

ENGRAM CHAIN RUNNING

A lecture given on
11 June 1963

Thank you.

Well, how are you?

Audience: Fine. Thank you.

Good. This is what?

Audience: June the 11th.

June 10th.

Audience: 11th.

11th? I lost a day. All right, 11 June A.D. 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course .

Now, this lecture today reminds me very interestingly of 42 Aberdeen Road, and Elizabeth, New Jersey, and 1949, Bay Head, New Jersey. Quite reminiscent, because this lecture concerns engrams.

And I finally found out why you can't run engrams. That's an awful slow take on my part. There's been something wrong with the communication; the communication of the matter. And I finally found out you've been trying to run engrams. And you never run engrams; you run chains of engrams. So we'll call this technology which I'm giving you "engram running by chains," well understanding that nobody ever successfully ran engrams any other way.

This is the way I ran engrams back in 1949. Let me tell you where it got crossed up. Oh, I fancied this up; this is very simple these days because we've got tremendous technology. I can give you a very close-to-rote series of actions that are very easy to do. Let me tell you where this got fancied up. You got it crossed up with repetitive processing: "Flatten the process." So naturally, you have to flatten the engram, don't you? Hmmm! No, you only have to flatten the chain. You don't have to flatten the engram, you flatten the chain. But repetitive processing is what raised its ugly head and got you all mixed up on running engrams. "Flatten that process!" "The way out is the way through!" You know? That kind of thing.

So you apply that to a single engram; you're in a mess promptly, for several reasons. Because it is only part of a chain of similar incidents which, in itself, is only part of a time track which has all sorts of incidents on it. And you're essentially running a time track—not a stick, not a chunk of something. These things are all related. So therefore, all engrams are handled as parts of a chain of similar incidents. And you never handle an engram all by itself. Because they don't exist all by themselves. I've already said it's part of a chain, and the chain is part of a time track; how can you handle it all by itself? It's too closely related to these other two things to be so handled.

Now, if it were just one item, like a hunk of mud or something, you could bring it in and mix it in water and precipitate it, and so forth. And then you'd pick up another hunk of mud, and handle it in some particular way, and then pick up another hunk of mud and handle it in some particular way. Well, that would be relatively easy. But unfortunately, the hunk of mud is a chain of engrams—is never a single engram. You've got to handle this thing as a chain and part of a chain.

Now, if you are a skilled auditor, you can pick up bypassed charge. You know why the PC is ARC breaking. You can find it out in a fast hurry. PC ARC breaks, bang! Either you know what you're doing (know what just must have happened), or you can shake it out of the meter in an awful hurry, and locate it and indicate it. And the ARC break will cease. And until you have a reality on being able to do this as an auditor, you're going to have very upset sessions. Because the PC will ARC break inexplicably. You won't ever be able to find out why he's ARC breaking.

You'll have the trouble that we used to have in the old days, where we had to have a process for an ARC break. Well, it might have gotten to it and it might not have gotten to it, and it was random, but now we could immediately and directly locate the bypassed charge that is causing the PC to ARC break. Now, that's very, very important to engram running because the bypassed charge is always the earlier incident on the engram chain. And you bypass the earlier incident on the engram chain, you get an ARC break. This is elementary, my dear Watson.

Charge. There, by the way, will be quite a few bulletins out on this; two have already been written—enormous things—and there'll be another bulletin on the material I'm giving you today. And these will be dressed up and put out into a new book on the subject; this lecture is the first release of this material. Therefore, I'm not releasing all of this material. I'm not telling you that in order to run an engram—I can tell you this, but not elaborate on it; let me say that—in order to run an engram you've got to know what the time track is and be able to handle, the time track. You should know what you're trying to handle in terms of charge. What is charge.

Now, the charge of course is that electronic ping-bang that hits the PC in the blonk and causes him to go bunk, or blows and causes him to get better. See, you pays your money and you takes your chance on charge. You either release the charge and the PC gets better, or you encyst and stir up the charge and the PC blows his stack. There's two roads by which you can travel on charge, and there's no middle ground. There isn't any middle ground. Just forget the fact that you could go on and grind for eighteen years and get no change on the PC. The PC will either get better or get worse. He won't remain the same.

Now, what do we mean by getting worse? Actually, he might think better, and feel worse. You get the ideas His knowledge has increased, but the charge is still knocking his 'ead off. Cow, you can get into that situation in engram running. You can lay open a tremendous amount of engramic information. He can get all kinds of information—you never blow any charge off of it anyplace. Well, that's because you weren't looking for basic, you were looking for information .

Many an auditor falls for this, because the PC wants to 'snow how come he was on the planet Yukzuk in a railway-conductor's uniform, you see? What was he doing there? And that's all very interesting, and we can assuage his curiosity to some degree, but if we go in for just assuaging the curiosity of the thing—dramatizing watching TV', or something like that, you see?—we unfortunately get into the situation where we're not following down an engramic chain.

So here, you see, is another great liability in running engrams. We get so absorbed in *dramatis personae*, and that sort of thing, that we actually aren't running the chain of engrams at all, we are simply trying to find out. See. Get that as a liability, because it is a liability. You actually can find out all about what this PC was doing on the planet Ilkzuk—you could find out all about it. The only trouble is, the basic on it was on the planet Panwan, which was a trillion years earlier. You see?

So, engram handling is engram handling in that you want the chain of engrams which lead to the basic of that chain; you want to go down that chain and get the basic of the chain. Why? Well, every time you run an engram, you open up a little valve. We have a big joke around Saint Hill about the "weather valves." Workmen and I are always talking about these weather

valves. And they get stuck open and they get stuck shut, and various other things happen. We have our opinions as to who's doing it. We think it's Profumo now, and so forth.

Well, if you could imagine an equally hypothetical series of valves: one between each pair of engrams, see? So let's take basic on the chain; that's engram 1. And then we get 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 a little valve between each one of these pairs, see? All right. You run number 20 on the chain and you unwittingly open the valve from number 19. And the charge contained in number 19 restimulates and leaks, to some degree, into 20. So you're trying to run the charge out of 19 by running 20. The charge is coming from 19. After a very short period of time, it's all coming from 19 now.

