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

Fran. Hldrs. HCO BULLETIN OF JULY 14, 1960

CURRENT RUNDOWN

CONCEPT HELP

Concept processing is very old (1953). The original version of concepts goes:

"Get the idea of....."

The modern version of Concept Help O/W goes:

"Think of helping a....."
"Think of not helping a....."

Two-way Concept Help goes:

"Think of a.....helping you"
"Think of you helping a....."

Five way Concept Help would go:

a) "Think of a.....helping you"
b) "Think of you helping a....."
c) "Think of a.....helping others"
d) "Think of others helping a....."
e) "Think of a.....helping a....."

Concept help has the value of being below, in its effect, the level of articulate thought which of course means that it bangs away at reactive thought.

Just exercising a pc in thinking at command is a sort of CCH on thinkingness, with which, of course, pcs have trouble. They have more trouble with creating than thinking and concepts are more in kind with confronting than with creating. Making a pc invent answers is of course, right on his worst button. Therefore Concept Help goes a long ways on a case. It is quite unlimited, no matter what form is run, so long as some attention is paid to flow direction. (a flow run too long in one direction, gives anaten - unconsciousness, remember?)

ALTERNATE CONFRONT

Concept Help, however, has the liability of making things "muggy" at times because of its indefiniteness.

Aside from create, the primary button that is awry (but which cannot be directly attacked without often overshooting the case or involving it in heavy bank reaction), the next things mechanically wrong with a pc would be unconsciousness and confusion. Help, of course, is the primary point of association and identification and is WHY things go wrong with a pc. But a scale of WHAT is right with a pc in descending order of importance would be, as above:

Creativeness
Consciousness
Order
Control

and these would be flanked by the things wrong with these items which makes them decline:

Create - Irresponsibility
Consciousness - Refusal to confront
Order - Unwillingness to bring order
Control - Lack of control.

Help fits in somewhat on this order. One creates to help (and fails). One goes unconscious to help or makes another unconscious to help him/her (and fails). One sees difficulty for others in too much order, seeing that two systems of order clash, and lets down his to help.

One conceives that control is bad and ceases to control and resists control to help others. These are all wrong helps, apparently, and when done, bring about aberration.

continued...

Aberration consists, evidently, of wrong-way assistance as follows:

Optimum Condition → Response → Resulting Condition
Creativeness → Irresponsibility → Disowned Creations
Consciousness → Non-Confront → Unconsciousness
Orderliness → Unwilling conflict → Confusion
Ability to Control → Consequence of control → Mis-control.

Confront is a remedy for the consequences of the first three conditions and also communication. An auditing session itself by its Tr mechanics, improves control and communication. Therefore Confront in one form or another is needed in routine sessions.

Havingness is an objective and somewhat obscure method of confronting and using it as we do objectively, it is a specialized form of confronting, possibly its best form, objective or subjective, even though a series of subjective havingness in Washington in 1955 tended to show that profile gains were not made by subjective confront, a conclusion still subject to further checking.

Confront straightens out any "mugginess" churned up by concept help. No vast tone arm improvements should be expected from alternate confront, but even if it doesn't work well, like havingness, as a primary process, it has very good uses. Alternate Confront gives us a stabilizing tool. PC feels weird = run alternate confront. He'll feel saner. Following this subjective process with the best objective process, havingness, we achieve stability for the gains reached by a help process.

As a comment, beingness is more involved with havingness than with confront.

Confront, on short test, can be run lop-sided, and does disturb the tone arm. "What would you rather not confront?" run all by itself in one pc (a BMA type test series!) did very well. "What can you confront?" of course did very well. Alternate confront has enough wrong with it to be poor as a process for getting gains but wonderful as a process for stabilizing a case. I'll run some more tests on negative confront and let you know. But it is a fluke. By theory it is improbable as it is a cousin to the no-good "What could you go out of communication with?" But "What could you withold?" is the greatest I.Q. raiser known! And it works. So perhaps Negative Confront "What would you rather not confront?" will work too. Of course it's a fundamental button. All unconsciousness, stupidity, forgetfulness and enforced beingness results from problems in confronting.

INDENTIFICATION

A=A=A=A is as true today as it ever was. The inability to differentiate is, of course, a decline in awareness. Identifying Joe with Bill or Rocks with Smoke is loony. This is identification, a word that is amusing semantically, as its exact opposite "Identify" is its cure, but is the same word!

Association of things or thoughts into classes is considered all right and may even be necessary to "learn"things. But this is the middle ground, already half way to lazy thinking.

Help, as assistance, is an identification of mutual interest in survival. Thus we have (1) Possible confusion of beingness and (2) continuation. This makes help ripe for trouble. When one fails to help he keeps on helping! No matter how. He does keep on helping what he has failed to help. One of many mechanisms is to keep the scene in mock-up.

Help is a fundamental necessity, it appears, to every person. But it is dynamite when it goes wrong.

As a symptom of its continuance (survival factor - see Book ONE) pcs running help readily get the idea that help on some terminal "will never flatten" even though it is flattening nicely!

To handle this as a special item, one can run the confront part of a session with "Continuous Confront", the Alternate form of which is:

a) "What could you continue to confront?"
b) "What would you rather not continue to confront?"

The positive form (a) can be run alone for case gain. And I am going to test the negative form (b) as a single run to see if it can be "gotten away with." In

continued...

theory, as all anaten is unwillingness to confront and as all help is continuous survival, form (b), Negative Continuous Confront, should do marvels for I.Q. and may become the proper companion for help processes if the session is ended with havingness.

At the present moment auditing routine is:

Pre-session
Model Session
Help Processes
Alternate Confront
Havingness

all in every session.

L. RON HUBBARD.

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