

GENERAL USE OF PROCEDURE

A lecture given on 8 February 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

This is 8 February 1957, 16th ACC, lecture number twenty-seven.

All right. I want to call a few things to your attention with regard to the handling of preclears and various vagaries, but in particular the use of what you know on a very broad level.

When I gave you Procedure Communication, Control and Havingness, I did not mean that you were supposed to narrow your repertoire down to simply starting a person out and carrying him through an intensive. Do you understand? And I did not mean that you could not use the various variations which occur along that line. That is why I gave you that very long form.

I want to give you an example now of what you may run into with preclears here and there, using CCH. We have preclear B, and preclear B is in an excellent state of being a Black Five. And preclear B doesn't get any reality on very much. We get the preclear into session one way or the other, and then we run, with some effectiveness, keeping something from going away -- just run that, with some effectiveness. It's being effective, things are happening, a bit of a somatic turns on, something happens, case getting along fine. And the preclear goes ten commands with no change. Somatic is off, preclear doesn't feel bad -- ten commands, no change.

Of course, your rule, as per communication lag, is that you shouldn't run anything forever with no change. And this technique, for some peculiar reason, at this time, space and preclear, produces some change and then doesn't produce any change.

Well, you would be apt to think that it was flat. You'll have to differentiate between „flat“ and flat for the time being. Get the idea? The difference between „flat“ and flat for the time being.

So, you say, „*Well, it's not producing any change now. Comm lag flat. He's had a couple of cognitions. Feels good.*“

Actually, you know, you change processes ordinarily on this criteria: Could I end the session now?

Got that? If you could end the session right that moment, it is superpluperfectly all right to change processes. You get that? If you want to be extreme on „*When do I change processes?*“ well, „*Can I drop the preclear right where he is?*“ And of course, it's always safe to change processes at such a moment. If there's any doubt in your mind as to when to do so, just ask yourself that question: „*Well, could we drop him right this minute?*“ All right, you can always change a process.

Well, it ran ten times without any change. The person is not now suffering from a somatic. Everything appears to be all right. But you only ran this process for fifteen minutes! And you're sitting down for a nice, long haul, and you say, „*Well now, we ought to run this process for...*“ Auditors very easily Q-and-A on this process, and run keeping things from going away by the hour, you know, and they just run it and run it -- or by the intensive -- because it itself is being kept from going away. See, they Q-and-A sometimes to the degree of not letting the process change. Something you should be aware of, that once in a while when you're tired or sleepy or something of the sort, you sometimes have a tendency to Q-and-A with a process. Your impulse to do something in the session sometimes is the direct reaction of the process you're running.

So you only ran it for fifteen minutes, and there it is, and it's apparently flat, and you say, „*My goodness, we're really sailing here, and all right.*“ Don't think that you should have run it for three hours before you could make that judgment, do you see? It's whether or not it's flat, not how long you ran it. That's how you judge.

And so you say, „*Well, here we go.*“ And you shift the preclear over to holding the same item still. Now, wonder of wonders, we get somatics, dopiness, all kinds of change-change-change-change. And it goes right on changing for the next half an hour, change- change-change-change-change. And then all of a sudden it seems to be flat. It doesn't seem to be changing anymore.

„*Well,*“ you say, „*I guess this is flat.*“ Well, you would be wrong if you said, „*This is so flat that I never again will have to audit this process.*“ But you could say, „*It is flat for the time being. It is flat for now.*“

And then you decide „*Well, let's go into some Connectedness around here.*“ And you do some Connectedness. And you run Connectedness for an hour, and all of a sudden it appears that Connectedness is awfully flat. You're not getting any change. And you say, „*What's this all about? Well, all right,*“ you say, „*what's flat's flat.*“ You'd again make a mistake if you thought this was flat forever.

And you run into the next, whatever it is you're going to run, perhaps some Objective Solids. You find out all of a sudden the person can do a little bit of Solids, and they can do some Objective Solids.

But you've had the preclear sitting in that chair for a long time, so you're going to do some Objective Solids, and you can vary your repertoire. You know you can always throw an 8-C type process in there. You can have the person look around and find something he wouldn't mind making solid, and then walk them over to it, and then take hold of it, and then make it solid. That really throws everything in.

Because if you've run this many processes with the preclear sitting down, you can be fairly sure of something: that the preclear sooner or later is going to feel the absence of control. You see, this is very early. You haven't run this preclear very much. He's not going to be reacting perfectly. So if you've run him this long, why, let's walk him around. Do something else rather than have him just sit there. And we ran Objective Solids, and he can make things solid, and he gets along just fine. And all of a sudden, why, we find out he's in for a long run.

What happened? Just what happened? You can run this process, and run it and run it and run it and run it and run it, and he gets changes, changes, changes, changes, changes, changes, changes, changes. What happened?

Well, this happened: The preclear was found by you, at the beginning of the session, sitting in a very solid rest point. One rest point in the middle of one confusion. And you ran the preclear out of that rest point and out through a confusion a couple of different ways. And now the preclear has moved to another position on the track, and another rest point and another area of confusion.