Well, now this is very interesting because it poses this kind of a condition: Number 20, if you continue to run it, gets sticky, solid, E-Meter action ceases, no tone arm action on running it. There's nothing on it, you see, it's just gum. Or it's getting more and more solid, and it'll eventually collapse on the PC. What's making it collapse? Well, it's the charge in 19. And you could run 20 endlessly without ever taking any charge off 19. But this makes 19 potential bypassed charge. So the PC will ARC break. Do you see that now? You opened the valve and then didn't do anything about it. So, the thing to do is to find out—by the way, you don't have to find 19, which is quite interesting; you can sometimes find 16. But let us just keep it in an orderly progression here, and we find 19.

Now, oddly enough, until we found 20, we couldn't have found 19, because it's as though we had a big barrier across the track. It's all the charge there in 20, don't you see, prevents us from seeing 19.

And this is a very funny thing: we can say, "Give us the earliest engram on this chain" (this is inevitable), and they give you number 20. See? And the E-Meter only registers on 20, and 20 will register that this is the earliest incident on this line. It'll do this consistently, you see, because the track is barriered. The E-Meter, the reality, nothing else can get back of 20.

Although you've asked for the earliest, that's true of the earliest part of the incident, you see? You always get more first part of the incident, you see; you can always find a few minutes earlier on an incident. Well, similarly, right on down to basic, why, you can always find an earlier engram.

See, even though your meter kept saying that it was the earliest engram, or even though the PC and the meter said that it was the earliest part of the engram—that nothing like this ever happened before—as soon as we sweep some of this debris away, well, we find out we're looking at number 19. It's now the earliest, see? And it'll continue to be the earliest till we clean it up a bit. And as soon as we've cleaned it up a bit, we've got number 18. And as soon as we cleaned 18 up, we now find the absolutely regrettable first incident on this line. And what do we find? We find 17. And that is absolutely the first incident on this line. And we get 16. Do you see what I mean?

Now, if you recognize some of these, they're terribly interesting, but awfully simple, idiotic points. You could take a piece of garden hose, or something of the sort, and put clamps on it, see, and put a block of wood across it, and say this is an engram, number 20, you see? Now run this engram and then loosen up this little clamp, and you will see that the water pressure which you've gotten into the hose, you see—it is in each one of these balloons along in the hose sections—will go into 20, from 19. See? It's just as fluidy and fundamental as that, you know? It's like pouring beer steins back and forth into one or the other. . . But the charge always flows late; charge always goes later, doesn't go earlier.

Now, it's quite interesting, many of these manifestations, but if two things come together, two pictures come together, then there is bypassed charge. In other words, if two engrams collapse or two pictures collapse—no matter what you're running in auditing . . . This is true of all auditing, by the way. It isn't a specialized subject. You got this bypassed charge, it'll cause two pictures to come together.

For instance, a PC is looking at a lamppost. And all of a sudden there's another lamppost standing alongside it, and he knows they're not the same picture because they have different periods of architecture, and so forth. And he says, "There's two lampposts here." The first thing the auditor knows is that charge has been bypassed. See? That's what causes the collapse. Got that?

Now, that's the first thing he knows. See? Whatever else he knows, he knows that. Now, if charge has been bypassed, what's the PC going to do in the next few minutes? He's going to ARC break. Yeah. Sun rises, sun sets; bypassed charge, PC ARC breaks. Okay? Very inevitable.

So this tells you why some auditors are capable of running smooth sessions and some auditors have ARC-breaky sessions. Well, it's just the degree that some auditors pick up bypassed charge and some auditors don't pick up bypassed charge. See, that's the difference between this ARC-break and no-ARC-break session .

All right. Now, out-of-valenceness—you know, "That's me over there"—is also a problem in bypassed charge. You will get this in running an engram. And you shouldn't make a mistake, because this out-of-valenceness is quite interesting. The engram he is in, if an earlier engram is tapped (you see, he's in engram 20, and you've just clipped or tapped number 19 and it's bled charge now into 20), it will simply cause a beef-up of the mass, you see, and it'll cause a strengthening somatic, and that sort of thing, but it probably won't cause an out-of-valenceness.

An out-of-valenceness is a missing earlier portion of the same engram you are working. See? He starts getting two-pictureness. He's getting two pictures, that sort of thing, that's probably out of 19. You understand? But it also may be in 20. But for sure, if he goes out of valence, you haven't picked up the beginning of 20. There's another five days at the start of 20.

So we know it was the beginning, because the PC said so in 20. We know that was the start of 20, because we sent the PC to the beginning of it. And he takes a look at himself, and he says, "I'm way out of valence here." That is to say, 'I'm over there.' Well, he didn't go to the beginning of it, that's all. There's more beginning on this engram than he has suspected. And that's the charge that finally throws them out of valence. But that out-of-valenceness is also assisted by bleeding charge up from 19.

You understand what I mean by out-of-valenceness? That's very simple; that's very elementary—just as though you were four feet over, looking at your body sitting in the chair. That is the position the PC is running from. You find some PCs are totally in this, all up and down this lifetime; they never can have any picture in which they are (quote) "in their own valence" (unquote). See, they're always out of valence all the way up and down the line. This case, by the way, also falls too low on the Reality Scale to run engrams.

But this happens to any PC—they flip out of valence. Well, what happened? Well, there's another earlier piece of this same engram is missing. And the PC gets a couple of pictures collapsed on one another, or pictures collapsing, well, you've opened the valve on 19 without finding 19.

Actually, all this sounds very complicated, but actually isn't complicated. You're dealing with charge, and if you regard charge as water or cream, or something like that, it behaves in exactly the same way: It flows, and it always flows later. Charge doesn't run back down the track, it runs up the track. Water falls; charge rises. About the only difference.

All right, now, let's look at this. We've got a PC. He 'its his 'ead. It gives him a 'eadache. So we run the engram—now let's take an elementary thing, see? We're bugged, see, on the subject that if you get your hands on something, you must flatten it! See? If you get your

hands on an engram you must rub it out! See? All mixed up with “flatten the process,” don’t you see?

