stretched out on the track beautifully, which has no comparable counterpart in the physical universe. It is not a confused mess at all. If there's anything, it is too idiotically orderly. You *always* get the engram you ask for. The pc *always* moves to the point. There's nothing confused about it. That may be a brand-new point of view for you. You've looked at the mind as being a mass of confusion. No. Confusion isn't in the mind. The pc looking at this file system and unable to grab onto the proper file catalog thinks it looks very confused.

But how would you like to go into the archives of some space opera society, all of which is delivered to your hand – and these, by the way, are quite interesting as archives. Operated one about 612 million years ago, something like that, which was quite interesting. Card-file systems were all stored in a basement. And I think the basement of that computer room was about the size of Chicago. And the machines which read that occupied an area – just the machines which read it – that's, you know, the final results appeared on and so forth – looked like seven or eight Grand Central Stations. You know, just the banks of machines. And the reanalysis machines on that were all composed in a little hut that was about a thousand feet long by about four hundred feet wide.

And everything was all done on automatic card shuttles, and pneumatic tubes and comparisons. And these IBM machines down here look something like a child's hurdy-gurdy or something, compared to one of these other machines. These machines could get the finest, tiniest difference between a umph and a umph. And then they could get all things that had the tiniest association with umph and umph. You talk about your smallest and your largest magnitude of comparison – tremendous, see.

If you'd wandered into that without knowing how it worked, seeing these tremendous rows of varied-colored machines and buttons and tapes, and the wastebaskets around there just used to flood. And you would have said the devil himself can't operate this thing. Actually, all the operation it required was one single machine on a little platform and you simply asked what you wanted to know on that machine, and then it mastered the master machines which mastered the master machines which mastered the files. It's very simple.

You wanted to know how many stripes does a zebra have on the planet Xnu in the year Brfrumph of Wuf. Zoom! "How do you make a zebra?" "What is the name of the OT who originally designed zebras for this particular consolidation coordination and what were the basic faults of the design? How many zebras survived after 10,000 years in the environment of the planet Path? Are lions actually the best answer to zebra overpopulation?" All of this is statistical information, don't you see? All statistical.

Well, if you tried to build machinery that would answer up, you've got it in *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science.* The size of the machinery – something like that – it'd take Niagara Falls to cool the vacuum tubes. It would. It'd burn up enough fuel to light a city if the mind was on a computer basis. Fortunately it isn't. It achieves this fantastic and marvelous accuracy because you are quite fantastic and quite marvelous and so is the pc. That's about all there is

to that. It's simply the – it's the recorded protests of time. And this stuff all wheels off and it's all timed beautifully and so forth.

And you're looking not at necessarily complicated arrangement. You're looking with the procedure, you're just looking at the master keyboard. And all you've got to do is punch the master keyboard, it always delivers the answer. The most things wrong with engram running is auditors don't think it's delivered the answer. How many auditors say, "Go to the beginning of the incident. Are you there?[1]" [laughing] What the hell's the matter with him? Doesn't he think he's in charge of the machine – I'd hate to have that guy driving me, you know? He gives the wheel a big yank, you see, and gives the wheel a big yank, and then he says to the automobile, "Did you turn the corner?" I don't know why he's asking the automobile if it turned the corner! The automobile can't tell him if it turned the corner. The automobile can only turn a corner.

Some people try to treat the reactive bank like an Ouija board. And you'll find some of the darnedest Ouija board questions being addressed. "Will you be clear after I've run another 300 engrams?" See, it's a misapprehension of the device you're operating. It's not an Ouija board. You tell it to move – well, you can get your dates quite grossly, you can say, "Move to the incident at approximately 84.9 trillion trillion years ago." And the pc says to himself – says, "Eighty-nine point four? Jesus!" You know? "What a laugh," you know? "Gosh, that's a terrific date, though" and so forth.

And you say, "All right." It doesn't matter what the pc did, see, and you say, "All right. What's the duration of the incident?" And you finally get it on the meter and it says eighteen trillion years, and the pc says, "Eighteen trillion years!" [pc shocked]

And you say, "All right. Move to the beginning of the incident." Clank, the meter goes. And you say, "Okay, now move through the incident to a point eighteen trillion years later," and sit back and quietly make your notes and so forth.

