

CONFRONT AND HAVINGNESS: ROUTINES 1, 2 AND 3

A lecture given on
16 June 1961

Thank you.

All right. This is the 17th of something or other. Sixteenth? Sixteenth of June. Thank you. I depend on these lectures to find me on the time track.

Well, you have reached the end of a week, and I hope that hasn't made you reach the end of your tether. You look younger. All except Reg.

Okay. And undoubtedly this week you've accumulated enormous numbers of questions. I'm waiting. Yes, Kay?

Female voice: When you're running SOP Goals with the Have and Confront Process, as you run, do your Have and Confront Processes change?

Yes. Thank you. I should put you straight on this. When you're running SOP Goals using the Have and Confront Processes, and actually running Routine 2 with Have and Confront Processes, the processes change with considerable rapidity. They can be expected to change, so you have to be very alert.

Now, you're not trying to run the tone arm motion out of the Confront Process. You're not trying to, but the Confront Process must move the tone arm. You see, a Confront Process is a very junior process. It is a very mild process, but it has the effect of making people feel sane. It is quite good in that, you see? This fellow, he's feeling all confused or something, and he's had a lot of cognition's, all of which are opposite, and a Confront Process is really a doll. It changes the immediate state. And actually it has almost no long-term benefit. You never saw the results of any process fade out as quickly on a Confront Process except maybe Have.

Objective Havingness and Confront are both unlimited processes, but if you run them in an unlimited fashion, like you would run SOP Goals or something of this sort, your pc would feel absolutely marvelous . . . just feel absolutely wonderful. You . . . I'm sure right in this room there are people who have had this happen to them. And they just had seventy-five hours of Havingness, you know. Just marvelous, you see, and they just feel fine, and a week goes by and they still feel all right. And another week goes by, and they don't feel that good. And then another week goes by, and they're right back where they started.

Same way with Confront. It has this odd aspect. That is why you don't find the word Confront on the Prehav Scale. Well, that isn't the original reason. The original reason is another one, but you don't find it on the Prehav Scale because it is of no lasting benefit. It is just marvelous for making somebody feel good. They get unconfused, and they come up to present time, and so forth. And the Have Process, that orients them.

And actually, to know more about these processes, to know the answer to your answer . . . I'm not digressing . . . you actually have to know really what these processes are. And then that alone would give you judgment in when and how to use these processes, see. And it would answer all sorts of things, so I wouldn't have to be telling you, well, you run eight minutes and seventeen seconds of Confront and eighteen seconds point three of Have, you see, because that's silly. It can really depend on your judgment exclusively if you understand really what these processes are supposed to do and what they are. And when you've accomplished that end with either of these processes, you of course have accomplished that end of it. That is all.

The whole criteria is this: Do you feel better now? Fellow's running Havingness, you see. Well, your meter will tell you whether or not he feels better because the needle is looser. If the needle loosens up between the front test of the Havingness and the end test of the Havingness . . . which by the way you

always use . . (get your pencil busy). You always use this test in every session that you run Havingness. You always have him squeeze the cans at the beginning of the Havingness and squeeze the cans at the end of the Havingness, and see if the needle has loosened. You got that?

So every time you run Havingness you go through that little routine. That's part and parcel not of just testing for havingness, but that is part and parcel to using it. And all you want out of Havingness is a loosened needle. Now, how loose? Well, it's just like the one-command process, if you ask somebody to look around the room and find something that's really real to them, and they all of a sudden find one object in the room that is really real to them and they're not pretending about in any way, shape or form, that is really alive. It's a marvelous process. And that is its total effect. It's a one-command process.

The other one is "Think of somebody that believes you're sane or doesn't think you're insane." The person thinks of one person and that's it. Now of course, he might think of two or three more, and you might be able to kid yourself in believing that . . and it might even appear that it'd be a good thing, you see, to run these processes for ten more commands or twenty more commands, or fifteen or twenty hours. If they're this good, you see, they ought to be that good. Well, they're not that good. And until a person is way up and almost Clear, Havingness has no lasting benefit. The valence eats it up. See, the valence and consumption circuits eat up the havingness. Got the idea?

Now, it's absolutely necessary when he is almost Clear to stabilize his whole case, and his whole case will stabilize, and his stabilization at Clear will take place when havingness stays stable. Once run, it stays there. And this isn't a needed test but happens to be one of the tests.

Well, this person is awful close to Clear because when he runs Havingness it stays with him. This orients him in the environment. He goes out and looks around the world and it stays that way. He gets a good reality on the world. For instance, he remedies his havingness in this room, and his havingness is remedied for this universe. Got it?

Until a person is up in that kind of state, he remedies his havingness for this room but it is not remedied for the next room, see?

All right. As long as the fellow has a dominant valence or dominant machinery, it's going to eat up all the havingness you run on him. And you can run the whole bank with Havingness. You can sit there, and the engrams will run by, and the case will change, and it'll just be dandy, and boy, are we producing an effect. But that's all you're doing You're producing effect.

You're not giving the case any lasting gain. The lasting gain of Havingness occurs somewhere in the vicinity of eight or ten commands. Very short. Very brief. And when you've done that, you've done it. Now what you've done, then, is sort of peg the guy at a new level. And that havingness, that much havingness, remains constant. That's okay. He's got that. He can have that. But if you run another half an hour of it, he can't have any of that, you see, so it's just a waste of time. Let's run the case by music therapy, Los Angeles fashion or something. You've heard of that I imagine. Let's give the case some good auditing with some ARC Straightwire, and then let's spend the next . . rest of the week on music therapy. And then, of course, any benefit he got, you see, occurs in the first few minutes of ARC Straightwire . . which, by the way, is another one of these processes that works dandy for a few commands. And then the rest of it is just lost. See, there's no use doing it. Yes, it'll run the case. Yes, the pictures will change.