Well now, let’s look what happens here. So he ‘it his ‘ead. So we find out we’d better run this engram in which he ‘it his ‘ead. So we roll up our sleeves and we start in. Eighteen hours later we’re still getting him walking in to the cupboard and raising up too suddenly and banging his head on the door. And for some reason or other the PC is getting very unhappy, and the cupboard is getting more and more solid in the picture, and then it gets gummier and gummier, and then it’s collapsing, and so on. And the PC is pretty nattery, but you say, “No, look, I’ve got to run this incident,” and the PC finally goes into apathy, gets too far down scale to have a headache, and you’ve “cured his headache.”

Now, get that approach. Now compare it to this approach: PC has ‘it his ‘ead, and he ‘as a ‘eadache. You say, “All right. Good. Good.” We block this incident out. He walked in to the pantry and hit his head on the cupboard. All right. Fine. We start him into the pantry, we bring him through the moment he hit his head and, for some reason or another, he just skips that whole section; his head comes nowhere near the cupboard. But we get him afterwards holding his head.

Now, what’s this all about? Well, this means you’ve hit a chain of engrams called “‘it on the ‘ead.” And why is that area where he can’t hit his head—why is that missing? Well, the prior charge on being hit in the head is too great, that’s all. That’s simple. So you don’t try to force him through and you don’t need any interesting tricks to push him through it.

You find that was 20, see? Just find 19 and block 19 out. And we find out that he was working in the carpentry shop and raised up too suddenly one day and ‘it his ‘ead. There’s no somatic there either, see? I mean, it’s just all sort of, you know, thud. We just get that, bang! and we run him through it.

This is all done very formally; it isn’t asking any questions like Straightwire, see? We zip him through it, we move on the time track—dress-parade situation, see?

We get him there to 18. We find at 19 that there’s an 18, and at 18 there’s a 17—that’s the first time he ever hit his head, see, was 17—and then we find 16, and then we find 15. And we’re lucky, and we actually do find—all the way down the chain—we find it’s in this lifetime. That’s why we were lucky, because we just started out to cure a headache.

And by golly! We find him falling out of his perambulator with a dull thud, see? And it runs with full somatics, full perceptions. And we run it through and we run it through and we run it through and we run it through and we run it through. And it’s all getting thinner and thinner, and it’s less and less, and it’s disappearing, disappearing. Nothing is toughening up. And with a clank, that’s the end of that chain of being hit on the head.

Well, what happens? The engram disappears, we bring him back up to present time, all these other head-hits—you could touch on each one of those too if you wanted to. He’d get the clonk from each one of them. You hit him on the head all the way to present time. Every one of them would hit. See? And that’s the end of this chain, and that’s the end of his headache. See that?

Now, if we tried to approach it “We are going to run the engram of him hitting his head,” we have made an error by saying the engram. We have to say the engrams of him hitting his head. Now, a great deal can be said, snarlingly and meanly and viciously, and so forth, about what terrible things auditors have done with running engrams. But the truth of the matter is I take full responsibility on the matter. I’ve pretty well desensitized that goal in the Helatrobis implants, “To be responsible.”

But I actually hadn’t made an adequate communication. You’ll find all about basics, you’ll find all about this type of mechanics in other material on engrams, but you won’t find this

differentiation: Repetitive processes? Ah, yes. Flatten them always. An engram? The only way to flatten an engram is to flatten the chain of engrams. So the communication factor is you don't run an engram, you run an engrams. See, you've got to run a chain every time.

Now, if you've done any sec checking and had any difficulty sec checking at all, it's because you weren't running on the basis of the earlier overt. Now, overts will follow this, and it's very good training finding overts; very good training. But the second that we lay a training restriction on it of "run only overts in this lifetime," we of course have inhibited the possibility of picking up the complete overt chain.

Well, "this lifetime," of course, is the biggest lie of all. A person's life is quite consecutive. And the first time you may find, actually, a basic on the fact of him hitting a mule over the head as his overt on the fifth dynamic, and you find the basic on this thing at 285 trillion. Well, you will get, then, all aversion to mules tearing up. The overt chain, don't you see?

Now, that's not an engramic chain, that's just a chain of overt acts. But there are overt engrams. So there's two types of chains: There's the motivator series and the overt series. And oddly enough, it doesn't matter which you run, because the overt-motivator sequence is itself an installed sequence.

Oh, yes, that's a big swindle. But everybody is obedient to this particular swindle, and they behave that way below a certain particular level, so it's operable. So you can use it in processing; you can relieve things. And actually, it is so operable, that if you don't get the overts off they don't progress. In other words, it's sort of the overts they have committed obscure the overt-motivator sequence as an installed mechanism.

You won't run into this overt-motivator sequence or undo it for—oh, my God! That's way back, and way deep, see? That's quite fundamental in livingness. There are other things like obsessive creation, and that sort of thing, they're equally . . . Well, the overt-motivator sequence isn't as deeply laid-in as obsessive create. and that sort of thing. You think you've got it time after time, and there's still an earlier impulse to create, you see. And they're all engramic, of one kind or another. They contain pain and unconsciousness and implantations and so forth.

But an overt chain is handled exactly the same way as a motivator chain. We couldn't care which we're running, except on a motivator chain you have to keep calling for an overt of this type, you see? And on a motivator chain you have to keep calling for whatever follows its line—identifies it.

Now, these two seldom entwine when you're running engrams, because they're so fundamental they're hardly governed by any laws but those of livingness. They are very fundamental. They're the cause-effect-communication formula, the ARC triangle, and matter, energy, space, time and significance's, and perceptions (which, of course, are part of the communication formula). And that's about all there is to engrams. Actually, they're the most elementary, uncomplicated lineup that could be; they're the most fundamental. The most fundamental laws of livingness are expressed on this channel, and they undo along these lines. So you don't have to pay too much attention to finding the overt engram to match the motivator engram, and all that sort of thing.

Oddly enough, however, you can switch over from a motivator line to an overt line. You can switch from an overt line to a motivator line—doesn't matter which. But I personally would never bother to run the two at once unless the PC came up with it. The PC suddenly looks at you studiously and says, "You know, I've got a lot of overts against hitting people on the heads." Well, all right. Fire away. But you're now going down an overt chain, don't you see? You'll get the same type of hit-on-the-head. But unfortunately, you've also got to clean up the motivator chain of the same thing.