The funny part of it is, you could go right back and have him keep things from going away again -- right back to where you were in the beginning. You get the idea?

In other words, you can run the scale, and the scale affected no more than one rest point. But you weren't able to knock out the whole bank and the preclear's whole reaction to energy, masses, spaces, the mind, thoughts, valences, with just one pass of this first technique you use -- *„Keep things from going away.“*

Now, I'll give you some sort of a notion of another backwards look at this thing. You understand, he ran out one section of the track. And now he has a new section of the track. Now, this doesn't go on forever, because the preclear's ability to handle track will eventually turn up and occur to him. He will eventually find out that he is handling these things. He will eventually discover -- and actually discovers with each time you go over something of this character -- that he is a little bit better at it. And each time you do, you'll find you have less trouble handling it, and all of a sudden he will be able to handle something in its entirety rather than in its particularity.

But you could turn right around on that preclear, by the way, and run Two Objects, *„Keep things from going away,“* *„Hold them still,“* Connectedness, and come back to 8-C again, you see, to Tactile Havingness. You could do this, and you would find out that he again repeated somatics, and so on. This, you might call, is running the scale. You

go from do-re-mi right on up to a new do-re-mi, but it's the same scale that you would run again, and he would run differently on it.

All right, let's look at this preclear who has just been injured. He's just this moment been injured, see -- bang! See, he's very thoroughly thudded. He is in a remarkably secondhand condition. His anatomy is a beautiful hue of royal blue. Maybe there's a busted bone or a dislocated joint or two involved. He's in bad shape. And you run something on this order as an assist: You'd get him into some kind of communication, just so he knows you're there. But at this time you shouldn't be too insistent that he be in good communication before you run something. You could make a mistake, you see. You could get him into good communication and reduce his havingness, and he hasn't got any right now. He's practically lost a body and he's alarmed.

What is he trying to do? He's trying to keep his body from going away, or he's on the lower harmonic of it, trying to get rid of it. And in either case, „*Keep it from going away*“ solves it. Getting rid of it never solves it. (Boy, that's something you'd better know.)

It's always, „*Get more, hold in more, connect to more,*“ and never, „*Dispense with, push it out of the road.*“ I received an auditor's report from someplace in the South, very recently, in these big stacks of reports you all were so kind to send me back. And, actually, this auditor said he was getting good results with „*Pushing the wall away.*“ I never heard of such a process.

There is no such process. Well, maybe he was getting good results with it, but for whom? One asks that question; he has to.

All right, here's this bruised, brutalized, chewed-up, knocked-apart pc, and you do something of this sort: It's his left arm that is very badly hurt, and you say, „*All right, take ahold of your left arm. All right. Now, you keep it from going away.*“

Now, if you use one part of a body, by the way, it is always best to use the matching part of the body, particularly if it's one of those parts of the body of which the body has two. It's quite interesting, because you'll find all the somatics of the injured arm turning up in the uninjured arm in a very short space of time. It's very amusing.

Person has an injured right hand. You start running it. The somatics will turn up in the left hand before they go back to the right hand. There will be a stage in your processing where they will be on full in the uninjured hand, and then will return over to it. The mechanism of sympathetic vibration.

Actually, what is happening here is very simple: The neurons are carrying a shock load, and the hand on the opposite side of the body tried to help distribute that shock load. It re-echoed on a complete duplication, and you'll run that out with this process.

All right. So you say, „*Take hold of your arm. You keep it from going away. Good. Now take hold of your right arm and you keep it from going away. Good. You take hold of your left arm and you keep it from going away.*“ You move him upstairs on this just about as far as he goes, and he will go quite a distance. But after a while it'll get flat, and you will find that it does not have a totality of cure, see?

It's quite remarkable. The bone will go back together again. The anchor points will tend to snap into position. The blue bruise will turn yellow. The whole healing cycle is followed through with very rapidly, but it doesn't get well. See, it just comes up to a certain point, and then seems to level at that point. Now, what have you done?

You've just run into the next step of CCH. So, you say, *„All right. Now you keep that left arm still. See, hold it still. Right arm -- take hold of your right arm. All right. Hold it still. Take hold of your left arm. All right. Hold it still. Now, take hold of your right arm. Hold it still.“* And you'll find out the bruise will even further abate.

Now, you could do all sorts of things above this point. You could say, *„Look around the room and find something your left arm can't have.“* This is quite effective as a leveling-off, havingness sort of process. Actually, his whole effort to keep from being struck is bound up in *„can't have.“* But the probability is that he will be in very adequate shape and be able to mope, when you simply get up to *„still.“* See, he'll probably be in very good shape when you get up to *„still.“* And you could drop it at that; you needn't go any further.

But it's fairly certain that you will have to clear both commands on the somatic, according to my own experience. And I have seen some of the most remarkable things happen in terms of assists these days, with these two processes: *„Keep it from going away“* first, and then *„Hold it still“* immediately subsequent to that.