Yes, the person . . but look, this is a hell of a way to run a case: to get his attention on the wall so he'll run his bank. See, what you're doing is run a shift of attention. After Havingness works, after about twelve, fifteen, twenty . . the zenith I don't know, but the zenith certainly wouldn't be more than about thirty-two commands. I mean, it'd be up in that range. After that, all you're doing is saying, "Take your attention off your bank. Thank you. Take your attention off your bank. Thank you." And, of course, the bank changes. And the engram that he was halfway through mysteriously moves the rest of the way through. But in view of the fact that it moves the rest of the way through without the pc inspecting it in any way, of course, it's no benefit. It'll also move through the next day.

If you want to run an engram perpetually, forever, why, just keep running it with Havingness. Say, "Now, you're nicely fixed in that engram. Good."

You've got that engram. 1601 it was when you murdered the king. Very good.

All right. That's fine. Now you're sure you're there? That's good. All right.

Now we're going to run some Havingness."

And we run twenty commands of Havingness and then we say, "Well, how about that 1601?"

"Oh," he says, "that went."

"Oh, well, you'll have to get that back. Let's get that back now. And just - just how was it that you went about the assassination? What kind of a weapon - what kind of a weapon would you most hate to be assassinated with?"

"Ohhhh!"

"Oh, all right. All right. That's good. Now get your idea of that weapon.

You got that real good? All right. That's fine. Now look at that wall. Thank you. Look at that wall. Thank you. Look at that wall."

And the engram will reel straight through again. And you could actually run it through perpetually. I don't think it would ever run out unless those little beginning commands of getting him into it and the little datings that you were doing happened to blow it. But the Havingness itself will move the engram through, move the engram through, move... Like making somebody sit in a cinema through the picture time after time and making him look at the usher. Years later they see the motion picture and they say, "What's this?" you see. "Never seen this before." So you get the point here that . . .? So that's a limited sort of a process. Yes, it'll apparently produce enormous results after run for a few commands . . . apparently. And this is very inviting.

Back in '55 I was investigating this like mad, and I knew there was something there in this Havingness Process, but I couldn't establish exactly what. And it was mysterious, and actually if you review the old tapes and bulletins and things like this, you'll find out I said so often, that I didn't know what Havingness was all about.

Same way with Confront, because Confront is actually Subjective Havingness. Now you're going to run the reverse. You're going to make him face the wall. You're going to make him face the bank. I don't care what the Havingness command was, exterior, or what the Confront Process was, subjective; all you've said to him is, "Now, look at that wall. Now you got the real universe? That's right. That's real good. Got it real good. Well, look at it a few more times. Oh, that's fine. Feel better now? All right. That's dandy. That's it." You got it?

All right. Now you have him look at the bank, and you say, "Bank, bank, bank, bank." I don't care what command you're using, see, for the Confront Process; you're saying, "Bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank. You feel better now?" The guy says, "Yes, oddly enough, I do."

Well, don't expect him to go on feeling better for the rest of his life, you see, because it's too arduous, as a process. It . . . there . . . they do things. Odd things will happen doing them. There're vagaries. The full benefit of the Havingness Process and the full benefit of the Confront Process, as far as therapeutic value is concerned, is realized in something on the order of eight to a dozen commands in Havingness . . . zenith about thirty-two commands. And Confront? Well, it's a little harder to establish in terms of time, but what you want really is a wiggle on the tone arm.

You want the tone arm to wiggle and preferably go lower. If you can make the tone arm do that with a Confront Process and you can get it done in ten minutes or fifteen minutes or something, why, you've

done it. And if you're not doing it in ten or fifteen minutes, you'd better say, "Well, it's just too bad, but this pc will have to feel bad till the next session." I mean that's it. Because a process is nothing to fool with if it is not producing benefit. And if it's not producing benefit, you won't get a tone arm motion. Got it?

So therefore, the Havingness and the Confront Processes apply all the way from the bottom of Routine 2 to the near top of Routine 3. Routine 2 to Routine 3. Hm? And they are always used exactly the same way. You use them exactly the same way. But look, this case is changing. So if you find them too early, you're just going to have to shift them every time you run them. And if you find them too late, all you're using them for is stabilization of Clear. And in the middle ground it's sensible, but you keep your eagle eye on the needle for the Havingness and you keep your eye on the tone arm for the Confront. And if all of a sudden . . . this person's been running along fine on the Confront Process of, "Get the idea of your bank flying by at ninety miles an hour" . . . that was his Confront Process . . . and the hitherto . . . if he was sitting at 4.0, it would go to 4.5, and it would then blow down to 3.5, see? Some much . . . such evolution as this . . .

I've gotten more data on this, since I've given anybody any of it, by the way. I'm glad you asked the question. I've had quite a bit of data accumulated on this one way or the other. I haven't even written a bulletin on it.

And it works just fine . . . "Get the idea of your bank flying by at ninety miles an hour. Thank you. Get the idea of your bank flying by at ninety miles an hour"; whatever the Having Confront Process is. And hitherto it would go up a half a tone and then it would blow down a tone. Something on that order. And as soon as it blew down a bit, you'd come off of it and you'd skip it after that. Ah, that's good. That criteria, by the way, used to be used for the Havingness Process, and it's not used there. Use it for the Confront now.