Now, what point am I making here? That engram running handles the most elementary laws of livingness and thinkingness, follows the most elementary rules itself, and is terribly, fantastically uncomplicated. It is so uncomplicated that you're going to overshoot it every time. You'll never add anything to engram running but complication. Isn't that an interesting observation? It's awful simple.

,If I ever show you a demonstration of running engrams without giving you any reasons why, and so forth, you'd wonder how the hell this was happening. Because apparently nothing was happening in the session. You'd say, "What's going on?"

The way I used to run engrams—the way I still run them, and so forth—runs something like this: Crude date. Very crude date. Order of magnitude, you know? Eighty-nine trillion, something like that, you know? A little greater than eighty-nine trillion. That's the date, see? Takes you how long to get that, see?

"Return to this incident at eighty-nine-plus trillion. All right. What are you looking at? Okay, thank you. How long is this incident? Minutes? Hours? Days? Weeks? Weeks. Good. Two weeks? Greater than two weeks, less than two weeks? Greater than four weeks, less than four weeks? Greater than six weeks, less than six weeks? Five weeks? Five weeks. . .all right, it's five weeks long. Very good. Now just move on through this to the end."

PC, ten minutes later, comes up and says, "All right, I did."

"What's it all about?"

"Well, I don't know. I get something or other, something or other, something or other."

"All right, fine. All right, now is there any slightly earlier beginning on this?"

"Yeah, there's a little bit earlier beginning on it."

"Is it a day before? Two days before? An hour before? Hours before? Four hours before? Five hours before? All right. I want you to go about five hours earlier this time, all right?—for the beginning of the incident. Move to the beginning of the incident. Okay. All right, move on through the incident."

Five minutes later, PC says, "I'm there."

You say, "All right, what you got now?"

"Oh, it's a sort of a thrashing machine. And there's this long blue-and-white thing and it goes on . . ." so on, and so forth. And "Somewhere . . . somewhere I must have run into machinery. I must have had something to do with machinery. This kind of machinery. Makes me dizzy. Just like this one. Just like all these do. Dizzy."

"All right, very good. We're now going to date an earlier incident in which you get dizzy with machinery. All right. Is it greater than ninety trillion, less than ninety trillion?" Here we go. "All right, I got ninety-three trillion—not quite ninety-three trillion. All right, move to the beginning of the ninety-three-trillion incident. Okay. What have you got there?"

"Oh, I'm just looking at this thing and it's all black."

"All right. Okay. How long is this incident? Days? Weeks? Months? Incident is five minutes long. Okay, fine. Fine. All right, move through to the end of this incident. (pause) Okay. What's it all about?"

"I don't know. It's a machine. Roars! That's all. I'm scared by the roar of the thing, so I dump it off a cliff."

“Oh, all right. Is there any earlier moment there on the beginning of this?”

Tick.

“How much earlier does this go?”

“Oh, it goes three days earlier.”

“All right, that’s fine. That’s fine. All right. Now, that three-day point, now move to the beginning we now have there. All right. Good! Now what are you looking at?”

“Oh, my God! There’s acres of machines. They’re all over the place here; they’re all over the thing here.”

“All right. Thank you. Move through this incident, tell me when you’ve reached the end.”

I sit there and try to make as little noise as possible and PC finally comes up in the middle of it and says, “Ha-ha-ha!” “Took the thing and busted it grrkk! like a big watermelon.”

I say, “Okay. Okay, continue.” “All right, go back to the beginning of this incident now. Go to the beginning of this incident.”

He says, “You know . . . you know, I don’t think this is basic on this chain.”

“Oh, all right! Good. Good. Good, machines that make you dizzy,” you see? “All right, that’s fine.”

“A machine that makes you dizzy? No, I guess it’s just machines. It’s actually not machines that make you dizzy; it’s ‘machines that catch you.’ “

“Oh, all right. All right. Let’s get an earlier incident here. Now, is this earlier incident on ‘machines that catch you’ later than ninety-five trillion, earlier than ninety-five trillion?”

And you find out it’s only a billion years later [earlier] than the one you got before. Same procedure, same action, on and on and on. PC comes to the next session, you say, “All right, now let’s pick up this—we’re going to pick up this ninety-five-trillion-year incident and run it now again. Run it this time.”

PC says, “I . . . why . . . I . . . I don . . . don . . . I . . . don . . . I don’t know, I don’t get anything,” and so forth, and so on and so on, “I don’t get the picture that I had before.” and so on, so on, so on.

So you say, “All right, okay. Thank you. Thank you. Now, since the last time I audited you, is there anything you weren’t willing to duplicate? No? Thank you. Last time I audited you, is there anything you weren’t willing to duplicate? Thank you. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you weren’t willing to duplicate? All right, that seems clean. All right, return to the beginning of the ninety-five-trillion-year incident. How’s the picture now?”

“Hell, that picture’s perfect, thank you.”

“All right. Very good. Move on through to the end of this incident, tell me when you get there.”

You say, where’s all this hep-cat stuff, see? Where’s all this (snap!) (snap!), you know, and bong, and “What are you looking at?” and “Well, is there blue sky or a pink sky there? Well, where . . . what are you doing now? What are you doing? What are you looking at there? Where . . . where . . . have you seen anything? Oh, can’t you see anything more than a house?”

Well, what's in back of the house? Is there anything in the basement of the house? What's in the center of the planet there?" Where's all this? It isn't there. There's nothing there, except just these little, elementary actions. PC runs like a baby carriage.

Now, why won't PCs do this, when they don't do it? Well, it's the wrong place on the program scale I gave you. [See the State of Case Scale] But you can even take a dub-in case and run them early enough to get before the dub. But that's asking for it, so you've got your ARC processes. And lower than that you've got your MEST-universe processes; you've got these various things that can straighten up a PC and put him into a situation. Because let me tell you this, engram running is important for this reason: You aren't going to make an OT without it. See, it's that important. And we now have the underpinnings that we can move any case into a situation where it can run engrams.

Now, all this fancy stuff developed trying to run dub-ins of dubs on engrams; cases that were too heavily charged to run engrams. What's the common denominator of that program case scale that runs from "no time track" down to "total unawareness"? What's the common denominator of that thing? The common denominator of that thing is "no-duplicate." It's right in the middle of the old communication formula.

