

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex.

Franchise Hldrs.
All Staff Auditors.
Note HCO Secs. send to
every certified auditor
in your area.

HCO BULLETIN OF APRIL 7, 1960

A NEW SUMMARY OF AUDITING

(This bulletin is the first major break-through in processing in 1960. It is a new statement of processing you will appreciate).

In ten years, the chief thing which needed improvement in the dissemination of Dianetics and Scientology was more and faster processing results.

A good result in processing depends on two things:

- a. The workability of the technical process; and
- b. The ability of the Auditor to apply processing to a preclear.

The bulk of my own work for ten years, then, has been on these two things.

However, you should not make a mistake in thinking that the first released processes did not work as processes. Book One Engram Running, as any old time Dianeticist can tell you, works.

Engram running from "away back" works so well that I probably would not have advanced auditing technically to any degree, if people at large had been able to apply Book One engram running as given in 1950.

Personally I have rarely failed to resolve a case and bring it to a happy conclusion solely with engram running. I would have gone on researching to resolve the mystery of life but not to improve auditing if a majority of auditors had been able to get excellent results.

Alas (or happily) there were too many cases that didn't change when audited by some auditors. And so I tied further researches on life with the development of processes most auditors could handle and with which they could obtain spectacular results rather easily. I do not say that to condemn auditors, only to show the why of further processes, the basic impulse behind the release of new processes. They make it easier to do it faster and they reach the few cases we now and then failed to reach before.

For a long, long, long time I've felt we have been there. I have wanted it to be positive enough so that all auditors could experience being there at a process level.

Training is better and easier. Theory today goes light years beyond what I would have considered as necessary years ago. Processes reach even unconscious people.

But in all this wealth of technology, we still have the problem of auditor application. Here is an example: In spring 1959, I gave the exact way to handle a co-audit group (London HPA and 6th London ACC tapes). To obtain maximum results I had learned, the instructor was the auditor to each pc in the room. Each case was assessed by him. Each person run by him on a via of the Co-audit auditor. Here and there I hear of a co-audit losing people. I hear of an instructor saying "I only have to look in on (the co-audit people) them once in a while during an evening." And I hear of a spectacularly spectacular co-audit group, fully successful, several clears in fact, where the only thing that was done was the exact duplication of the London HPA and ACC instructions!

Now do you see what I mean by processing results depending upon the auditor?

Co-auditing in groups was wrapped up, complete, in the spring of 1959. The task now is to get it adhered to so there will be more clears. A whole year later we are just starting to win on this.

The programme of research may present a myriad of new data. It has not changed certain fundamentals about auditing. It has not changed the exact way to make a clear. Let's not lose sight of these facts.

The first and foremost rule of auditing is FIND SOMETHING THE PRECLEAR CAN DO AND PROCESS HIM TO IMPROVE THAT ABILITY.

A lot of auditors audit quite oppositely and fail here and there and say they don't know why. The auditor finds "what is wrong" with the pc and tries to remedy it. That has nothing to do with the goal of auditing. That's a Q and A with the pc's bank. The pc thinks something is wrong with him and restrains himself. All you have to do to make a pc clear is to help him build up his confidence back in the

cont/

things about him that are right!

To clear a pc all you have to do is give him or her a series of wins he or she realizes are wins.

The 1947 scale of wins was this: Get a pc to have pictures by any device. Get the pc to erase light locks. Get the pc to be more and more able to handle gradually heavier bits of bank. When pc was fully confident, pc was clear.

(That wasn't all, by the way, that's been overlooked in clearing. Read the Book One clear definition again.)

Of course as time has gone on we have been more and more articulate. I have found ways to say things, found ways to describe things that I thought everybody knew. I have erred consistently in overestimating understanding. I seek to remedy that by stating things more clearly. I feel I am winning on this.

But there are certain things I myself find very hard to understand. Among these is how I can run any engram flat in a few hours unless its overt has to be run first; and that some auditors take 50 to 75 hours to flatten an engram. How is that? Well, I'm sure I don't know unless it is as follows:

All you have to do to run an engram is first get the pc accustomed to his bank and track by various mild processes, get him under good control, contact the least incident necessary to resolve the case and flatten it. Well, that's it. To flatten an incident Dianetically, you only erase it. To flatten it Scientologically you run it until pc has it back again fully and its total cause over it (you run it after it has erased). To accomplish all this apply the rule in capitals above. No auditing tricks are necessary unless you have thrown the pc in over his head without a gradient approach to the bank.

Recently I had some auditors complain that they were being forced, using OT-3A to start at Step One on new pcs when "auditor discretion should be used as to what step should be first taken". And what was auditor discretion? Throw the pc in over his head, I guess; New pcs deserve at least some recall process to start out.

The rule I audit by is the one in caps. above. By gradients I recover for the pc confidence in handling himself. At length analytical handling replaces reactive handling.