All right, let's say his head was injured. Now, you certainly had better pick some other extremity of the body. *„All right. Keep the head from going away. Keep the knees from going away. Keep the head from going away. Keep the knees“* -- with his hands, of course -- *„Keep the head from going away. Keep his knees from going away.“*

Don't let him, by the way, just look at it. Make him take some means of holding it with his arms and so forth. And don't let him start doing it with his eyes -- mostly because a preclear fakes too badly, quite ordinarily. They fake it up; you can't depend on their doing it. That's one of the main reasons you do it, and the other one is it seems to reduce havingness.

All right. So we keep the knees from going away, and keep the head from going away, and keep the knees from going away, and the head from going away, and then we hold the head still, hold the knees still, and so forth.

Well now, let's look at that as a more or less standard repertoire, which would do very well for an assist. Why does it work so well on an assist? That's because the assist has a bunch of brand-new rest points and confusions, and you just run those out, that's all. See, assist has brand-new rest points and confusions, and you're only working on one single rest point, the last one. And if you're bright, you'll know when to quit. Why? Because you've gotten rid of the bulk of a rest point. And now, if you run it any further, you're going to put the fellow into a brand-new sequence of rest points in auditing. So you watch the bruises and the pains and so forth, and when they go down and abate, why, you've had it, that's it. That's it; don't carry them on.

They probably are rather tired, as probably the session was impromptu; it probably was not well set up or established. You're not well located to do auditing, and so

forth, so you get rid of the existing somatics, the existing injury and let the rest of it go. You see that?

And then catch him sometime later on a formal auditing session, and this time you don't pay any attention to that injury or your auditing of it. You just skip that, and you just put him right straight into session. And you carry on, on a highly generalized basis, not hitting at anything specific.

You will find quite oddly that your auditing will run out. I ask you to keep this in mind: Auditing is itself not painful. The auditor is not administering pain; he is not administering duress to the preclear. When auditing runs out, it simply means that you are running processes strong enough to run out even auditing, and that's quite ordinary today.

The strength of a process depends, by the way, upon the number of processes any given process runs out. I wish to register that with you just in passing; it's something that you really should know. The strength of a process is best demonstrated by the number of processes which it runs out.

Now, today's auditing is adequate to run out all auditing that anybody has ever received -- *„Keep it from going away,“* *„Holding it still,“* Connectedness, S-C-S, Stop-C-S, these various processes, and certainly Solids. Then and Now Solids just blow up all the auditing anybody... As a matter of fact, you will wonder why the auditing doesn't come off readily. Well, *„It doesn't come off soon“* is the proper statement. It doesn't come off early. The auditing lies as locks on many, many other conditions, and they come off first. And you will find in Then and Now Solids a fellow, quite often, is flying on up the track through an awful lot of auditing. All right.

Therefore, the mechanical repair -- and we call that a mechanical repair of a preclear, whether suffering from an assist or suffering from having been in this universe -- are equally easy to handle by exactly this same procedure: CCH. But I don't tell you that you have to exactly follow the exact one form of *„Keep it from going away.“* *„Keep it from going away“* is actually a group of processes. It's a very large group of processes.

This *„Keep it from going away“* by the eye, and so forth, undoubtedly has its place in processing, although I find auditors use it rather badly. I don't have any trouble with it, but I find auditors have gotten into trouble with it, so I just say, *„No. The devil with it.“* It isn't evidently necessary to complete anything. After a person exteriorizes, why, he can still make hands and beams and things -- hold on to things.

It's a whole series. Now, you could have keeping one object, one massive object -- not two objects sitting still, don't you see? (object one, object two, object one, object two) -- and we'd have the step of *„Keep it from going away and leave it totally uncontrolled.“* That's a complication on exactly the same basic process.

You have the preclear stand up there and keep the house from going away, you see? Get a big object. Have him grab hold of a doorjamb or a window ledge or something like that. You can do all sorts of things. You could use just one object repetitively, see -- one object over and over and over and over and over and over and over. You don't have to at any time get a variety of objects, but your preclear's interest may depend

upon your having him handle twenty or thirty. That's just the interest of the preclear. He believes in that much complexity. All right. But what is it? It's all „*Keep it from going away*,“ isn't it?

Now, you could put it on vias and in a crowd you could say, „*Have that person keep that person from going away*,“ you know? Numbers of ways this could be used. „*Invent a method of keeping it from going away*,“ of course, is really not indicated, because it's a thought process, and „*Keep it from going away*“ is a mass process. All right.

Now, how about „*Hold it still*“? Well, if you think that Stop-C-S is anything but „*Hold it still*“ with frills... You can get so far on that as what they call Stop Supreme. Jacqueline Sainte Anne: she was specializing in it. She could get a preclear to stop so suddenly and so fast that his shoes would burn. But this Stop is what? It's hold it still -- stop it, see, hold it still. Well, Stop is actually somewhere between „*Keep it from going away*“ and „*Holding it still*,“ you see, in the way people do it. But something which is stopped is held still.

You could have somebody go along and tell them „*When I say stop, you stop the body absolutely still*“ -- „*Stop the body and hold it absolutely still*“ -- whatever command seemed to clear best. And you get all sorts of interesting, interesting things.

