Central Orgs
Franchise

HCO BULLETIN OF JUNE 24, AD.13

ROUTINE 3
ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS
BULLETIN 3

ROUTINE 3-R,
ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS

Given a knowledge of the Composition and Behaviour of the Time Track, engram running by chains is so simple that any auditor begins by overcomplication. You almost can't get uncomplicated enough in engram running.

In teaching people to run engrams in 1949, my chief despair was summed up in one sentence to the group I was instructing "All auditors talk too much." And that's the first lesson.

The second lesson is: "All auditors acknowledge too little." Instead of cheerily asking what the pc said and saying "continue", auditors are always asking for more data, and usually for more data than the pc ever could give. Example: Pc: "I see a house here." Auditor: "Okay. How big is it?"

That's not engram running, that just a lousy Q and A.

The proper action is: Pc: "I see a house here." Auditor: "Okay. continue."

The exceptions to this rule are non-existent. This isn't a special brand of engram running. It is modern engram running. It was the first engram running and is the last and you can put aside any complications in between.

The auditor is permitted ONE question per each new point of track and that is ALL. Example: Auditor: Move to the beginning of the 88 plus trillion year incident. (Waits a moment.) What do you see? Pc: It's all murky. Auditor: Good. Move through the incident.

Wrong Example: Auditor: Move to the beginning of the 88 plus trillion year incident. (Waits a moment.) What do you see? Pc: It's all murky. Auditor: Can you seee anything in the murk? FLUNK! FLUNK! FLUNK!

The rule is ACKNOWLEDGE WHAT THE PC SAYS AND TELL HIM TO CONTINUE.

Then there's the matter of being doubtful of control. Wrong Example: Auditor: "Move to yesterday. Are you there? How do you know it's yesterday? What do you see that makes you think ......" FLUNK! FLUNK FLUNK.

Right Example: Auditor: "Move to yesterday. (Waits a moment.) What do you see? ...... Good."

Another error is a failure to take the pc's data. You take the pc's data. Never take his orders.

Right Example: Auditor (meter dating): Is it greater than eighteen trillion, less than eighteen trillion (gets contradictory reads or a DN). (Off meter.) Are you thinking of something? Pc: It's less than 18 trillion. Auditor: Thank you. (On meter.) Is it greater than seventeen trillion five hundred billion. Less than ...... Pc: It's seventeen trillion, nine hundred and eight billion, four hundred and six million, ninety-five thousand, seven hundred and six years ago. Auditor (having alertly written it all down): Thank you. (Ends dating.)

Wrong Example: Auditor: Is it greater than eighteen trillion, less than eighteen tr...... Pc: It's less than eighteen trillion. Auditor: O.K. Is it greater than eighteen trillion, less than eighteen...... FLUNK FLUNK FLUNK.

In dating, the pc's contrary data unspoken and untaken can give you a completely wrong date. Your data comes from the pc and the meter always for anything. And if the pc's data is invalidated you won't get a meter's data. If the pc says he has a PTP and the meter says he doesn't, you take the pc's data that he does. In dating, an argument with the pc can group the track.

So take the pc's data. And of the pc is a dub-in, you should be running the ARC processes not engrams anyway as the case is over-charged for engrams. If the pc isn't a dub-in then the pc's data is quite reliable.

Also, minimize a pc's dependency on a meter. Don't keep confirming a pc's data by meter read with, "That reads. Yes, that's there. Yes, there's a rocket read......" Just let the pc find his own reality in runing an engram. "All auditors talk too much." You can date on a meter but only so long as the pc doesn't cognite on the date. You can help a pc identify or choose an area of track but **only** if he specifically asks you to. Example: Pc: I've got two pictures here. Can you find out which one is the earlier? One is of a freight engine, the other is a whole train. Auditor: (On meter.) Is the freight train engine earlier than the whole train? Is the whole train earlier than the freight engine? (To pc) the whole train reads as earlier.

Now, however, if the pc has two facsimiles, your problem is only that you've missed something.

RULE: WHENEVER CHARGE IS MISSED THE TIME TRACK TENDS TO GROUP.

This does not mean the Auditor has to do something about it unless the pc gets confused and **asks for help,** at which time the **only** action is to spot on the meter what charge has been missed and tell the pc.