All right. And you start him in on the Confront Process, and the tone arm doesn't go up. And you run ten commands, and the tone arm doesn't go up. And you run ten . . . fifteen commands, and the tone arm hasn't gone anyplace yet. Well, it's too confusing to find another Confront Process right at that moment. You simply come off of it, run your Havingness Process and that's it.

And the next time you audit the pc, say, "Now we are going to find a Confront Process," because that Confront Process is no longer functional

All right. You always do the can-squeeze test. You wouldn't have had to have done any of these things, you see, if we weren't traveling at a fast rate of speed with our auditing progress. It was perfectly all right. The finite period of time that they lasted before didn't require all these cautions, but they certainly require it now.

So here you are with your case going along at a whizzing bang, and you give that can-squeeze test just before you run the thing. All right. You say, "Squeeze the cans." You watch the needle, you see. "Squeeze the cans" . . . watch the needle. Don't necessarily set the sensitivity knob, who cares? And then you say, "Look around here and find something you can agree with. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can agree with. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can agree with. Thank you." Run it about eight times, something like this . . . maybe twelve times. And, you don't count them. It's not that exact an action. Counting them is something on the order of the ensign going out and holding the sextant upside down in a bleary-eyed way and shooting Venus when it should have been Arcturus. And then he comes back down and spends three hours of the most minute mathematical calculations you ever heard of, don't you see. And he reduces the ship down to a pinpoint, only he's 150 miles north of the headwaters of the Nile, you see. It's very amusing, you see, to take something that is of a gross application and then figure it out minutely, and yet the world of mathematics is doing that all the time. That'd be something on the order of counting the Havingness Processes, don't you see.

You run it kind of watching the pc. Don't watch the needle on the Havingness Process. And the pc says, "I agree to that. I agree to that. I agree to that. And I agree to that, agree to that, agree to that, agree to that. Yeah."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Okay now. Would you give the electrodes a 'squeeze'." And you look at it. Wham! You say, "All right. Thank you very much. That's the end of that process." No bridge out. Don't bother.

Confront Process is run before the Havingness Process. And what you do there is you say, "Now get the idea of your bank flying by at ninety miles an hour with a witch on it. Thank you." Whatever your Confront Process is. Watch that tone arm. Watch that tone arm, and it goes zzz-zzz-zzz-zzz-zzz-zzz-thoom! And you say, "Thank you very much. That's very good. Ah, that's real nice. That's fine. How do you feel now?"

He says, "I feel much better."

You say, "Good. That's it."

And all they are . . . are stabilizers of the gain. Now, an individual gets no idea of what else is going on. He is running this horse, you see. And he's running Fail Leave on a horse. And my God, he just runs Fail Leave on horses and Fail Leave on horses and Fail Leave on horses, and Fail Leave on horses, and Fail Leave on horses, and Fail Leave on horses, and horses failing to leave him, and him failing to leave horses, and others failing to leave horses and horses failing to leave others, and horses failing to leave horses, and . . . man, he's just been having a ball, you see.

And all this time he's been having trouble, see. That's the way the bank is going on this silly valence, and the valence is separating out, but he's having trouble this whole time. What's happening here? This is . . . gets to be very amusing when you're running a valence directly, because what's happening here?

You know, there are other quadrupeds that failed to leave. Namely donkeys. And he's gone along through the course of auditing, obeying the auditing command very nicely, except every once in a while something in the bank would say "Hee-Haw," you know, or something of this sort. And he'd say, "Well, down. Get away from here now. We're supposed to be dealing with horses."

And during the process of his auditing, he will stack up quite a few donkeys over here. Somewhere on his left or somewhere behind him there'll be some repressed donkeys. Get the idea? This is inevitable, see.

Well, now listen. Let's give him a chance to get rid of the donkeys, and that's why we run the Confront Process. Whatever the Confront Process is, the first thing he's going to confront are the things he kind of restrained himself from confronting, because he was running horses. The mechanics of the process, in other words, have prevented him from confronting certain things. Well, so he blows that off; you don't hear any more about the donkeys. Donkeys aren't any difficulty for him. They're just an associated terminal, see.

All right. Let's say we have one case running on a terminal that doesn't occur in this lifetime. Never occurs in this lifetime . . . the terminal doesn't, that's it. Or if it did, it'd be so slight. But the person for various reasons . . . not necessarily this particular case that there aren't any in the present lifetime, but just the case is the person is incapable of being one in this lifetime by reason of sex. So we're running this person when and how? We're running this person out of the present lifetime, all the time, on the terminal.

Well, let's give him a chance to catch up. Let's give him a chance to come up to present time. And the best way to get him up to present time is a Confront Process. Confront is the old answer . . . 1950 . . . of how you got a pc up to present time. You could have confronted any pc that got stuck on the track back up to present time. If you moved him out of present time, you could have confronted him back up to present time, don't you see?

On such a terminal, if you do not run the Confront Process, no vast catastrophe is going to occur, but the pc is going to be perpetually uncomfortable. And the fellow will finish the session over here holding down these eight donkeys, you see, and he will find himself going around until the next session with these damn donkeys. You see? It's not even catastrophic. It will not hold up his progress, so it is not a

vital action. It simply keeps the case on a little more even keel and maybe speeds it up because the case might not get so many ARC breaks out of session, because they're in a little bit better shape in the physical universe, don't you see? That's why you use the Havingness and Confront Process.