Now, the oddity is you can have a person stop the body and keep it from going away. A great deal of randomness turns in. Sometimes a Stop-C-S doesn't run well on „*Stop the body and hold it still*,“ and does run well on „*Stop the body and keep it from going away*.“ It's just what the preclear interprets it as, see. All right.

There are a number of processes stemming off of this. You use an object. I showed you, you use an object on a mirror-image with the preclear; just hand the object back and forth. What is that? That's sort of a Stop-C-S or an S-C-S that has to do with mimicry.

Here we get up the line a little bit, and this whole business of making it solid actually depends to a large degree on keeping things from going away and holding them still. We have the preclear make things solid. Well, we don't care how he makes things solid. We don't much care how we run it, as long as what we run is run in an orderly fashion with great attention to making things solid.

Now, just how you frame up a process so that the preclear will wind up with making things solid, of course, is another thing entirely, as long as you don't go so far afield and figure-figure that you're wasting time. The thing which you're trying to do is to get him to get a number of objects or pictures and make them solid. That's your goal. Now, how you go about getting this done is quite something else, and nobody should lay down a very heavy restriction on you about this. If you do this with good auditing procedure and it doesn't consume too much time, why, that's fine, you see?

Now, making things solid: I ran the process on a preclear this -- the preclear was very hard to interest, by the way. This preclear was total no-effect-on-self: „*I am never interested in anything. If I got interested in anything it of course would trap me. So therefore, I don't dare be interested in anything*.“ And as a consequence, he worried because he wasn't interested in anything.

Well anyhow, I had this preclear make chairs solid by sitting down on them. I found out he could do this. And we had a number of chairs in the room, so I just sent him from chair to chair, and had him make each one solid by sitting down on it. Almost blew his silly head off. That is a rather extreme and strange form of what used to be Tactile Havingness. See, he had to walk over to a chair and sit down on it and make it solid. It's quite wild. It certainly tore up the obsessed-anchor-point pattern which he had and threw it back into something like an anchor-point pattern. It was quite strange. You could see his physiological structure change as he did this.

This boy, by the way, was a pilot and all of his work was sitting down. And he'd become afraid after a while: everything was zero; there wasn't anything under him. See, the chair wasn't there; there was no floor in the airplane. When he was flying airplanes he was -- several thousand feet of space between himself and the ground. He didn't notice and I didn't either, until he'd been run on this for a little while, that he had another vagary that he hadn't run into, is he didn't have any body between himself and the chair. This turned up later. So, we put a pilot's seat under him and we put a cockpit under him.

Now, a person that had been through an automobile accident ran similar to this with just a „*Make it solid.*“ The person was injured; had him sit in a chair, and person was sitting on a couch. And all of a sudden I said, „*I don't know. This isn't quite right. This isn't quite right.*“ The couch was sectional, so I pulled out one section of the couch so that it was almost the exact width of an automobile seat, you know, and had them do three things: „*Keep the head from going away*“ (which had been injured), „*Keep the knees from going away*“ (which had been injured) and „*Keep the seat from going away.*“

And you never saw quite so much agitation take place in the bank. All of the lurches and lunges and plunges of the car at the moment of impact, and so on, all ran off and dropped away, and so forth. And the somatic ran out rather rapidly. Here is just the addition of a third item, the seat.

Seats are very important to people, for some particular reason. They use them as a dependency. When they are tired they know that if they sit down they will become rested. I don't know why this is. It's a now-I-am-supposed-to, you know. After you've been sitting in a chair for long enough, why, you're supposed to be rested, and so you become rested.

Here is a -- two circumstances where a seat was added to „*Keep it from going away*“ and „*Hold it still.*“ Both of these processes were run.

Now, let's take a fellow who, for recent years, has been working on machinery. Let's say he's been working at a machine bench or something of that sort. Well, let's keep it from going away, see? Let's go find one and keep it from going away. And you'll find out that the specificness of the circumstance does have a tendency to speed up the process, and he'll get over the machines.

Let's take a stenographer. She gets an occupational disability in sitting there pounding away at a typewriter, pounding away at a typewriter, pounding away at a typewriter. Well, her action demonstrates she's actually trying to push the typewriter away from

her. In other words, the strike and action is down. She's getting rid of pieces of paper. And this is a rather aberrative action.

If you wanted to put her right back in the running as a stenographer, you would have her sit down at a typewriter, and you'd have her keep parts of the typewriter from going away, and then the whole typewriter, and parts, and the whole. And in addition to that, eventually add in, or add in at once, pieces of paper, and hold them above the typewriter and keep them from going away. And all of the letters and everything that she's had anything to do with have a tendency to run off, and she gets a tremendous amount of reaction in the bank.

Well, if you did it „*Keep it from going away*,“ you'd have to turn around and have her hold all these same things still, see. That'd be your next step.