Years ago I used to run into a case occasionally, you'd run him on process Z on Monday and it wouldn't bite on Tuesday, but another process would bite on Tuesday, and on Wednesday another process would bite, and on Thursday another process would bite. What was going on with this character? Well, I finally understood what was going on with him: The duplication was missing from the communication formula. He would not duplicate; it was dangerous to duplicate. And that, actually, is the swan song of this universe: That which you're unwilling to duplicate tends to go on automatic.

You could clean up somebody's auditing in a rather rudimentary fashion. Of course, this is like all high-level processes—it's not applicable because it's insufficiently fundamental to reach the reality of the PC in many cases. But sometime when you've given or had a rough session, something like that, or your PC has given or had a rough session somewhere else, or something like this, just take a crack at cleaning up the auditing on this basis: "Since " (you know, the day before that session occurred), "what have you been unwilling to duplicate? What have you been willing to duplicate? What have you been unwilling to duplicate? What have you been willing to duplicate?" And just run the process flat. And you'll all of a sudden find all the ARC breaks and everything else torn out.

We can show you a bad demonstration of auditing, a very bad demonstration of auditing on the TV screen. You're unwilling to duplicate that, and you fumble the first five minutes of your session. See? That's showing the bad example. Get the idea? "Unwilling to duplicate" is the only thing it says, see?

All right. You get the idea that you can't duplicate MEST, you can't duplicate engrams, you can't duplicate this action, you won't duplicate that continuous state of being a tree, let us say, or something like that. This becomes very obsessive, begins to wear on you, and you just start refusing the idea of duplicating a tree, and the next thing you know, there you are, obsessively duplicating a tree. Because that resistance to duplication can be caved in.

Now, a person's ability to duplicate is what determines their ability to run engrams. Because the engram itself is a duplication of the actual event. And where they didn't duplicate the actual event—or they duplicated the actual event but then the picture they're running is an altered copy of the picture of the actual event—that is dub-in. So they'll run through the engram, and it's this way, and they run through it that way. All engrams develop materials. All engrams develop surprising changes. And all engrams have a little bit of dub-in in one place or another. You get in the middle of this thing, you wonder, "What's the surgeon got in his hands? He can't possibly have a water gun. You know? Looks like a water gun, you know? What on earth is it? Hm?" And it finally turns into a spoon or something else he's taking your guts out with. Anyhow, the . . .

In other words, things look a little bit different. And the particularly dangerous things—people don't want to duplicate dangerous things. Very easy on this planet to give somebody a bad name. You know, the public in general. All they got to do is start riding a saw and say so-and-so is no good, so-and-so is no good, so-and-so is no good, so-and-so is no good. Don't you see? And nobody must duplicate this person, you see; nobody must duplicate him. They all do it obsessively after a while. It's a sure mechanism of making bogeymen, and then making everybody into bogeymen that didn't exist in the first place. You see, you can think up a lot of things and there's a lot of philosophy connected with this duplication, but just add it up to what engram running is all about.

A series of tests need to be developed for this sort of thing—of whether somebody can run engrams or not. The easiest way to find out whether somebody can run engrams or not is to try to run an engram on them. And if they can't run one, why, you'd better uncork the ARC triangle, that's all.

But there's another way to do it. You say to some person, "One, two, three, nine, seven. What did I say?" And he says "You said uh . . . popcorn? Uh . . . uh . . . uh . . ." Aw, skip it, man. Of course, it's a possibility that you didn't speak loud enough for him to hear you, but if you spoke loud enough and you said, "One, two, three, seven, nine," and he said, "Popcorn? Popcorns What's popcorn got to do with it?" well, you'd better not try to run engrams on that person .

Now, the person who is totally unaware has tried to whip the mechanism of obsessively duplicating everything. That's his final answer, don't you see? The only trouble is, his duplications then go on total automatic. And you'll find people around who 'nave very, very heavy engrams indeed; they are all very heavy, and they have no control over them of any kind whatsoever, and so forth. And the engrams also are very inaccurate. All life is an engram. Anything is an engram, so forth. But then the engram isn't the engram. They stub their toe, and they go down the street, and they've got a picture of being run into by a truck—in full 3-D, utterly overwhelming. Gruesome flow, you try to run an engram stubbing their toe, it isn't there. They run this engram of being hit by a truck. Well, that's great, because if you run the engram of being hit by a truck, you unfortunately aren't doing the case a bit of good. You're just running off a copy of the copy of the copy of the copy of the copy, you see? I mean, you could get into that kind of nonsense.

Now, because there are such incredible things on the track anyway (such as the Helatrobus implants, and all sorts of things), people get auuuh.' Tell some bud of the Freudian school about these things, he'd become very puzzled about this whole thing. As a matter of fact, in the second series there are some tumbler devices—tubes, in the second series—where the thetan on the pole is locked up in a sort of a curled-up position in the middle of a tube, with a lot of lights hitting him from one quarter or another. It's the perfect fetal position. And that's basic on the prenatals which we used to find. And those prenatals all fly to pieces if you hit this basic on the thing, you see?

But there's so much incredible material that it would be very, very dangerous to determine on a PC whether or not he could run engrams be what was the fact of the case, see? This is very dangerous. We've tried this and it doesn't work. So therefore, you need a better test. And that test would be simple duplication.

You'd give him a series of questions of one kind or another. The old driving test is a doll, because that gives you too little to understand and too much to understand, and so forth. That's a lovely test. A person who got a very bad score on that probably couldn't run engrams, you see? Because it's a duplication test. That's how you'd find—not by the material the person runs, but by the person's ability to duplicate.

Now, another test of a person's ability to duplicate is: On Monday, did they get beautiful rocket reads on a GPM, and on Tuesday, you couldn't get the needle to squeak? That's an

interesting condition. Well, they've hit something they're unwilling to duplicate, that's for sure; and you could probably turn it back on, that's for sure; and you can probably handle it, that's for sure; but you also are running somebody over their heads, that's for sure!