Now when you use it, naturally . . . you would certainly be wanting to use them on somebody who kept feeling a little spinny. If the person's kind of feeling a little spinny, level by level, and you don't have his Havingness and Confront Process, you haven't got the weapon necessary to set him right. A little bit of Confront does marvels for the fellow's spinniness. You know, guys can get pretty far off beam with this spinniness. They can get pretty nyarowrrrow, you know?

Anyway, where do we have a borderline between not running them and running them? It's just auditor's judgment. It's just the state of case and auditor's judgment. And they run all the way through from Routine 2 right on down through to the bottom of Routine 1. And the more the case is progressing, the more rapidly the Havingness and Confront Processes will change, and you will start somebody out, and he'll be getting along fine. . .

They don't necessarily go up scale or down scale, you know. Just as a word of warning. A person starts out, "Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you." This remedies his havingness beautifully, you know. "Look around here and find something you can have." Wonderful. It just remedies his havingness gorgeously. And about eight sessions later, he's made a good case gain. See, he's had a good run on a level or something like this. And he's got a lot of withholds off on a Joburg. And you run "Look around here and find something you can have. Look around here . . ." eight times. Squeeze the cans again, you know, and it just goes clank! Almost stands up and barks at you, see. It doesn't move anywhere near like it did on the first can squeeze. Well, this is running his havingness down now.

Well, it's not a temporary condition that will fade out in . . . during the next session, something or other. He might have gotten an ARC break you haven't caught, or some other things might have caused this. But you'd catch those on the end rudiments. This Havingness Process has ceased to work, and now you're liable to find something corny. Here's a Havingness Process: "Why, look around here and find something that would substitute for something if something wasn't there." And you say, "How in the name of common sense can this Havingness Process . . ." you see . . . which you've picked off the list or any existing list; there are lots of them . . . you say, "How could it remedy anybody's havingness."

Well, it's doing so because the can-squeeze test before and after shows it loosens up the needle. And you'll get along and you'll suffer with this . . . along with this one, and your curiosity and mystery and not-know of how this could remedy anybody's havingness. And all of a sudden, why, clank! Can squeeze . . . it didn't work. You're going to have to find another Havingness Process. And this time you find, "Look around here and find something you can have," and "Look around here and find something you would rather not want," or whatever it is. And that remedies havingness now. And then we get another one: "What scene isn't that wall part of?" Oh, that works like a breeze.

You see what's happening here. The bank is shifting. The valence is going nuts. The pc is getting better, but the valence is going crazy. And you can expect the Prehav level on a valence to deteriorate. And you can expect the level of complexity of the Havingness Process to deteriorate. And you can expect the level of complexity of the Confront Process to deteriorate as long as they're being run on a valence, and he's not rid of the valence yet, so therefore you're running on a valence. Got it? So therefore, they deteriorate.

And there's only one other thing I'd like to add on this general subject. There apparently is some idea abroad that the only thing that will clear anybody is running a valence directly and immediately. You look what happens to valences on a Routine 2 run. All kinds of little side-panel valences start flying off the main valence. And you get rid of plenty of extra secondary valences on a Routine 2 run. And when you finally ask the fellow for his goal, after you've thoroughly done Routine 2 . . . Ah, it might be 150 or 200 hours later; we don't care. But if you ask the fellow for his goal, and his terminal and so forth . . . there's his goal; there's his terminal! Bang/ It falls. You assess them for level, and all of a sudden they run out.

Where's this goal? Where's this terminal? Well, you assess them for level, and what are you doing now? You're just doing SOP Goals, but of course you've . . . your general runs hit all these valences. Only they hit them less speedily. They separate them out more. They do different things with valences, but they get rid of valences.

And CCHs, Routine 1, gets rid of valences like mad. They all do the same thing. The whole criteria on Routine 1, Routine 2, Routine 3, is not how nutty you are, but how fast these things will operate. And I will lay you down an operating rule right now for these. An operating rule in no uncertain terms. And that is, if a case in large quantities of auditing has not had a significant change . . . and I'm talking about past processes or even present processes . . . if he hasn't had a significant change over a long period of time . . . he's still got his lumbosis; his zorch is still out of order, you got one answer. This is policy. It has to be policy because valences protest on it. Regardless of graph, meter read, opinion or objections, you run Routine 1. Got that one? HCOB 17 June 1961 [HCOB 16 June 1961, CCHs AND ROUTINE 1]. I just put it in the mill. I might as well tell you what it is.

Don't monkey with this one, huh. If a case hasn't been rapidly changing on auditing, the most rapid way to make the case change is the CCHs with a Security Check. If the case hasn't been changing over a long period of time in auditing, the most rapid way to make them change is CCHs and Security Check. It has nothing to do with their nuttiness. We don't care whether they're nutty or not nutty or anything else. It's just what's the effective thing to do, that's all.

So if you follow that as a policy . . . I'll give you an idea, Wing goes into New York City and there's a perfectly nice fellow, and he has always been a nice fellow, and everybody knows he's a nice fellow, and he is very sane, and he has been very helpful and so forth in Scientology, and Wing says to him, "All right. You say you want some auditing? All right. I'll give you some auditing I'm going to run the CCHs on you."

And the fellow says, "No, no, no. Under no circumstances." Well, my God, he just did an assessment on the man, didn't he? Do you know all of us have got the CCHs unflat on us, practically? We've had them run a little bit. It's too beefy a process to leave unflat. It'll flatten off. Of course, you get up toward Clear, it'll flatten off in a morning. But sooner or later, you're going to have to collide with them and face up to the fact that they require finishing. It's no more serious than that.