Pc says, "Jesus Christ! Eighteen trillion years! God almighty! *Yaaww!"*

You don't do anything else and you're not excited about it, and so forth. Pc finally says, "Oh, well, hell, I might as well look at it!" and shuts his eyes. "There it is, going by, man! There it is, going by!" It's only when you say, "Go to the beginning of the incident," which is at the end of the incident because the incident is eighteen trillion years long, "Move through the incident now to a point two seconds later," at the "end" of the incident. And the machine goes… [lot of laughing in that paragraph]

I had one the other evening: "Move – move thirty seconds before the incident begins. Move through the incident to a point thirty seconds later." [laughing] You can't do it, you know! You can't do it. It's not possible! Wouldn't have mattered if the incident was a thousandth of a second long, you still couldn't have executed that auditing command. And the somatic strip will not execute that auditing command. It'll lock up at that point. Now you're in real trouble. You've done something extraordinary.

---

[1] „Are you there?" is pronounced very childish.

No, this is a very, very orderly machine you're operating – very orderly – idiotically so. Only the pc gets in your road. The pc very often says, "Eighteen trillion years long! In this goddamn thing? No!" See, you know, and the pc says, "Oh, no, that's – that's terrible."

"Well, close your eyes and watch it go by." You don't even have to say that. He will, inevitably. It's almost beyond his power to stop a properly managed somatic strip. He couldn't stop it. He sometimes keeps on chattering at you. The incident is running right on off…

No, you're actually handling a very easily handleable thing, providing you don't get incomprehensible about it, you know? Like, "Move" – double command – "Move twenty years later to the end of the incident." Pc, you'd be surprised, very often does this – tries to do it. Imagine your embarrassment a short time later when you redate this thing, reduration it, and find out that it's eighty-two years long. So you see, he just can't manage that – double orders – that sort of thing.

Well, this is all taken care of in your rote handling of engrams. The biggest problem that an auditor has – the biggest problem that an auditor has is one, dating, including duration, and the other one is ARC breaks.

Now, most auditors are afraid of ARC breaks, to some degree. And if he tries to learn dating on a pc or handle ARC breaks of a pc who is in the middle of the living lightning, you know, these two worlds – and because the pc has made a mistake and pushed the wrong button – these two worlds are now at war and he's just now being shot, having been court-martialed while the whole place is being bombed at the same time, this is not – he's in the middle of all this, you see – this is not the time, definitely, to learn how to assess an ARC break if he ARC breaks. "Let me see, how do you assess an ARC break? You say you're in the middle of this and guns are going – "Yes, I' know. Let's see, how – where's that bulletin? Let's see, it says here, it says here – I don't know, I don't seem to have the assessment sheet and so forth. Where's the assessment sheet?" I'm afraid that's not the time to learn that.

No, you'll get loses. You'll get loses. Your loses will be so catastrophic that you, next thing you know, won't run engrams anymore. That's what I've got to watch, you see? Dating is difficult – finding the times of things and dating – and if you can't pick up the ARC break quickly, why, you're just licked. If you can't do an ARC break assessment for engram running you're just licked right there.

And the violence of the ARC break while the pc is running engrams is catastrophic as far as the auditor's concerned – if the auditor is at all allergic to ARC breaks – because he is now being taught that he has had a lose. He meant to have a session with no ARC breaks and here he's got an ARC break or he intended to get the pc through two more engrams and the pc isn't going through two more engrams – here's the pc with a horrendous ARC break. See the difficulties? The auditor loses.

And there's where Routine – now understand, it's designated Routine 2H – comes in and it's ARC breaks by assessment. And you're going to consider this a training process until you've run it or had it run successfully on you and then you all of a sudden won't consider it a

training process anymore. You will realize that it is superior to ARC Break Straightwire. Quite interesting. And you will have that bulletin tomorrow.

Now, I'm not going to try to give you an outline of that process because the bulletin is coming right out. But what it does is just ask the pc for an ARC break – you take the ARC break and you find the bypassed charge. And then you ask the pc for an ARC break and you find the ARC break and you assess for the bypassed charge – locate it and indicate it and give it to the pc. And you'll find all of a sudden this pc starts to fly. Very complex auditing but it's very simple in its result line. And you very rapidly discover then that finding ARC breaks is very, very easy and puts you as a master of ARC breaks and so you no longer need to be scared of them. And it gives you dating, lots of dating practice on stuff that the pc isn't necessarily very nervy about.

