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

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 May, 1960

Franchise Holders
HCO Secs.
Assn. Secs.

HELP PROCESSING

At last we've found the button almost any case and all the world can run.

Help may not be everything that is wrong with the world but it is the only common denominator the world can understand.

I have known about help for some years and in 1957, autumn, used it, with fateful Step 6, in clearing people. The first clears made easily by others were done with meter assessments and five way help brackets on terminals.

It was found that Step 6, being a creative process, was bad on some cases. The clearing formula was help and Step 6. We tended to abandon both when Step 6 became an overt. It blew us off.

The next big technical development was O/W. Overt-withold, of course, is as old as 1954 (Phoenix) when reach-withdraw was introduced. But the full knowledge of what overt-withold meant to cases was not released until November, 1959. Here came much new technical data, all of it vital to clearing. A person with large witholds from the auditor will not go into session. This is true, valid and useful. We could not clear many people even now without it. Further, we find all losses in Scientology personnel in Central Orgs. and the field stem from O/W.

In researching O/W, as early as December, 1958, (Washington, D.C.), it was found and proven conclusively that it was what the person himself did to others that was aberrative, not what was done to him. The test of this can be made easily. Given: an ARC break between auditor and pc who have known each other some time. Note the position of the meter tone arm. Run "What have you done to me?" "What have I done to you?" Observe that after some small variation the limited value of this two-way flow (which assumes the auditor's bad action was half what was wrong with the pc) shows up in a stuck tone arm. This two way process is too limited to alter the tone arm after a few minutes. A lie has been introduced. This lie sticks the tone arm. Now shift to "What have you done to me?" "What have you witheld from me?" And watch the tone arm free up and eventually go toward clear reading. In other words, the situation freed wholly only when we assumed that only what the pc had done had any aberrative value.

This and other vital material learned between 1957 autumn and now was the technology necessary to do full clearing on everyone except the wholly psychotic and unconscious people (where we have the CCHs.)

Everything learned about O/W is still necessary to clearing. But everything that applied in O/W also applies to running help.

It's marvelous that a five way bracket on help cleared people. It did clear some. But where it failed it ran into the rule that it's only what the pc does that is aberrative, what is done to him is not. Thus, what help the pc has given and what help he has denied or failed to give are aberrative. What help the pc received, in the long run is not (no matter how the psychologists cut it).

There are probably thousands of ways help could be run. You can think of dozens. All of them would be effective in greater or lesser degree. Just add help into any process form we know. But the one general process on help that would rank high would be "What have you helped?" "What have you not helped?" alternated.

This is not a dichotomy. This is the best way I know of to run the sense of what help one has given plus what help one has witheld. This is the O/W version and we will call it "Help O/W" to keep ourselves oriented and not introduce too many new terms. I find "failure to help" instantly upsets "What help have you given?" "What help have you witheld?" This version does not run. The correct sense wording is "What help have you given?" "What help have you not given?" This lets the pc as-is his failures to help as well as his denials of help.

This is only the general form. Think how much more we know about O/W. Apply it to help.

Two-way help would have use. But would be limited. Use it. Know it's limited.

Five-way bracket help would have use. But would be limited. Use it. Know it's limited.

This pair have enough power to gain more constant attendance in a PE Co-audit than we have had. So use them in PE Co-audit. Two-way help has just moved a PE co-audit case that has been in co-audit for one year without moving on any other process.

Two way comm on help has value. It's the presession version. No matter who is helping who, a discussion of it can get the pc closer to session.

Now here is data you've been wondering about. Does help in presession become an end all in the HGC. No. Hit the presession points lightly, then in Model Session form use help as the process to be run. And run it until it's flat - flat - flat.

When the Model Session has begun, run a meter assessment. Find any terminal that drops. On that terminal, in specific or general form, "How have you helped --- ?" "How have you not helped --- ?"

Any experience you've had with O/W and meters and assessments, apply it to help.

And that's how you're going to clear people. It's amazingly fast, even on a psychosomatic illness.

Now get your own reality on this.

L. RON HUBBARD.

LRH:dm