The reason Wing would say, "I'm going to run CCHs on you" is he happens to know that the fellow has had lumbosis ever since 1952 and it hasn't disappeared and the fellow has had a bit of auditing . . . quite a bit of auditing during that period of time. Without monkeying around about it and without running into whatever it was or trying to analyze what it was that kept this fellow from cutting free of his lumbosis and spending eighteen hours in the arena, bleeding and raw, fighting this lion to find out what is this that is so tenacious that is continuing lumbosis on this case and getting very brilliant and brainy about the whole thing; just "Give me that hand, brother." That's all.

And all of a sudden, Mr. Lumbosis, when you combine "Give me that hand" and the rest of them with Security Checks . . . that lumbosis, first it runs up a little white flag . . . First you see this helmet being waved over the parapet, you see, rather meanly, you know. "You can't get me. You can't get me. You can't get me." And then finally you see a dirty pocket handkerchief, you know, being waved. And then they finally help you . . . and then they want to beat a parley. And all kinds of things. And then all of a sudden, why, "Oops! There went my lumbosis. Hey, it did, you know." And that's it. What I've done is figure out a way that you can't make a mistake with a case.

You see, there are several things you can know about a case. You can put them on an E-Meter and find out how they read. That's very reliable. You can give them a profile; you can read the profile. That's very reliable. There's another way of reading a case: Looking at them. You can look at them, make up your mind about it, and that's another way of figuring out a case, you see.

All right. There's yet another way. This person has been audited for the last four years and hasn't had much gain. Isn't a Release yet or something like that. Well, that's a complete assessment of the case, isn't it? Otherwise, we'd have to assume that all auditors are bad auditors, which they aren't. We'd have

to assume that no processes have worked in all these years. And they have. See? And we'd have to assume these various things.

Well, why sort all this garbage out? Why spend hours and hours and hours and hours and hours monkeying around with this? Because look, somebody else has already spent hours and hours and hours monkeying around with this one. Well, there's one answer. And that is, it evidently doesn't surrender to the basic mechanics of formal auditing. Whatever it is that's wrong with the guy doesn't normally . . . he's alter-ising the commands or he's auditing through a machine, or he's going on a big via, or he's got a present time restimulator that is very, very rough. It's this. It's that. It could be ten thousand different things. And you can worry yourself to death over it. But look, out of all those things there's only one common denominator for the whole lot. And that is, he's been audited quite a bit and hasn't had a significant case change. That's fine. That's all. That's it.

So you get up on the pitcher's mound. Let's see, what's a pitcher in cricket? A bowler. You stand on the bowler's box or you get in . . . on the pitcher's mound, and you wind up and you pitch CCHs, man. That's all. Or you bowl them. God, I'm international today.

Anyway, there you are. You ask for a simpler tear-apart of a case than this? And there's no reason to be upset about it because actually the very reason that a person gets upset about the fact that somebody thinks they're a little bit potty is an index in itself. You see this? Because it tells you they must be worried about the world's opinion of them. You see? It tells them that pride is entering into processing.

Well, I don't know. I've been run on the CCHs. I don't see anything very bad about it. I know other people who've been run on the CCHs. It produced results on everybody I ever saw it run on actually, if it was run right. So what's the difference here, see? That's all there is to it. I hope I answered your question anyway.

Female voice: Thank you very much.

Good. All right.

Male voice: And a big one of mine.

Good enough.

Male voice: Same here.

Good. We had an interesting incident, by the way, going on in a course . . . special course that's being run someplace. We had a boy . . . he's pretty stormy. He's quite a guy. Pretty stormy. And he walked in on this course and found out that there was kind of a lot of yow-yow-yow going on about, oh, well, this stuff about Security Checks and so on, you know. All these cases, no advance, no spins and so on. And he got down and he told them, "Now look, you guys.

This is your last chance, see. Because if you don't make it in this course, I'm gonna make sure that you just go out and spin forever. So you better get serious about these Joburg Security Checks, and you'd better snap and pop, and you'd better give up those withholds and get it whizzin' and bangin'!" And everybody says, "Well, all right," you know.

They got in and started standing and delivering as though we were being attacked by highwaymen. Then the most interesting thing evolved. A very important person in that area had been invalidating Security Checking and most of the students had withholds about that person. And that one little speech all by itself cleaned up a whole Scientology area. They had been practically under orders to regard the Security Checks as just a nonsensical idea.

And I've just heard from another area that wrote a special Security Check for the Academy. I think that's very nice. I like that. Sooner or later, we'll get out one for the Academy. And the only difference between that and a standard Joburg will be in every third question "What unkind thought have you

thought about your Instructors?" and so forth. Get the idea? It'll be Scientology personnel about every third question, you see? That's the only difference it'll have.

But this was a nice, sweet Security Check. It consisted of something on the order of about twenty-five, thirty questions, and it all says in a high generality "Have you ever been a paid agent working in Moscow directly and immediately for Khrushchev?" That's good. Well, we've taken care of communism. "Now, have you ever been a homosexual? Thank you very much." Or I don't think it's that general. "Have you ever been a homosexual in this organization?" or something. Real cute. Probably says something on the order . . . I didn't read it all, but probably said something on the order "Have you paid your bill?" or something. And that was a Security Check. That ranks with this other one, "Have you had an ARC break with . . . ?" That was another doll. That was a real wowie one.

So it just comes down to the fact there must be no special Security Checks. There must be standard Security Checks, and that's it. And is . . . it happens at this moment that it's HCO W Form 3. When we say Security Check, we mean HCO W Form 3. We don't mean the special Academy edited check, because you see "It's very rapid to give it, you see. It's very rapid to give it. And the other takes too much time." And . . . because people still will walk around their withholds, that's all. Somebody writes a Security Check independently in some vast different part of the world that is in objection to the Joburg Security Check, you can just be sure that it has nothing whatsoever to do with a Joburg taking too much time in the Academy.