Here are the first winning sessions on two pcs and the point of first win on each:

P.C. "A" 1952: No pictures. All unreal. Suicidal. Now most people would have tackled the suicidal trait of some such. This pc had had at least 200 hours on engrams. No results. I found pc had an allergy to milk.

By using "think processes" I managed to get expanded gita run without creating mock ups. "Think how you could waste milk" etc.

The pc was able to drink milk after that. Big win! PC made steady gains of like nature afterwards. The pc could drink water. That was an ability. I made the pc able to drink milk too!

P.C. "B" 1959: PC never before audited and had a mysterious field. No relief or release on scouting the present life. No change. Got the pc to describe field. Found it was a window. Run "What part of that picture could you be responsible for?" for a half an hour with pcs only response "I could be responsible for looking out of this window." Then suddenly all shifted, pc got a big kinesthetic of jumping into his car and tearing off in it.

We stopped right there. PC had a big win, felt there was a change. Felt he could be helped by auditing.

The indicated procedure after was to run responsibility on anything pc saw in the bank until he was in present time with his pictures and then, little by little accustom him to locks, secondaries and engrams, a win every time, until he was clear.

Clearing is a qualitative return of confidence in self not quantitative handling of bank. By returning confidence, one achieves clearing in a short while.

By the quality approach one drags the hours out endlessly since there's an endless supply of engrams. The regained ability to handle one fully is better than ploughing through a thousand briefly.

Well some day somebody will hear me. And we'll have lots of clears.

There's also this matter of having a session going before we tackle a bank, for the pc is always tackling his bank out of session and doesn't recover, so there must be a session if he tackles his bank and does recover.

A session depends mostly on these conditions:

1. PC willing to be helped by Auditor (or as in an unconscious pc, unable to prevent being helped);
2. PC under auditor's control to the extent of doing the process;
3. PC willing to talk freely to the auditor;
4. PC interested in own case; and
5. Auditor well-trained enough to handle a session form properly.

Then and only then can we begin the gradient approach of recovering pcs confidence in analytically handling himself and abandoning his reactive witholds and restraints and self-imposed barriers.

To accomplish 1 above, run two way help. Even an alcoholic bum, antagonistic and vicious, will come around eventually on two way help more or less two-way commed until it is running like a process.

"How could you help me?"
"How could I help you?"

Those are the magic words on the reluctant or unwilling pc. Eventually the pc becomes willing to be under the auditor's control.

To accomplish 2 above, it is sometimes necessary to run "You make that body sit in that chair" or "You make that body stand still" or both for a long time, pc doing command each time, before control exists sufficient to run S-C-S. These can be big wins for a pc.

To do 3 above, the auditor can run "Think of something you could tell me." "Think of something you might withhold from me?" until the E-meter arm dives. PC will eventually talk if the pc was under control enough to do the process.

To accomplish 4 we have only to be lengthy in discussing the aspirations and upsets of the pcs life.

To accomplish 5 we should have started a long time ago.

To give pc Big Wins we tackle small targets. Open up the recalls with cause ARC Straight Wire and "What would you be willing to forget?" Erase and put back a lock. Erase and put back a moment of pain (stubbed toe, cut finger). Erase and put back a secondary. Erase and put back a minor engram. Erase and put back a rougher overt engram. Do every little job well. Handle every session well. Finish what you start. If pc goes greasy on the track and skids, return to control processes via 1 to 4 above. Then run up some more wins.

Straighten up women and men and other terminals with O/Ws.

Do what you like, but keep it no heavier than pc can win with. Give him wins, not a caved-in bank.

Sometimes you have to patch up a whole case that was long ago flubbed. Go at it just as above and then run out the first engram that pc was ever thrown into and then run out that auditor.

This is the basic philosophy of auditing. The main reason any auditor has lost on a case is his misunderstanding of his approach. He knows "~~whats wrong~~" with the pc and attacks it. And the pc loses before he wins.

The only thing wrong with a pc is his lack of confidence in handling himself without hurting others. So he creates disabilities which automatically restrain him from making the same mistakes again. Try to relieve those disabilities without returning confidence to the pc and you are liable to lose every time.

It would help you if you made up a chart for each pc and checked it off each session.

1. PC still willing to be helped
2. PC under control and executing every command.....
3. PC willing to talk to me.....
4. PC interested in own case.....
5. I am following model session exactly.....
6. PC havingness is up.....
7. PC is having wins.....

If you check these off every time before a session, you won't miss. And you'll know what to tackle if the intensive is not going too well. The answers are there in those six points, not in a startling new departure in processes!

Look, I want you to have even more wins than you are having.

I'm not really growling about it. I'll even concede I've never said it so succinctly before or lined it up so smoothly. But study it well, won't you? It contains the whole "secret" of auditing. We want more clears.

Whup me up some more won't you?

LRH:js
Copyright (c) 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

L. RON HUBBARD.