LEVEL II COURSE

for

ALETHIOLOGY CLEARING PRACTITIONERS

ALETHIOLOGY LEVEL II COURSE CHECKSHEET

CERTIFIED CLEARING PRACTITIONER

2 JANUARY 1989

PREREQUISITE:

1. Qualified Clearing Practitioner
2. Alethanetic Practitioner
3. Student Course
4. Trained Clearing Practitioner CLASS I

ORGANIZATION:_____

STUDENT'S NAME:_____

DATE STARTED:_____DATE COMPLETED:_____

This checksheet contains vital survival knowledge and technology dealing with Perpetrations and Withholds.

REQUIREMENTS:

Study Technology is to be used throughout this course. Processing requirements for course completion are mandatory. When you can apply the processes of the level easily you will be acknowledged as a CLASS II, CERTIFIED CLEARING PRACTITIONER.

Study the data in checksheet order. Do not go past a word you do not understand. Use a dictionary and for Alethiology terms, use the LANGUAGE OF MIRACLES DICTIONARY.

The checksheet is one time through materials and practical.

LENGTH OF COURSE: _____
                    (Agreement between CS and Student)

BOOKS:

THE WAY TO HAPPINESS, CHAPTER 19 AND 20 (These chapters are to be read during the course and are to be completed before the end of the course.)

SECTION ONE: CHARTS

1.   READ: MASTERY OF CLEARING CHART - CLASS II   _____

2.   READ: LIFE EXPANSION CHART - RELIEF LEVEL   _____

SECTION TWO: SCALES

1.   READ: OLD AND NEW REALITY SCALE   _____

2.   DISCUSS: How people at various levels operate in life   _____

SECTION THREE: CODES

1. READ: THE CODE OF INTEGRITY   _____

2. DISCUSS: How this code could be applied to your life - Would you
              add to it or change it in any way? How?   _____

SECTION FOUR: FLOATING NEEDLE DATA

1. READ: F/N AND RANGE ARM POSITION   _____

SECTION FIVE: THE CLEARING BIOFEEDBACK METER

1. READ: METER READING   _____

4. READ: CB METER DRILL #13   _____

5. DRILL: CB METER DRILL #13   _____

6. READ: CB METER DRILL #14   _____

7. DRILL: CB METER DRILL #14   _____

8. READ: CB METER DRILL #15   _____

9. DRILL: CB METER DRILL #15   _____

10. READ: CB METER DRILL #16   _____

11. DRILL: CB METER DRILL #16   _____

12. READ: CB METER DRILL #17   _____

13. DRILL: CB METER DRILL #17   _____

NOTE - The student Clearing Practitioner should cycle through the above CB Drills two more
times to attain a pass if needed.