In the first place, certainly in an Academy, for God's sakes, these people must learn how to do complete Joburgs, not be given a little twenty-five-question short form and not ever be permitted to have a Joburg anywhere near them . . . which is what this adjudication amounted to. You know, "It must not be given in the Academy. Only this one is given in the Academy."

Interesting, isn't it? You've got to watch that one wherever you are. You see somebody all of a sudden saying, "Well, I think it's perfectly all right." I'll give you the pat answer to this because we're not stopping anybody putting together Joburgs and Security Checks.

It works like this: Unless we lay down a blanket rule that the Security Check given shall be an official HCO WW form with a number for a certain purpose . . . unless we lay that down . . . then, although we have opened the door for anybody who is inventive to write himself a lot of Security Checks and actually contribute to Scientology, we have also opened the door wide for isolated areas of the world to carefully omit their own overts from the particular list and issue it as another check. And that is what happened in this area, I am sure. This is too nonsensical.

This other ARC break one that came out . . . that came out before the Joburg. That came out before there was any real importance being put on Security Checking I just use it as an example of how mild a Security Check can be.

But if you want to put together a Joburg, if you think there are a lot of questions missing, and there certainly must be, I'll tell you how to put together one. I've got a special category going right now. Did you ever know anybody that had about thirty or forty baskets sitting in the same space? Did you know that thirty or forty baskets could occupy the same location in space? That would have driven Hayakawa mad, wouldn't it? Or even Korzybski. But I've got one on the corner of my desk. It'd be absolutely impossible to rack up enough basket systems and enough filing systems to take care of all categories of my immediate projects, so I put them all in the same space over here at the side of the desk.

But oddly enough, although they get up to towering, I let the projects accumulate, and I know I'd better not let them go to files, you see. If they go to files, I have now put the rest of the office staff to work . . . and I'm going to put them to work, but not this senseless filing. When I get a stack this high, and it's all questionnaires to Ds of Ps that I've put out, and I finally see that the stack is high enough to justify my believing they have all replied . . . like, "Send me all the profiles you have on all new Academy graduates." Nothing of this sort, that . . . too silly a project. But if there'd be such a project, I'd just let them stack! See, stack. And I don't send them to file.

And then my basic system that I have newly been putting into effect is simply pick up the whole lot on a donkey cart someday and turn it over to somebody and say sort them out. And they sort them out, and they bring them back. But I know if I . . . you see, the answers of these projects are addressed to me. We have so many things going. I don't have time to advise everybody what every project is. So the easiest thing to do is collect them. And I do collect them. And I do sort them out. And I do all of a sudden fire one of these things when it's all accumulated, because we are now in a zone and area of accumulating information from organizations and people and auditors, you see, and that sort of thing.

And when I ask them for some information, because we're so far flung, it takes an awful unconscionably long time to get something all the way down the Congo out through the various pirates in the Congo now, such as the United Nations and Kennedy's special emissaries, and so on, and it takes a long time to get here. But it gets here. And then I accumulate them, and I put it together.

So don't think that something you send me on a project of this character is just waylaid and neglected, because it very often isn't. Verner, when he was over here looking over the organization . . . one thing stuck thoroughly in his mind. They showed him all the files and papers and routes and it all looked very fantastically interesting to him. And amongst these oddities was the fact my initials appear on everything or my routings appear on everything. And he had the idea that I sat in an ivory tower somewhere, you know, and never saw anything, and you couldn't communicate with me and all that sort of thing. And he looked this over and he saw this vast ocean of accumulated detail, papers, despatches, all this kind of thing Yeah, I see them. I don't always answer them. I try to get them answered, but I don't always answer them.

Sometimes there is no answer. I think, "Well, later on I'll have an answer to something like this, and I'll put it out in a bulletin." Sometimes your despatch gets answered very . . . on a very odd via but not too often. And I'm saying this, giving you this preamble of the thing: If you've got questions that do not appear on these Security Checks or you think should appear on these Security Checks, just address them to me on an ordinary piece of despatch paper. And this file system where the twenty or thirty or forty projects all sit in exactly the same area of space eventually accumulate these things. And one day, why, I'll get some time . . . some 2:30 in the morning sometime . . . and sort them all out and stack them all up and give them to somebody and say type them up. And there we are. And then we'll sort them out. We'll find the questions repeated very often. And we can sort them out, and we will have a new Security Check. Now, Jan right now is doing a very nice rundown, and Dick, with a whole track Security Check.

One question that they originated stuck in my mind on the thing is, "Have you ever wantonly, viciously and villainously destroyed hostages given to you to hold under your sacred trust?" or something like this. So various questions on the line like this and they're good questions. This is a bearcat. And it's the result of saying that one of these days, why, we need a Security Check, that when a person got up about halfway to Clear and his whole track keeps opening up, and he's got withholds on the whole track, and we keep trying to check him in this lifetime, and the withholds are no longer in this lifetime, he goes practically potty. If somebody would just ask him some of these questions, why, it'd all turn up and work out, you see?

All right. So there's a project: whole track questions. There's another project: What peculiar questions should be asked in an Academy? That's another project for another Security Check. And: What peculiar questions should be asked on a repetitive-type Security Check which, while covering the whole Joburg, yet covers it a page at a time? Well, there's got to be certain repetitive questions occur. You see, every time that page is asked, certain other questions have got to be asked with it. So that you could get in the CCHs a one-page administering of the Joburg at a time. You got the idea? And the fellow would always be getting new Security Checks, which yet wouldn't neglect his old Security Checks, you see. It's an interesting problem.