And we must remember that because we ourselves become totally unaware of seats -- they are normally behind us and under us and so not observed -- that a seat itself can become quite aberrative. Probably Freud's sole reason for ringing in everything connected with seats... He had a remarkable repertoire of things that he said were connected with seats. He'd become aware himself that when one sat down in a chair there was a chair there, and this was probably a great shock to him, and he had to figure it out in a lot of other categories. But it's just the fact that one doesn't look at a chair, but one sits on a chair and he becomes unaware of chairs.

So when you're auditing preclears, don't you neglect the chair. It's quite interesting, you see. A person is aware of the chair but isn't aware of the chair. All right.

Another vagary along this line is the preclear with the invisible bank. The preclear who is unaware of any bank at all would normally see a picture if you pulled it up for him. But there is such a thing as a preclear who, even though he had a picture in front of him, couldn't see it because he's sitting in invisibility. In other words, he's sitting in invisible mass.

This is brought about, quite often, when a person has been seriously injured by glass screens of some sort or another. In other words, one is not aware of the screen, and yet the screen is there, and one can hit it and can be injured by it, and yet it isn't there. Well, if you were to take a number of glass objects and park them around the room, and have the preclear walk around to them one after the other, and keep them from going away, and walk around and hold them still, and so on, you would have a rather easier approach to it. But you could hit it right head on by just saying „*Do you see that piece of glass? All right, make it a little more solid.*“ You could just clang into it, if the pre-clear could clang into it. The approach to it, however, would be on the two other steps.

If you had a number of pieces of glass, you'd have the preclear run Connectedness on pieces of glass. Any way you could get a gradient, flatten each gradient as it goes up and then run it for blood.

Now, black objects are very, very delusive to you. You will be tempted, I'm sure, to run black screens. And black screens and black fields are not black terminals. And so you lay this law down, will you please? This is a law in auditing -- not because I laid it

down; because it becomes very manifest and when disobeyed gets a person into a lot of trouble: Process terminals, not the product of terminals. Process terminals, not the product of terminals.

In other words, process the man, not the conversation of the man. In handling problems, get problems about terminals, not problems about conditions or significances or particles. You see that? In other words, process terminals always. That runs all the way through.

We've noticed this many times before, but didn't realize that the processing of terminals would solve particles, which it does. So therefore, we can say it with great enthusiasm. That is, you process terminals. If I catch you running „*Give me a problem of incomparable magnitude to unconsciousness*“ -- no, thank you. Don't run such a process.

You could say -- and this is shaving at it a little bit, but it's runnable -- „*Give me a problem of incomparable magnitude to an unconscious man.*“ See, now that's runnable. Problem of incomparable magnitude to unconsciousness isn't very runnable. Why? Well, there's no terminal connected with it. If there's a terminal connected with something, havingness tends to stay up. And if there's no terminal connected with what you're running, it goes right on down out through the bottom of the floor, crash!

In the handling of any preclear there is, omnipresent, the problem of havingness, reduction of An agitation or dopiness on the part of the preclear may take place when havingness is being increased or decreased. In other words, it indicates change of havingness.

You take a preclear who is a Black Five. Now, we just started to speak about the Black Five. Now, you are going to be fooled by a Black Five, because you occasionally will have a tendency to try to process those screens. And those screens are full of black particles and are themselves invisible. If there's any terminal there, it's an invisible screen, not a black screen!

You would do it by having the person mock up and make more solid, black terminals of any kind: the black terminal, the black terminal, the black terminal, you see, one right after the other. „*Mock it up; push it into the body. Mock it up and push it into the body.*“ „*Mock up a black terminal; push it into the body.*“ See? „*Mock up a black pole and push it into the body.*“ Anything you want. „*Mock up a black pillow and push it into the body.*“ We don't care what it is, as long as it's a terminal. You wouldn't have somebody mock up a black knight and push it into the body, you see; because they might spell it n-i-g-h-t.

The black condition or unlighted condition doesn't depend on black terminals as much as it depends on light, scarcity of. But light depends on terminals, not on flows. So you could remedy a black-screen case by saying, „*Mock up a lamppost and shove it into your body,*“ or anything you cared to do. And he would probably snap up a little bit better if you added the ingredient or potential of light.

Don't try to confirm the blackness of blackness. There's nothing wrong with blackness, except blackness is an absence of something. Something which is a black post is a black post.

By the way, I've been all over this. This is one of the wilder excursions I ever took in research: trying to ferret out the actuality of blackness. Blackness is the only actuality. A lighted blackness encompasses at once this wall. That wall is a lighted blackness; if there were no light, the wall would be black. If there were no light in this universe (shudder at the thought), it would be a totally black universe, but all the masses would be present. But you would never see them.

But you have an interesting series of considerations and now-I- am-supposed-to that let you see lighted terminals, and you do not see black terminals. But a terminal is simply a terminal whether it is lighted or not lighted.

So your preclear mocks up lighted terminals and shoves them in, or mocks up black terminals and shoves them in. What's the difference? You see, I mean, the lightedness is another condition.