You know, the postman scolded them. He said, "You always are asking why I don't bring you mail." See, that's the totality of the incident. Well, the pc can hang around that for a long time without having anything happen to him. And yet you can find its date and you can find the bypassed charge by assessment. And there is a special assessment for that type of ARC break which I dreamed up and run. I've tested and gotten this thing organized and gotten the bulletin written before I'm telling you about it.

Because there's the best – the best news you've had in some time. There's practiced skill and you'll all of a sudden get very, very cocky on the subject of ARC breaks.

Now, the action of handling an ARC break during engram running is just another assessment. It's simply got other questions connected with it. And if you've already got this dusted off then the biggest liability to engram running is shut right off, right there, right now. In other words, ten minutes later you haven't got any situation at all. The pc's happy and carrying forward and you know exactly what went wrong. There isn't any dragging the heels on this. The pc isn't left in the middle of an ARC break and your sessions don't end in a debacle. That is the most damaging thing. Not being able to handle an ARC break, not being able to date and not being able to handle the time track, nobody can handle engrams; nobody can run engrams.

Now, who can engrams be run on? Well, we have our scale of cases that I've been telling you about. And then, of course, a case that has level 6 type bank – pretty difficult to run any engrams. But you can run ARC breaks on that pc. And you can boost them up and stabilize the bank one way or the other. You can do various things with this pc, and so forth, but factually engram running goes a long way if you don't necessarily call it engram running but call it R3R. Don't keep specializing in engrams because a couple of you, unbeknownst to you – to my shame I'm sure – you don't know what it is – are running secondary chains on your pcs. You're not running engrams on your pcs; you're running secondaries. You assessed for secondaries and you're running secondaries. Perfectly all right, perfectly feasible. Nothing wrong. Except please don't think you're running engrams when you're running secondaries, see.

Because that's the misemotional moment that depends on the engram for its charge. So here's the engram chain and you're running the chain right up here. Perfectly fine. Wonderful.

Your pc's getting off a bunch of misemotion and that sort of thing, marvelous. Set the pc up most remarkably well. Great. Nothing wrong with that. Except if you think you're running engrams you're, of course, making a basic technical error which is going to make you very puzzled sooner or later about all this.

Some others are running chains that haven't been assessed properly. At least one other. And of course the thing they're being running, not being assessed, is now branching, trying to get over to the proper chain. You know, you've taken an arbitrary chain – you're running an arbitrary chain on the pc. And this thing is trying to go around the corner and get over to the right chain. So you're not really running a chain of engrams at all. You started out on one chain and the meter is pushing it over to the chain you should be running.

Well, that's perfectly all right, but don't think you're running one chain. You're running – two chains happening, don't you see?

So to prevent this sort of thing, and to make – to put engram running into the hands of far more pcs, you shouldn't, in the first place, believe you can run engrams until you can run engrams. Just because it's awful simple, and so forth. Got a training process for it now – you'd better master some of these points and get cocky about the thing before you tackle this, because you're going the whole hill and there's no process beyond this. And you don't want to tie somebody's time track up.

So running of engrams, however, has a great deal more flexibility because you can also run secondaries; you can also run locks and they all run on the same procedure. So this gives us very shallow – shallow looks at cases. You can take a case, then, that can't stand up to an engram and you can still use R3R. And you can get marvelously forward with the whole thing providing you do your assessment properly.

Now, a proper assessment, of course, is a list, a completed list under the rules of listing of 2-12 and 2-12A. Those rules of listing are observed in that first list. Don't get an incomplete list. Not a forever list, but just list it until you've got a clean needle.

And you can dip further by assessing the eighteen buttons of the old Prepcheck. You assess the eighteen buttons and you'll be able to get people who are not-ising – who are far beyond being able to protest, they can't protest – and you'll get such things as suppress. And then you'll get a list of what they've suppressed and your list is in this lifetime. And you make a complete list out of what they've suppressed in this lifetime. And you will get a chain of something – whether locks, secondaries or engrams, we know not which – but you will get a chain that you can go down and it will release charge and will give you tone arm action. And then it reaches a lot further south than you might suspect.