SECTION SIX: THEORY OF PERPETRATIONS

1. READ: RESPONSIBILITY - KEY TO ALL CASES   _____

2. READ: THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING   _____

3. CLAY DEMO: Responsibility   _____

4. READ: SUDDEN DEPARTURES   _____

5. READ: THE PRECLEAR WHO QUITS   _____

6. READ: PERPETRATIONS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM   _____

7. DEMO: The mechanism of "blowing"   _____

8. TAPE: THE NATURE OF WITHHOLDS 16 JANUARY 1962   _____

9.   TAPE: WHAT IS A WITHHOLD 20 FEBRUARY 1962   _____

10.   CLAY DEMO: Perpetration Withhold   _____

11.   READ: PERPETRATION - MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE   _____

12.   TAPE: THE PERPETRATION - MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE
         3 MARCH 1985   _____

13.   READ: PERPETRATION MOTIVATOR DEFINITIONS   _____

14.   DEMO: Perpetration Motivator Sequence   _____

15.   READ: A LIMITED THEORY   _____

16.   READ: PREDICTION AND CONSEQUENCES   _____

17.   READ: WHY PERPETRATION PROCESSING WORKS   _____

18.   READ: ROBOTISM   _____

19.   READ: ON CONTROL AND LYING   _____

20.   READ: CONTINUING PERPETRATIONS   _____

21.   READ: BY THEIR ACTIONS   _____

22.   READ: FAILED HELP   _____

23.   READ: PSYCHOSIS   _____

24.   READ: PERPETRATION MANIFESTATIONS ON A DOWN
         SCALE CASE   _____

25.   DISCUSS: The types of cases you want to avoid as a
         Clearing Practitioner   _____

26.   READ: MORE ON P/W   _____

27.   READ: CHANGE OF COMMANDS - PERPETRATION
         MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE   _____

SECTION SEVEN: WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS

1.   TAPE: WITHHOLDS AND INSESSIONNESS 24 JANUARY 1961 _____

2.   TAPE: MORAL CODES: WHAT IS A WITHHOLD
         4 OCTOBER 1961   _____

3.   READ: MISSED WITHHOLDS   _____

4.   READ: MISSED AND PARTIALLY MISSED   _____

5.   TAPE: MISSED WITHHOLDS 22 MAY 1962   _____

6.   TAPE: THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD 1 NOVEMBER 1962   _____

7.   CLAY DEMO: Missed Withhold   _____

8.   READ: ARC BREAKS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS   _____

9.   READ: GENERALITIES WON'T DO   _____

10.   READ: ARC BREAKS - MISSED WITHHOLDS
       _____

11.   DEMO: The 8 manifestations of a Missed Withhold   _____

12.   READ: MISSED WITHHOLDS, ASKING ABOUT   _____

13.   READ: HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND
            MISSED WITHHOLDS   _____

14.   READ: MISSED WITHHOLD RUNDOWN   _____

15.   READ: WITHHOLDS, OTHER PEOPLES   _____

16.   DRILL: What you do when the Pc gives you another person's
            withhold   _____

17.   READ: RECURRING WITHHOLDS AND PERPETRATIONS   _____

18.   DRILL: Handling a recurring withhold   _____

19.   TAPE: CRAFTSMANSHIP - FUNDAMENTALS 3 MAY 1962   _____

20.   TAPE: FISH & FUMBLE, CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES
            23 MAY 1962 (Only listen to parts of this tape)   _____

21.   READ: PROCLAMATION - POWER TO FORGIVE   _____

22.   DRILL: The Forgiveness Proclamation   _____

23.   READ: TYPES OF CLEARING PRACTITIONERS   _____

24.   READ: SUPPRESSORS   _____

25.   DEMO: The Dangerous Clearing Practitioner   _____

SECTION EIGHT: CLEARING PRACTITIONER DATA

1.   READ: SESSION MUST NOTS   _____

2.   READ: MORE ON Q AND A   _____

3.   READ: CURE OF Q AND A   _____

4.   READ: ANTI Q AND A DRILL   _____

5.   DRILL: ANTI Q AND A DRILL   _____

6.   READ: OUT TECH   _____

7.   DEMO: The 6 things that can be wrong with a Preclear   _____

8.	READ: DIRTY NEEDLES	_____

9.	READ: DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS ORDERS	_____

SECTION NINE: PRECLEAR DATA

1.	READ: THE PRECLEAR MUST GET WINS	_____

SECTION TEN: MODEL SESSION

1.	READ: THE PTP, PERPETRATION AND ARC BREAK	_____

2.	READ: LEVEL II RUDIMENTS	_____

3.	DRILL: Handling a Missed Withhold	_____

4.	READ: HAVINGNESS	_____

5.	READ: A LIST OF HAVINGNESS PROCESSES	_____

6.	DRILL: Find and run a Havingness Process	_____

7.	READ: CONFRONT COMMANDS	_____

8.	DRILL: Find and run a Confront Process	_____

SECTION ELEVEN: STYLES OF CLEARING

1.	READ: STYLES OF CLEARING - LEVEL II SECTION	_____

2.	READ: DEFINITION PROCESSES	_____

SECTION TWELVE: PREPCHECKING

1.	READ: DEFINITIONS OF PREPCHECK BUTTONS	_____

2.	READ: MODERN REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING	_____

3.	DRILL: Put the Prepcheck buttons on a card and drill the
	commands on a doll	_____

SECTION THIRTEEN: FINDING AND RUNNING TERMINALS

1.	READ: WHAT IS A TERMINAL?	_____

2.	READ: CB METER DRILL - FINDING TERMINALS	_____

3.	DRILL: Finding Terminals	_____

4.	READ: SOME HELP TERMINALS	_____

5.	READ: CONCEPT HELP	_____

6.   READ: FINDING HELP TERMINALS   _____

7.   DRILL: Finding help terminals   _____

8.   READ: THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP   _____

9.   READ: TERMINAL STABLE DATA   _____

10.   READ: EARMARKS OF A HOT TERMINAL   _____

11.   READ: TERMINALS   _____

12.   READ: SELECTED PERSONS PERPETRATION
               RECALL PROCESS   _____

13.   READ: HOW TO SELECT SELECTED PERSONS   _____

14.   READ: FINDING A TERMINAL   _____

15.   READ: HOW TO DO A DIAGNOSIS BY DYNAMIC RECALL   _____

16.   DRILL: Diagnosis by Dynamic Recall   _____

17.   READ: ANALYSIS OF CASES   _____

18.   READ: PRESENT TIME PROBLEM PROCESSES   _____

19.   READ: COMMUNICATION PROCESSES   _____

20.   READ: THE FOUR MAGIC QUESTIONS   _____

21.   DRILL: Using The Four Magic Questions as a rudiments process
                at the start of session to handle a heavy PTP   _____

22.   READ: MULTI-PROCESS TERMINAL RUNDOWN   _____

23.   READ: THE SIX MAGIC QUESTIONS   _____

The next item on this checksheet, called the Expanded Help Rundown, is normally run on a Pc as part of Grade I; however, it is studied on Level I because much of the rundown concerns Guiding Style Clearing. It can also be used as part of Life Repair, if needed, at that point on the Life Expansion Chart.