And actually, you never have to worry your head about whether you ask a preclear to mock up black terminals or unlighted terminals, or so forth, if you really get down to the final analysis. But it'll make the preclear more accurate (who is black and who can't get a mock-up) if you have him mock up a black terminal in that blackness, and shove it into the body. Now he thinks he's in a good agreement because he can follow your auditing command, not because it is necessary for him to mock up a black terminal to get rid of blackness.

Blackness disappears whether you audit blackness or lightness. It is simply a condition. And this condition is so thoroughly complicated, we depend on it so much, that there's a tendency on the part of an auditor to pay too much attention to it. All I'm telling you is it's not all that important. Whether something is lighted or not lighted isn't very important.

A child who has been victimized by being made to sleep in a black room is simply being victimized by some parent who has something on the subject of lightness and blackness, you see? It's just a peculiar aberration. There's no reason why a child has to sleep in a black room.

You mean, if the child wakes up suddenly, it's not supposed to be able to orient itself along its suppositions the way it should? In other words, all a black room does to a child is inhibit him from orienting himself in the manner of a rapid awakening. And I myself have been sufficiently often discombobulated by waking up in strange places and, because of an absence of light, not being able to instantly orient myself, that I know what the sensation is very plainly. It's quite an interesting sensation.

All day long you depend on light and lighted objects to orient yourself And you go to bed at night, and you turn out all the lights. And then you have no orientation if you wake up suddenly, so that you give yourself a nice moment of being lost. Otherwise, you're not lost when you wake up.

And you turn on a light in the kid's room (not too bright but bright enough so that he can see where he is), and he actually will wake up a little bit, a tiny little bit -- some noise or something -- and he'll see where he is, and he'll go back to sleep.

If there's no light present, he wakes up, he tries to use his accustomed method of perception and orientation, which is sight, and he doesn't know where he is. So he becomes terrified. He feels lost; he becomes terrified; he begins to scream; he has to go find somebody. He can't account for this, so he now dubs in a nightmare, mocks up a false series of orientation points -- because a thetan would rather be anywhere than nowhere -- and the parents, of course, have to get up, and so on. So we can assume parents that do this sort of thing just want more randomness. There's no sense in it.

Of course, night lights are expensive, they cost over sixty-seven cents, and they cost more than a nickel a month to run. I've noticed this great insistence on the part of some people, though, of making a child sleep in a dark room, and they seem to be obsessed with the idea. Well, they are simply obsessed with the ideas of lightness and darkness.

If you have an individual tackle this problem, for heaven's sakes, have him tackle the positive havingness; don't have him tackle the negative havingness, see? If you're going to tackle light, don't worry about it any further, but just tackle a lighted, or light-source, object. Have a preclear keep it from going away. *„See that lamp over there? All right, take hold of it.“* You don't want him to necessarily burn his hands, but just have him take hold of it and keep it from going away. And go over and get the other lighted lamp and hold it and keep it from going away.

And his concepts about light and his dependency upon light, and things of that character, will change. But what's really changing is his concept about terminals, and fear of.

Light is a particle condition that is itself a mass. Light is mass, and when it leaks it lights things. See, if you look at it on the basis of *„a light-source mass is there in order to spread this light around, and the light is a totally running item. You see, it runs into the source lamp and out of the lamp,“* and we go at it and tackle it in this fashion, it doesn't resolve in the field of auditing very well. It's quite interesting.

You have to tackle it as itself, as a source. It is a lighted source and the light is mass. And the preclear will at first usually tell you that light is not mass, and this does not happen to be true; light is mass.

Interesting drills. Well, you can have somebody look at a light and say, *„All right, see that light? Now keep it from going away. All right, see that other light? Keep that from going away.“*

The fellow will say, *„What do you mean 'Keep the light from going away'? I can keep the bulb from going away; I can keep the shade from going away. But keep the light from going away, I can't do that. It's flowing all the time, it's flowing all the time, it's flowing all the time.“*

You just say, *„All right. Keep the light from going away.“*

„What do you mean by the 'light'?“

„Well, I mean the light.“

Don't bother to clarify it any further, because he's simply into his tripped-up, messed-up circumstance, and he will come out the right end. If you keep two lights from go-

ing away, then you would have two lights held still. And he says, „*Well, the light is flowing; the light is running and it can't be held still.*“ Oh yeah? I'm afraid that that's physics, and you're doing Scientology, and the physics begins with the idiocy that all energy is conserved.

And any subject which takes off from that low-order point, that something is never created and never destroyed, shouldn't really have any further attention. It doesn't merit any further attention from you, really. That's a fact. It really doesn't merit any further attention.

If you can't overcome gravity you will have a hard time climbing water towers. And if you believe in physics you won't be able to climb water towers easily. So if you want to have a hard time climbing water towers, believe in physics. I mean, it follows, doesn't it?

If you're that short on restrictions, that you have to do something, why, of course, study physics, by all means. But don't process in the light of physics. Please, don't process in the light of physics.

In the first place, it makes the course longer. It makes the course of processing longer for the preclear if you pay attention to all his agreements with all of these idiotic conditions. I don't know how anybody goes around agreeing all the time that the acceleration of gravity is 32.2 feet per second. Do you know? Why has everybody memorized this figure? I don't even think they know what feet are on the backtrack. And yet everybody who sees a weight drop, why, expects that 32.2 foot per second per second, and there it is. I mean, so what?

