

HCO BULLETIN OF MAY 12, 1960

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

The next big technical development was Overt-Withhold. Overt-Withhold, of course, is as old as 1954 (Phoenix) when reach-withdraw was introduced. But the full knowledge of what overt-withhold 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 withholds 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 Organizations and the field stem from overt-withhold.

In researching overt-withhold, 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 preclear 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 preclear) 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 withheld 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 preclear 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 overt-withhold is still necessary to clearing. But everything that applied in overt-withhold also applies to running help.

It's marvellous 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 preclear does that is aberrative, what is done to him is not. Thus, what help the preclear has given and what help he has denied or failed to give are aberrative. What help the preclear 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 withheld. This is the overt-withhold version and we will call it "Help Overt-Withhold" 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 withheld?" This version does not run. The correct sense wording is, "What help have you given?" "What help have you not given?" This lets the preclear 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 overt-withhold. 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 P.E. Co-audit than we have had. So use them in P.E. Co-audit. Two way help has just moved a P.E. Co-audit

case that has been in co-audit for one year without moving on any other process.

Two way communication on help has value. It's the pre-session version. No matter who is helping who, a discussion of it can get the pre-clear closer to session.

Now here is data you've been wondering about. Does help in pre-session become an end all in the HGC. No. Hit the pre-session 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 overt-withhold 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.

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

NOTE: We publish this Bulletin on Help Processing out of sequence because we feel members would like to read about the new technology now being used with such signal results in HGCs. Auditors having any difficulty with Help processes should approach their local HGCs for guidance and aid. Editor.

NOTE: We publish this Bulletin on Help Processing out of sequence because we feel members would like to read about the new technology now being used with such signal results in HGCs. Auditors having any difficulty with Help processes should approach their local HGCs for guidance and aid. Editor.