Well, what are we running over their heads? We're just running the ARC on this case. This case is too queasy to approach a whole lump of experience. They want to sniff around the edges of life, you know? You let them around the edges of life; don't let them around one concrete experience of being hit on the head with a cleaver. See? Let them sniff around the edges and find out if they're alive. You know? Let them run this thing way off, and their track will straighten out and become factual.

That doesn't mean that you're only using the ARC processes to improve somebody's reality. That isn't their only use. It just happens to be a very good shotgun process. It works at every quarter on almost anything, don't you see? It cleans up all kinds of things: It'll clean up auditing and it'll clean up track and it'll do this and it'll do that. And it can be phrased in different ways in order to meet different levels of case, and you could do all kinds of things with this process—this new ARC setup that you have.

You can also do some interesting things with this duplication process. But you do the best in this physical environment. What part of this physical environment, what action or motion in this physical environment can the guy safely duplicate? When he finds out he can safely duplicate something, you've got the CCHs in a nutshell. That's the only thing you're trying to show him. That's why the CCHs have such a heavy power when rightly used, and such a weird effect when wrongly used. You make somebody feel like he's being punished for duplication, you run the CCHs wrong-way-to.

All right. So much for all that. So much for all that. We're talking about running engrams. Well, who can run engrams? Well, it's somebody who can get a picture of the actual event.

Now, how serious is this to you? Well, it's only serious to this degree: That if the case is not being successful in running engrams, you probably shouldn't be running them. Now that, I think, is the most elementary adjudication that you can possibly make. But let's add to this adjudication, this one: Running them right—as long as you're running them right. If the case just doesn't seem to grapple with this at all, and you just don't seem to do anything about it, or something of that sort, well, you're probably running the case too steep. That's the most elementary adjudication that can be made on the subject.

Now, engram running becomes very, very, very important to you, because the Helatrobus implants are actually a long chain of engrams which themselves have, each one, basics. And they tend to grab the whole track together at one point. You will only be able to run, on some cases, as few as six GPMs before you have to start running engrams, because the Raft will shut off. The things are getting too solid; thing is getting too solid. In other words, charge is bleeding.

So let's get what determines when to go earlier. First, it's the auditor's observation that they ought to go earlier—always first. But the second one—and this must never be violated—is the PC's recognition that there is something earlier. That tells you the curtain has lifted, and this you never ignore—and I do mean never.

PC can state this in a thousand different ways, and it all adds up to the same thing: There's something earlier. PC says "You know, I think there's another pole-trap incident ahead of this?" That's very blunt, isn't it? All right, let's just find the other pole-trap incident ahead of this, see? Simple. PC says, "I don't think this could be the last one on the chain. It's too late." Well, go earlier. PC says, "Where'd I get the idea that I couldn't hold on to things?" Go earlier.

You're trying to get from 20 to 19. And what is the last signal? What is the last signal, the signal that you just must not go beyond in running number 20 or number 19 or number 18 in

its turn? The signal that you must not ignore is the inference that there's something earlier. Because if you ignore this and continue to scrub away on the one you are on, you are ignoring the fact that something went down there and opened that little valve, and that charge is coming up here from now on. And that charge is going to make the engram that you are trying so arduously to rub out more and more solid, more and more arduous, less and less runable.

You've got to get back here and find number 19. Now, the second you find number 19, the charge that was leaking up goes fffff! That's charge off, don't you see? But the later an engram is on the track, the less charge you can bleed out of it itself.

Now, charge of course is a registry of the E-Meter. What is the registry on the E-Meter? Well, it's the motion of your tone arm, the motion of your needle. You're getting tone arm motion running these engrams? If you're not getting any tone arm motion running these engrams, just hope you can get back early enough to get some tone arm motion. If you never get any tone arm motion on it, all the way back, brother, you're taking no charge off the line at all; you are just restimulating mass and charge. You're just restimulating, you're not blowing anything. That condition, I don't think, however, will obtain very usually with you. You will get little blows of one kind or another.

Those portions of the time track which have had the individual so much at effect that the person could not at all be cause, and attended by pain and unconsciousness, are called engrams. And the only way an engram is ever torn up is by relieving the thing which holds it in place. And the thing that holds it in place is always number 1.

There's twenty engrams in a chain, if you can't find number 1—and you can find number 1 if you go down the chain—but if you don't even try to find number 1, and then don't erase number 1, then that chain will not blow up. But you'll see some of the funniest concatenations of charge release you ever wanted to see when you finally put your paws on number 1 and scrub it out real good. Number 1 erases. The rest do not.

Now, because of the complex nature of the time track, there will be some portion of number 1 addressed to something else or some other subject which may, in itself, not erase. Now you've got a new chain of engrams running back from number 1. Well, go ahead, run it back.

Don't get the idea of an absolute basic. There's only one absolute basic on the time track, and that is called basic-basic, and it's going to take you a long time to find that one. Basic-basic is unburdened with steam shovels and gangs of coolies and working for Lord knows how long. The ants that were emptying that granary—that's a very good example. Fortunately, if you go ahead at it in a very businesslike fashion, you will eventually find basic-basic. The character of basic basic is something I needn't go into at the present moment, but it contains these impulses which eventually became aberration.

Now, I want to call to your attention, just rapidly here, some data. There are two things you can do with dating: You can relieve charge or just identify something. Now, if you get a total dating, it goes on down to the second. It's how many, you know, trillions, hundreds of billions, hundreds of millions, hundreds of thousands, thousands, hundreds, days, minutes, seconds ago. And if you get that accurately, and in no argument with your PC, you're going to have a PC there who uh-zuhh! He gets somatics and the thing rights itself on the time track, and that's all very interesting. That's that type of dating; it's to relieve charge. You put something accurately on the time track and you'll get charge off.

Well, that's fine, and as an activity, is quite an interesting activity in itself. But remember that dating also contains identification. You want to know about the incident that was 89 trillion, 450 million years ago. So you say plus or minus. And you've got one that was almost—see, 89 trillion, 450 million—you've got one that was slightly more than 89 million and 450 billion, or something like that, see?

