HCO BULLETIN OF NOVEMBER 3, 1960

. . . . holders.

FAILED HELP

. . . ably the most sensational case cracker of all time is Failed Help.

In that the po has many times tried to help his own case and failed, the most accessible button is failed help.

. . is is run as "Who have you failed to help?" "What have you failed to help?" alternately. More difficult cases run on either one or the other. It can be distracting when the po hits an automaticity on who or what. However even the alternate version will win.

This flattens PTPs and ARC breaks, so on a very low case whose havingness is down, the rudiments may be omitted the first few sessions.

Failed Help may also be run on a terminal. If the po is always having PTPs with a certain type of terminal (woman, man, etc) then failed help can be run in a specific or general fashion. How have you failed to help your wife? This is run repetitively. Or: How could you fail to help a woman?

A lower dichotomy could be run in this fashion. How could you prevent help? How could you fail to help? This last pair are experimental. They would be run alternately.

While running failed help one should attempt every now and then to find the pc's havingness process.

If the pc's havingness process cannot be found even with overts off, run failed help as above, but continue to search for the havingness process at least once a session. If failed help is running very well indeed do not chop into it to search for the havingness process. Do that toward the end of the session.

A quarter of a division of the Tone Arm in three hours auditing is a good gift for a low case on failed help. Do not expect big changes at first.

As any failed help run is good, its all right to make an error and use it cases that could have better gains on something else. Cases that don't need move the least on the Tone Arm with it.

No one has yet run 75 hours of failed help on a previous CCH case. So I . . . . you how much it will take or how far it will go. But I would be . . . . to run 75 hours of it of the Who - What version on a case before it . . . . . a havingness process.

. . . is a marvellous process. I thoroughly recommend it. Just be careful not to lay in ARC breaks and try to keep the case coaxed along and I think you'll make it with some version of failed help on cases we found hard to start before.

LRH:js

L. RON HUBBARD.