In the first second they inevitably see something fall 16.1 feet. All it is, is a fixed idea; everybody has agreed upon it. It isn't true. And the funny part of it is, it is not something to which you as an auditor have to pay any attention at all. Doesn't matter.

The gravity components of this table all run out if you have somebody keep it from going away and hold it still and make it solid. All the considerations having to do with gravity, and its connectedness to Earth and what its relationship is, and his great concern over all these things all vanish in smoke.

In other words, we're now running processes which run out all these other minor considerations. So you don't have to get very complicated, I'm afraid.

It's a great relief to be able to run processes which run out any other therapy, or early Dianetics or Scientology. And that is quite an interesting thing to do, because it lets you simply neglect these cures. And it lets you neglect not only the cure of physics but the cure of physic.

After you've run a fellow for a while, you think you're going to have to run out all the phlebotomies that the AMA of that day made it illegal not to perform. The AMA is very silly. I hope it never looks at its own backtrack, because it would either shrivel up in shame or die of laughter. Because it actually has been against the law not to bleed a patient. And today's nonsense about electric shock is about the same thing as yesterday's nonsense about bleeding.

Here's a fellow. He's had a sword straight through him, and blood's running out the back, and blood's running out the front, and blood's plastered all over his clothes and over the floor and everything. An old-time pill-roller would come in -- „*We'll have to cup him.*“ They would. They'd cut a small vein in the arm and bleed him a half a pint of blood or something like that. The guy's been bled! And they very often would be very curious, and often cross with the patient, because he died. That practice, phlebotomy, is quite interesting. All right.

You'll start to run some of these modern processes, and as you run them -- particularly on handling one body, your own body, something like that -- you'll find out many of these other things run off. They're just additive to the terminal. And that is actually almost any consideration; it is additive to the terminal.

There are a lot of people around that think a nose is a nose. But actually, „*nose*“ is a word condition which describes a protuberance on a mass. It's additive to the mass. That all animate masses have noses is not true. See? But somebody came along and looked at those protuberances and said, „*Those are noses,*“ and we had this added to the mass. In other words, a form is a form; it isn't a form plus a whole bunch of other things.

Now, a cure is a cure without a whole bunch of added cures. And the fact that medicine has to dream up a new cure every week should demonstrate that something is haywire with this concatenation of cures. Yes, what's haywire with it is they can't accept a body.

Now, we ourselves have been guilty of too many processes. But not very guilty, because these processes were all a result of further investigation and never a result of a dramatization, as demonstrated by the fact that each series of processes we had, ran out all the old processes. In other words, at any given period we'd have a process, sometime during that period, that would wipe out processes of an earlier period. In other words, we were curing cures. We weren't adding cures. And these various things that happen in this universe -- like the medical profession dramatizes, simply, „*cures that cure cures.*“

Now, someday, somebody is going to have to have a cure for penicillin. They will give them penicillin, then they'll have to cure penicillin. As a matter of fact, right this minute they are curing penicillin. Sulfanilamide, sulfathiazole and these things -- two or three years after they were used so liberally, they had to invent a new cure for crystal sulfa in the kidneys. And it was an interesting thing that they had to cure this. In other words, they cure the cure the cure the cure the cure.

Now, we've been going in exactly the opposite direction. And that is to say, we have been looking for the cures which cured cures. And we knew this and monitored it by the fact that -- „*Would this practically explain, in its totality, all the theory and techniques of Dianetics and Scientology?*“ Well, if it did, that was fine. That was good. Now, if it did that then it must, therefore, run out all good or bad processes ever done in Dianetics or Scientology. And if it did both of those things -- wow! Well, CCH does both of those things. So I'm just sitting around now and bored with life, you see?

You run a preclear very long, and your own ability to slant the direction of these very simple processes will discover that you can run out almost anything.

Now, I want to give you another injunction, and that is don't permit your own body to be used as a prop in the auditing session. The preclear at once goes out of session. And you're liable to get somatics, and all kinds of interesting things happen.

In other words, you'd love to have a body around there that the preclear could keep from going away, and you just know that that would solve all of his troubles with marriage and so forth, if he really, finally could keep another body from going away, see. Be perfect.

So you say to yourself, „*Well, what the heck. I got a body here I'm not using at the moment.*“ And so you have the preclear keep the auditor's body from going away. And then all sorts of randomness occurs. See, he's looking at you, by which he means a body, to keep him in control and keep his bank at bay. But then he finds himself to some degree in possession of and in control of your body, and of course, there's no further controlling factor from his viewpoint in the session.

Quite in addition to that, your body rebels because this is a no- game condition for it, and it's liable to develop a bunch of somatics. If you're going to do this sort of thing, why, get a volunteer.

But more generally, you can do the same thing by taking a doll. I mean, you don't have to get very specific.