And you just identify it. And sometimes your identification is as clumsy as “that ninety-trillion-year incident.” Of course you’re only hung when there’s eight in a row. So then you have to get into ninety trillion, and you have to date these into the hundred millions, or something like that. Sometimes you have to date them into the hundred thousands, but that’s differentiation. Mostly, mostly, you will be satisfied with your trillions. See, you say, “Well, that incident that was not quite eighty-nine trillion years ago.” That’s dating. That’s sufficient. That identified it, don’t you see? Fine, nothing wrong with that.

Now, let me give you this operation of blocking it out. This is known as blocking out an incident, and it has just exactly these steps. It’s a very precise action: You identify it by date. You get the approximate date of the thing. See, that’s an identification by date. You move the time track to that date (but, of course, your dating has already moved it there), you ask the PC what’s there. And the PC says, “Nothing. I can’t see nothing.” PC says, “Green cats.” PC says, “Solid-black automobiles are stacked around. Their license plates are number 869, 942, 747, 815. And there’s a D.C. plate over on the other side, and so forth.

And that’s there; that’s what’s there.” And you say, in every case, regardless of what the PC said—and hear me now, hear me—in every case you say, “Good.” Understand? You don’t say anything else.

It’s very interesting. The PC can say, “But it’s all black and I can’t see a thing!” and so forth. And you say, “Well, there’s no reason to go on with that.” He’s there; he’s there. So it’s all black? So he doesn’t know what it’s all about? Well, hell, he didn’t know what it was all about a few minutes ago either. Funny part of it is, by the time you run him through a couple of times—I’ve even seen a PC blow a grief charge through something they didn’t know what it was all about, cry all the way through the whole thing, then come back to the beginning and begin to find what it was all about. All sorts of weird things happening like this, don’t you see?

So it doesn’t matter what they say. This has no tendency on that; that does not influence the auditor’s action at that point. Next thing you do: Find its duration. You know? “Is this incident minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, years?” Find its duration. Block its duration out fairly accurately, you know? If the answer is days, well, just get the number of days, don’t you see? Don’t go down to hours, minutes, seconds, and split instants, and galactic microseconds, you know? I mean, this is . . . This wastes time.

Find its duration, move the PC through it. Through. Get the difference of to and through. To get a PC at a point of the track you say “move to,” and to get them to go through something, you say “through.” If you want them to go through something, say through. Don’t say, “Go to the end of the incident,” because, of course, the PC just goes bang! and he’s at the end of the incident. “Yeah, all right. I’m here at the end of the incident. What do you want?” I can see auditors now—I’ve already seen an auditor do this idiotic thing: Said, “Well, go to the beginning of the incident.”

“All right. Well, I’m here. What do you want?”

“All right. Now move to the end of the incident.”

Bang! “I’m here. What do you want?”

That’s pure idiocy, see? If you want the PC to pick up the incident, you had better move them through it. And let me assure you, if it’s forty days long I normally say, “Move rapidly through the incident.” I like to be able to end my sessions on schedule.

But you move them through to the end, then establish what was there. Just ask the PC, “Well, what happened?” you know, when they come to the end of the thing. Anytime the PC says anything while they’re going through the thing, you say, “Good,” and one more word: “Continue.” You want them to realize that auditing command is still in effect.

When they get to the end of the thing, you've moved it through it once, you say, "What's it all about?" And a funny thing, if the PC doesn't talk to you, it's all right. Okay. Move him to the beginning of it, move him through to the end again. Simple as that. Never move him backwards through one. When they get to the end of the thing, why, ask them again.

I've seen a PC go through one several times before they could tell me anything about it. Thing wasn't beefing up at all. Just, you know, "What's this?" It's a solid mystery. Don't be impatient, in other words. You don't vary this routine. PC says, "I don't think I left." I'm afraid I'd be more prone to say, "You left all right. Run through it." See?

Now, if the PC keeps saying, "I'm stuck," and all that sort of thing, just forget the bouncers and deniers, man. You're just running somebody over his head, and you get them out of it any way you can and revere to ARC processes.

Any time the PC is that much at effect, where the auditor has got to kick him around inside the incident and do all sorts of weird things, and that sort of thing, you're simply running engrams on somebody who can't run engrams. There's no sense in my developing a technology for somebody who can't run engrams, for you not to run engrams with. You get the difference?

All right. Now, when he's told you all about it at the end, your next step is simply to find out if anything is a little bit earlier. You know? "Is there a little..."⁷—because the end always remains the end. You don't have to vary the end. If there's anything more, they'll eventually tell you; but you don't care about it because the charge is always earlier, you see? But always suspect the beginning.

PC says, "Well, I just got off the train, and there they were," you know? Aw, it's all right. Buy it. Sounds all right, and so forth. But ask before you send them through again, "Now, is there any earlier beginning on this incident?" and so forth. Yeah, he was shooting at them out the window for a half an hour, you see, before he got off the train, you see. There's always that little tag beginning. And sometimes you're lucky and there is none, but it just doesn't matter; it's whether it registers or not. Send them back to that earlier bit and tell them to move through it again.

Now, up to the moment you tell them to move through it again, you've simply blocked the incident out. Now you know how long this incident is. The second time you tell them to move through it is, however, quite perfectly safe and can be included in blocking out an incident. But I just want you to know that it doesn't perfectly belong in blocking out an incident. You've actually blocked the incident out now.

But to finish this incident off, just move them through it again. They'll pick up some more stuff. That's the time they're going to tell you there's something earlier. And it doesn't much matter how many times you run them through an incident. Less than twice is suspect. That's maybe a little careless. But might very well—if the thing appeared to be awful gummy and so forth, and messed up, once would be plenty. There's where judgment comes in. More than twice? Well, you're getting into questionable ground—very questionable ground. Trying to chug them into it and make them have more view of it, or more picture, or get more event out of it, or do something else with it than they can do at that particular time? Nah! Verboten. It'll turn up in an earlier incident or you got no business running engrams. That's all there is to that.

Now, how long would you run one of these things? I think if the PC was terribly fascinated with the thing: "You know? You know, that's where I got shot, and that's where I shot Bill. Yes. That's right! And then this place id-hmmmmhmmmm-hmmmm-hmmmm And I've often wondered whether or not, you know, hmm-hmm, this funny hole in my ear . . ."