Of course, when you run into the Helatrobus Implants with a dull crash, you've got to shift off R3H and go on to R3N. And if you run into some other type of GPM goal that nobody ever heard of, you've got to shift over to R3N2, see? So you've got the types of processes that handle those. And you're all of a sudden dimly aware of the fact this pc is saying, "Let's see, there's something here that says, 'Nix-nix vomica.' Yes, 'vomica, nix vomica.' I think there's some poles; they go crack. A funny engram. My head's getting very hot."

You say, "Oh, well, yes, that's very fine. That's – that's good." That was a near one, because you're going to have to run that engram with your specialized procedures which run GPMs. Get your difference? Thing for you about it is to be smart about the dates of those. The dates go from 38 to 52 trillion years ago. The earliest one I know of like that is at 315 trillion. There were some little early gags, some of the early eager beavers were in there trying to do – not the same pattern, but a positive-negative type of GPM. You don't find many of them, but you'll find that as basic on the chain on some pcs; some earlier positive-negative thing. You know, create-not create.

That seemed to get into fashion some time about then – about 315 trillion years ago. Anyway, to make up what I'm telling you here, your modern process depends to a very marked degree on the auditor and the pc both getting a win and if the auditor and the pc both can't get a win with the process, then the process is not with us long. So I've been working very hard to make these two points mesh with one another and I think I've got it in there pretty close and I think that you will have some good runs on this sort of thing.

And I want to make this point very strongly. Processing has not necessarily done a tremendous change or shift on its know-how. But it's being rearranged because of its target area. I want to make sure you understand that. The approach of processing – the approach to processing – has been upgraded because its target has been upgraded. We're shooting the moon. We're shooting the moon, to use a colloquial expression. We are not interested in clearing anybody; we're only interested in OTs, and that's what you had been watching here for some months. My problem was simply this: The United States government – ha! – and the government of Australia – huh – decided to cut up rough. And you have some crazy lunkheads in the Kremlin and some other birds on the other side of the world who are trying to form a dichotomy expressed with atomic fission. The time is narrowing down rapidly. The ability of governments to govern is degenerating at a great rate of speed. You're going to see nothing but chaos here in a very short period of time. I'm an old hand at watching these things go to pieces and I start to watch the square of the deterioration, *thah!*

So when *das* federal fascist state jumped us for E-Meters, I jumped them with OT. And I said the only thing we could do was hold the ground legally, which we are doing very successfully – even winning a bit. Hold that line and then upgrade the processing target. And I've been working since January to do that and this has been a very rough period. It's particularly rough on you students because it's given you a shifting quicksand of checksheets, stuff – the ink is dry on it so it must be out of fashion, you see? But I've been moving you up very, very rapidly, and I've been holding on to you more or less for the good reason I did not want your training to be antiquated as rapidly, you see – you just no more than get trained, you go home and your training is out-of-date.

So I've been holding on to you on a stable plateau basis, and this has been a bit of touch and go. What I needed was something that could run engrams very successfully and include all of these GPMs; and a training procedure that could do that – could lead a person up to being able to run engrams, that was still a therapeutic process – and then processes which got to cases which weren't making advance on the upper-level things, but which would move those cases up to those. And what I'm announcing here is I've achieved this definite

goal of mine with regard to this, and it's – the only target, the only target that I accept as an auditing target now is OT, and it's right within your grasp. It's coming straight up the line, and our campaigns for planet Earth I'm afraid has had to be speeded up considerably. And although some of you may shudder under that consideration, others will probably say, "Well, thank God, Ron finally woke up," you know? That sort of thing. We'd probably get a mixture of answers about the whole thing, but the shells and shellfire that's been coming our way is not just coming our way, it's coming in the way of this civilization. Its lights are going out very rapidly.

And sitting back and reading the newspapers, which tell you very little, you might not recognize this quite as clearly. So as far as I'm concerned we've beat the run. A lot of this now is up to you. So don't fool around with it and don't be lackadaisical about it. Let's press on, let's get the job done.

Thank you.