Now, I want to give you one last injunction here on processing. One, as I've told you: Don't get your mind too fixed on what you're supposed to do with one of these processes. You know there's -- it's highly efficacious to keep things from going away and that you better handle masses. See, now, what you can make out of that is up to you, you see, and you can make an awful lot out of that. Because in any given auditing session, when I'm suddenly given a condition of some magnitude on the part of the preclear, I can normally whip up a circumstance in the auditing session which almost exactly slants the processing right down the alley, see?

One fellow I was talking to one day had actually been hit by a door, and he had a big crease alongside of his temple from way back when, you know? And obnosis told me that this fellow was all scarred up there. And I was looking at him, and so on, and so I wanted to pick a likely rest point, and I couldn't seem to find any other starting place. But he had headaches; here was this huge scar.

I said, „*Where'd you get the scar?*“

He said, „*What scar?*“ Well, of course, I knew I was right on the main highway here. He looked at himself in the mirror every morning, he shaved every morning, he looked at himself all the time, and he didn't ever see this scar which ran across his temple. It was the most obvious thing you ever saw, and it wasn't obvious to him. „*What scar?*“ And he thought it over for a long time, and then he told me, „*Well yeah, that's where I ran into the door.*“

And I said, „*Who told you?*“

And he says, „*I've forgotten who told me, but...*“ See, we were really adrift.

So this guy was keeping doors from going away until he could give me that piece of information. I just had him go around and keep doors from going away.

And it turned up that the scar was kept around as a token of his first wife, who used to slam the door in his face every time he made what she called an „*improper proposal*.“ And actually, the scar had not been much apparent until she had started that, and then the scar had become quite dominant.

It was very interesting. But we held doors and kept them from going away, and we kept doors still, and we did things with doors and did things with doors and did things with doors until he could practically make doors, saw them up, and so forth.

Another point of obnosis is I myself did not notice this at first, but he had the devil's own time with every doorknob he came near. You know, he'd turn them the wrong way and then he'd put the body lunge against the door, and the door would stick. And he had trouble with my doors that I never had any trouble with, except I did not notice that until I had gone into it. I merely thought he was being clumsy. Good sharp obnosis said „*This man's having trouble with doors!*“

All right. And then there is this matter of Problems of Comparable Magnitude, which you must not neglect, because the game condition of the preclear must be fulfilled. He has an idea that he has to have lots of games, and you have to get him over the idea that he has to have lots of games, and into having a game, which is a big difference. He's just got an idea he has to have a lot of games, and he doesn't have any games. That's the usual state your preclear is in. And you have to get him into some state where he has some games and doesn't have to have lots of games, and then he's back to living again. And this is the way we'd go about it.

Problems of Incomparable Magnitude, of course, can probably be undercut in numerous ways. The latest one, which was proposed by Dick, was „*unworkable cures*“ -- „*Give me an unworkable cure for blank,*“ and „*Give me another unworkable cure for blank,*“ and so forth. Of course, he picked up cures because cure is the common denominator of all of the things wrong with the individual. The individual has been cured, and he's been cured so often and so completely that he is cured of being alive. So an unworkable cure tends to run the other side of the thing.

That's proposed as an experimental method of undercutting. And there are many other such things that could happen that would be more or less specific types of problem which a person could enunciate.

But a Problem of Incomparable Magnitude, Problem of Comparable Magnitude, Datum of Incomparable Magnitude, Data of Comparable Magnitude, all have a tendency to remedy games. And let us not forget that Dianetics 55! process, „*Invent a game,*“ which, of course, is a dangerous one to run on a low-order preclear, because he simply hands you games -- no matter how silly the game is that he hands you, he normally has played this for years. He rather strips the bank of games.

So Problems of Comparable Magnitude run on an auditor would be run this way: „*Give me a problem of comparable magnitude to a preclear.*“ And because he's been at this for a long time, and probably his auditing in this lifetime is a continuance of many other healing activities in other lifetimes, you'll find this will probably run and run and run and run. It'll eventually run off into patients, and you'll be very, very silly if you let him slop over into patients. Just run Problem of Comparable Magnitude to preclears - - Problem of Incomparable Magnitude, Problem of Comparable Magnitude to pre-clears.

When you're running Problems of Comparable Magnitude, you want to have a problem. Now, one of the ways you guarantee that a problem is there is you ask him, after he's given you a problem of comparable magnitude, „*Now, how could that be a problem to you?*“ And that's a good question to insert right after his answer, because up to this moment it isn't a problem; it's just a datum of comparable disaster. And you have a tendency to run out the curiosity which keeps him pinned to the track.

Take a bus driver: A problem of comparable magnitude to a passenger. Now, these are all run on a passenger, a preclear, a car. You don't run them on a generalized thing, because the second that you get into multiple terminals, he gets this confused with particles and it doesn't run as well.

You always have a problem of comparable magnitude to a terminal - - one terminal! Or at most, problem of comparable magnitude to two terminals. But don't let it get up into a whole flood of things or you're not solving it at all.

And I think with these small bits and pieces I've been giving you that you will be able to handle CCH very well.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]