All right, that's dandy. That's dandy. I'm afraid I'd just go along with this, as long as I was getting motion on my meter. Getting some motion on my meter, had the thing going tick and tock and click and clock and bong, and he was still running through the thing and wasn't wandering off into the fields, I'm afraid I'd run that. But I would never run it longer than "You know, I think we've had a fight before." All right. Hit the silk.

Now, if you do not bail out of an incident and find the earlier incident when the PC sights the earlier incident, you spoil the PC's ability to move back. You blunt it, and the PC will get tied up in this area of the track you're trying to run. And the only reason a PC gets tied up in an area of track is by insisting he stay there. You insist he stay there. He says, "Oh, God, I want out of this." Well, anybody who wants out of this . . . You've just gone near it, and he sees that there's a whole bunch of threshing machines, and they're cleaning up the wounded with these threshing machines, see? And he says, "Well, I . . . I can't have anything to do with that. That . . . that's . . . that's too much for me," and so forth. I'd say, "Okay." I'd let him bounce to present time and I'd run ARC processes.

In other words, I don't say, "Oh, come now. I'm sure that you could confront that part of the threshing machines," so forth.

But if a PC started telling me, "Eh, it's getting awful solid around here. Pressure is getting heavier! A little harder to run—I don't care if I was getting tone arm action or not—I'm afraid my action would always be "When did you spot something earlier?"

"Oh, well! Come to that, it was about an hour ago."

Yeah. He spotted an earlier incident. And I would realize that it was my fault as the auditor if the PC got tied up on the track that he couldn't get out of, or was unable to run the chain, and so forth, because I would have refused to let him move earlier. That's the one cardinal rule of this.

Now, there are several things I've tried to teach you here today. And one of these: You're running an engram chain; you're never trying to run a single engram. The only reason you run basic is not to get rid of basic. Sometimes basic is "I walked up and blew all of the powder out of the barrel. But nothing happened, see? Yes, I walked up—well, of course they lost the battle. That's the reason for it. I blew all the powder out of the barrel." That's basic, see? That's just bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bz-bz, and it's gone. It's the basic there was.

You look for basic to be the more powerful incident; it's never. It's the shorter incident, it's the simpler incident, but on that keystone—because the thetan never bothered to say that was important, you see—these other things built up, built up, got tougher, tougher, bigger, bigger, bigger. You get that basic, the rest of them will tear right up. Just like one of these patent sacks, you know—a patent-flour sack? You get the right string? Well, here she goes.

All right. Now, you're running a chain. So don't think because you've read Book One or snapped your fingers over engrams you know how to run engrams.

Learn this as a brand-new skill. And it's the skill which we'll call "engram chain running." And that is done by finding an incident, we don't care how. One of your best takeoff points is the Helatrobus implants. Run a few GPMs, then you're really making knots, you see? We don't care how we took off on this, whether we had to prepare the case for this or not, we got our paws on an engram. And then we block it out. And we get the earlier one and we block it out, and we get the earlier one and we block it out, we get the earlier one, we block it out. And eventually we've got nothing over here to block out. We then decide that we have our paws on a basic for this chain.

Now, as we now have a basic for this chain, this basic will erase. Okay? So we proceed to erase the basic and tear up the chain. Theoretically, if you kept wandering back, some of you could make an error of winding up eventually with basic-basic. Seemed like you never got

your hands on a basic. Well, you eventually did get your hands on a basic, but this apparently is the first engram on the track or something like this. I would erase it and suspect that I had simply discovered a basic.

You see, when you discover basic-basic and erase it, all engrams and pictures disappear on the PC, so that is the clue to that.

Now, the next point is: Never under any circumstances prevent a PC from finding the earlier incident—never do it; that’s courting disaster—even if you suspect the PC is telling you there is something earlier in order not to confront what he is going through because if he’s trying to bail out of incidents because he’s scared of them, I would watch this performance just once or twice, and then I would decide that I was misguided to be running engrams on this case. And I’d prepare the case a little bit more and get him back into running engrams later, you understand?

Now, those are the cardinal points of running engrams, and if you follow those things you actually will be able to develop one fantastic amount of case gain, because you’ll be blowing charge all the way.

It’s the easiest running you ever did, and the only mistake you’re going to make with it is to depart from the little blocking-out routine which I have given you here; depart from the earlier routine; you fail to realize you’re running a chain, you’re not running a single incident; and preventing the PC from going earlier when the PC spots something earlier; or this mistake: just complicating it up, man. You know? The PC says, “I’ve got a picture here of a green house.”

“Does it have gables?”

Blow your brains out, boy! You’ve done it! You’ve done it, you’ve finished it. You’ve wrecked the work, that’s it. You’ve had it. You just opened your mouth once too often. Do you realize what happens? You’ve pointed the PC’s attention to a large object, and the rule of the largest object goes into effect instantly at that point. And the PC will interiorize into that incident. Well, you didn’t want him interiorized into it. What do you mean you didn’t want him interiorized into it? You didn’t want that incident all swelled up, fully charged, 3-D. How can you make an incident fully charged and 3-D? By making the PC look at it and look at it and look at it, and examine it and examine it, and then prevent the PC from going earlier, and look at it and look at it and look at it, and look at the largest objects in it, and feel things in it, and so on. You’re going to have a universe built around this PC to a point where you’ll never get him out of it. Got it? Well, that isn’t what you’re trying to do.

If you were trying to discover the secret formulas of the Kabob civilization, and you got the PC into their formula security room, by all means follow this process! But make sure you don’t do it with an OT, because he hasn’t got any pictures to swell up. You actually could only do it safely with a Clear. And a Clear is so close to an OT if you’ve got him to a totality of Clear, you see—that’s dead-easy—that if you just made an OT out of him, he’d remember. You understand? So it becomes a very difficult thing to stay simple enough about.

I wanted you to get this data because, actually, there’s never been a recapitulation of running engrams, mostly because I never really had my fingers on why people had a hard time running engrams. And I find out there’s a miscommunication concerning it, and I’ve given you that miscommunication, which is just the fact that people said, “Well, if you have to flatten the process, you have to flatten every engram you laid your hands on.” And I think that’s where the whole thing broke down. Very easy to run them. I wish you lots of success with it. Thank you.

Voice: Thank you.

Thank you.