The whole track Security Check, there . . . actually is basically the improvement of the existing Johannesburg Form 3. And the more minds we get to work on what horrible things people should have done to people, why, the more broad and effective that Security Check can be. And it could even be something wild or as far approached, "Have you ever done any illicit diamond buying?" And nevertheless would catch some case.

Remember that a security question or a withhold-type question . . remember that it doesn't produce any bad result, it really doesn't waste enough auditing time to worry about now that you're doing instant read, and yet will catch some off-base case. And you yourself as the auditor sitting there reading one of these checks down will say, "What on earth? How could anybody possibly have ever done anything like this? That's a very unlikely question." And then all of a sudden one day you ask this thing, "Have you ever put any cats in slingshots," you see, "and fired them over walls?" And the thing falls off the pin, and we get somebody who has devoted his whole lifetime to doing nothing else. There it is, brother. Bang!

And then, of course, there have been other codes of justice than the South African code of justice that was the original derivation of the original Joburg South African code of justice is very precise. You can do more things wrong in South Africa than in most other countries, but in South Africa they have more problems, and all of these things are wrong in other countries except they aren't forward enough to say so. It's just a franker code of laws, you see?

They don't have so many of these catch-basket laws, you know? "Have you ever done anything the government doesn't like?" You know, like . . that's US law now. US executive branches in their law, after they've gotten Congress to write up their laws, they always add this catchall law. "Have you ever been non persona grata with any official in this particular and peculiar department and refused to bribe him?" or something like that. And they add this catch law, you see, on top of all the other laws, and then you never know where you're going. You never know what you're doing. You never know what the law is, you see? You don't know whether you're breaking the law or not. A big not-know enters into the scene. As societies tend to deteriorate, not knowingness enters into their laws.

But there have been many other law codes. There's been a Code of Hammurabi. There've been Persian law codes. There have been Egyptian law codes, Greek law codes. There are Spanish law codes right at the present moment. There's French law codes. And all of these things announce crimes of one kind or another that are rather unlikely, you see, to the Anglo-Saxon. For instance, our own law codes in England and the United States have gotten a little bit sloppy in various ways. There's tremendous numbers of laws on the books that don't get enforced, and there are a tremendous number of things that get enforced that aren't on the books, you know. It's getting slopped up this way.

Well, the Joburg actually has to follow through two legal systems because it's basically jurisprudence because it deals basically with the third dynamic, you see. And the best area to find the misdemeanors of the third dynamic, of course, is the justice codes of the third dynamic: What have these things included as being withholdy? Because somewhere on the track people were made to withhold things by a justice code, you see. And they were taught to believe these things were bad and then they deteriorated these things, and then they got inventive about what they did wrong with them. And then a law finally got passed to tell them not to do these things.

The Polynesian legal code, for instance: If you were to run a Security Check on a Polynesian under his old taboo system, your Joburg wouldn't apply. That is, at least 50 percent of the Joburg is perfectly legal in Polynesia, but there must be something on the order of a thousand other things that you would consider perfectly ordinary that would be absolute sudden death, "Throw him into the volcano," you see . . that kind of thing. "He has walked under a kapok tree. Hmmhmmhmmhmmhmm! Hang him!"

So the more . . the more minds we get operating on this sort of thing, why, the better off we are. And I . . I believe we'll probably be evolving Security Checks up here in the next ten years, easily. I can see it now. Maybe someday somebody'll even find Peter's crimes. He wasn't looking for that. That's a bad thing to pick on him this way.

Okay. Now I think you're . . the basics that I know about at the present time, that I think you're grappling with one way or the other, might be pretty well answered at the present moment. Are they? Do you feel you're adrift? Do you feel you're seriously adrift anywhere? Hm?

All right. I have no fault whatsoever with anything you are doing. You might possibly put too much emphasis on picking up data here and too little emphasis on practicing. There is data available here

which isn't available generally. And most of that data is . . well, Mary Sue, myself, Instructors, that sort of thing . . they can give you this data, but the perfection of practice is what we're terribly interested in. Because you will dream up questions, as you try to apply it, which will become burning questions to you, which won't be included in any bulletins anyplace merely because nobody ever dreamed you'd ask these questions. You got the idea?

Nobody would be able to foretell exactly what you would become confused about. And not being able to tell this, of course, you can't write a bulletin. It'd take a bulletin for everybody's blind spot, don't you see? And there's nothing wrong with having a blind spot, but the way to handle a blind spot is to not worry about feeling silly about it . . and not jump on Ken one . . in answering it the way I did one day. He startled me. Sometimes you get startled.

The criteria is that I am more interested in what you find out is a zone that is unknown to you, in the process of application, and that you get that zone cleared up. Because frankly, there are no unknown zones in Scientology at this particular time.

The only thing that is unknown is a question I always leave up at the top of the scale: "Are we all one, or are we separate individuals?" That's an unknown zone. But it's an unknown zone in theory only, you see. You get a reality on it. If it's true, it's true. Whichever's true is true, you see. And when you lay down facts and say "Now listen, you. We is all one. We is all . . we is all 'Nirvanese,' and that's why we is . . we'uns is so nervous. And when the great pearly gates of Nirvana open up and we all merge with the infinite . . ."

Well, you start laying down stuff like that, and you've obscured truth with your inevitably certain zones that remain unknown. But they are not in the zones of "How do you clear somebody?" They are not in the zones of "How do you apply a process?" They are not in the zones of "What is the basic rationale back of why you do this? Why, for heaven's sakes, do you do this?" Well, believe me, there's probably a darn good reason.

And you might get to wondering about this "Why does . . CCH 1 . . why don't you run it with both hands?" Well, you've gotten the idea you're trying to clear hands, you see. That isn't your purpose of CCH 1. CCH 1 isn't trying to clear people's hands. If you wanted to flatten CCH 1 for its own sake, and just for itself, you'd have to, of course, body wise, flatten it on the right hand, flatten it on the left hand, flatten it on both hands. Flatten it on the right foot, flatten it on the left foot, flatten it on both feet. Flatten it on the right ear, flatten it on the left ear, flatten it on . . . You have to call a halt on this sort of thing so you might as well call it right up at the front of the parades.

It's very easy to go into super developed, evolving systems of this particular character. It's like the gardener today. Our boy out here that handles stone masonry and bricks and that sort of thing . . he came up to me rather worriedly. He had been trying to see me, and the gardener wanted him to start a brick wall which goes from the exit at the back gate there on up the road in front of the garage, see. And he intimated to me he didn't think this was too good an idea, and he didn't really have any good reason why he thought that was a bad idea, but it just seemed to him somehow that that was a poor idea.

Actually, it was a poor idea. Where do you stop? See, you start in running a small brick ledge. Where do you stop? Because if you're going to run it up there ten feet, you've only made it obvious that you had better run it twenty feet. And if you've run it twenty feet, you had better make it up there because it won't match the front of the garage now, you see. So you'd better run it the distance of the garage. But that doesn't go up to the gate up there at the top there, at the top of the side road, so you'd better run it to the side road to make it neat. Yeah. But then this doesn't take in the field there. That field there. That better be bricked up too. The next thing you know, we're in Manchester. Now, we didn't intend to go to Manchester at all! We were . . .

You can get strung out this way very easily in research of application. It gets very ridiculous.

Okay. All right. Well, now I hope you have a nice weekend. And I hope everything goes well in any other activities you're taking up. And those that are doing a lot of the auditing here and so forth . . hope you get in some sessions on one another over the weekend. And I haven't looked over your case reports

yet for this week because I've got all day and all tomorrow to do it, but apparently you're doing all right.

How do you like, by the way . . just as a general question, any one of you who's on Routine 1 and a Security Check, how do you like it? How do you think it's going?

Female voice: Very good .

It's going very good? Good. You notice how those new things keep coming up on . . . Do new things keep coming up on Security Checks or . . ? Huh?

Female voice: I spent twenty-five hours on one.

Oh, no! Coo! That's rough, man. I'd say . . I'd say that doesn't just stop the Security Check. I'd say that must have stopped an awful lot of thinkingness someplace or another.

All right. Very good. Well, that's coming along okay.

Female voice: Yes.

Do you get new material on it all the time?

Female voice: Well, what I got, I certainly shouldn't have thought was the answer to the question, but it seemed to answer it.

You what?

Female voice: The things that came up didn't seem, analytically, to answer the question, but it seemed to lift the charge off it pretty much though.

No kidding. Weird. Weird. Something like that'll blow out at the other end of the roof. That's very unusual for something like this to happen.

All right. Those of you who are on Routine 2, how do you think Routine 2 is going?

Male voice: Great.

Good. Good.

We haven't got quite as many goals being searched for here at the moment or terminals and so forth being searched for . . and I don't want to put a stop to that by a long ways. In addition to doing Security Checks, I guess, start looking for goals. I mean, I don't care what . . . Interesting combo. It'd be perfectly all right to look for goals while you're being run on Routine 2 by somebody else because you do it all the time anyhow. You're . . every day and night you're walking around, you're wondering, "I wonder what my goal in life is?" and so forth. And everybody's always walking up to you, you know, sort of saying . . inferring . . that they ought to be informed of what your beingness is. You know? What is your name? What is your name, rank and serial number? Who are you? You're answering this question all the time, you know. Every time you've put up the body . . is every time you walk in down the hall and walk into a room that somebody else is in, you're answering the question "Who am I?" You got the idea?

I mean, you run this one perpetually in this universe, you see . . identification of self, which is terminal finding And people are always asking you, "Well, what do you really want to do here?" You see? "What are you really trying to do?" or, "How can I help you out?" or, "What don't you understand?" Well, you're actually announcing to them "My goal is . . ."

You could look for goals and run Routine 2, but I don't think . . and a Joburg. You could probably run Routine 1, a Joburg and look for goals. You could probably run Routine 2 in its entirety and look for

goals. You could probably do a Routine 3 and also get some CCHs run. You probably could combine these things in the most infinite and scrambled fashion, you possibly could. And the only danger you'd get into would be being run by two auditors at the same time on, let us say, Routine 2, you see, and they're both looking for levels and doing general runs on you . . . irrespective of what the other one is doing But oddly enough, two people could be looking for goals on you and you wouldn't get mixed up.

All right. We've even run two people on one person on the CCHs and not gotten too upset by it. And certainly we already are doing two people on Security Checks on the same person, and nobody's getting mixed up in it.

In other words, you've got a variety of combinations here which are occurring. And you can keep Routine 1, Routine 2 and Routine 3 in very tight compartments and do just those and they are themselves. But also realize that they're sufficiently related that most of them could be done concurrent with the others. Okay?

So have a good weekend. And thank you.

Audience: Thank you.