24.   READ: EXPANDED HELP RUNDOWN   _____

SECTION FOURTEEN: THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

1.   READ: THE PRIOR CONFUSION   _____

2.   CLAY DEMO: A Prior Confusion   _____

3.   READ: PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE   _____

4.   TAPE: PROBLEMS INTENSIVE 10 OCTOBER 1961   _____

5.   TAPE: PROBLEMS INTENSIVE ASSESSMENT

6.   READ: PROBLEMS INTENSIVE PROCEDURE   _____

7.   DRILL: The Problems Intensive Procedure   _____

SECTION FIFTEEN: LEVEL II PROCESSES

1.   READ: A SUMMARY OF THE BEST LEVEL II PROCESSES   _____

2.   DRILL: Drill these processes by yourself facing a wall while the
              Course Supervisor listens   _____

3.   READ: EXPANDED CONFRONT RUNDOWN   _____

4.   READ: EXPANDED PERPETRATION RUNDOWN   _____

SECTION SIXTEEN: STABILIZATION

1.   READ: ANALYSIS OF CASES   _____

2.   CLAY DEMO: Fixed Attention   _____

3.   READ: SEARCH AND DISCOVERY   _____

4.   DEMO: The three types of PTS   _____

5.   READ: THE PTS INTERVIEWS   _____

6.   READ: THE SUPPRESSED PERSON (PTS) INTERVIEW   _____

7.   DRILL: The PTS Interview   _____

8.   READ: THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN   _____

9.   READ: PROCESSES FOR THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN   _____

SECTION SEVENTEEN: STUDENT THEORY COMPLETION

I have completed the requirements of this checksheet and I know and can apply this material.

Student Attest:_____Date:_____

I have trained this student to the best of my ability and s/he has completed the requirements of this checksheet and knows and can apply the checksheet data.

Supervisor Attest:_____Date:_____

SECTION EIGHTEEN: PRACTICAL CLEARING

CLEARING REQUIREMENTS:

1.   Find one person who is PTS and administer the PTS C/S-1 and
       then do a simple PTS Interview on that person.   _____

2.   Run some processes of the Suppressed Person Rundown on
       your PTS person.   _____

3.   Do an Introductory Interview or other interview, find some
       terminals and run them with Grade II processes.   _____

4.   A taped session submitted and approved by Academy C/S   _____

I ATTEST THAT I HAVE COMPLETED THE ABOVE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
CERTIFICATE OF CLASS II CERTIFIED CLEARING PRACTITIONER

Student Attest:_____Date:_____

Academy C/S Attest:_____Date:_____

OLD AND NEW REALITY SCALE

13 DECEMBER 1988

Needle characteristics plotted on scale with numerical TONE (Scale of Emotion) values, "OLD" REALITY SCALE and "NEW" REALITY SCALE.

TONE	REALITY SCALE (OLD)	REALITY SCALE (NEW)	NEEDLE CHARACTERISTICS
40 to 20	POSTULATES	PAN-DETERMINED CREATION	PRODUCES METER PHENOMENA AT WILL --
20 to 4	CONSIDERATION	SELF-DETERMINED CREATION	FREE NEEDLE
4 to 2	AGREEMENTS	EXPERIENCE	FREE NEEDLE, DROP AT WILL.
1.5	SOLID TERMINALS	CONFRONT	DROP
1.1	TERMINALS TOO SOLID LINES SOLID	ELSEWHERENESS	THETA BOP
1 to .5	NO TERMINAL SOLID LINE	INVISIBILITY	STUCK, STICKY
.5 to .1	NO TERMINAL LESS SOLID LINE	BLACKNESS	
.1	NO REAL TERMINAL NO SOLID LINE SUBSTITUTE TERMINAL	DUB-IN (no confront, not-isness)	RISING NEEDLE
0.0	NO TERMINAL NO LINE	UNCONSCIOUSNESS	STUCK. ALSO STAGE FOUR NEEDLE. ALL MACHINE - NO PC

THE CODE OF INTEGRITY

28 DECEMBER 1988

1. Never desert a comrade in need, in danger or in trouble.

2. Never desert a group to which you owe your support.

3. Never disparage yourself or minimize your strength or power.

4. Never need praise, approval or sympathy.

5. Never compromise with your own reality.

6. Never permit your affinity to be corrupted.

7. Do not give or receive communication unless you yourself desire it.

8. Your self-determinism and your integrity are more important than your immediate life.

9. Your integrity to yourself is more important than your body.

10. Never regret yesterday. Life is in you today, and you make your tomorrow.

11. Give allegiance only to your own true nature.

12. Don't desire to be liked or admired.

13. Be your own advisor, keep your own counsel and select your own decisions.

14. Be true to your own goals.

15. Do things unconditionally and when a task is done, let go of it and seek no reward or recognition.

F/N AND RANGE ARM POSITION

28 DECEMBER 1988

It has been found that some Clearing Practitioners have been ordered to disregard all F/Ns that were above 3.0 or below 2.0 on the meter.

Clearing Practitioners have also called F/Ns which were ARC break needles, thus falsely indicating to the Pc.

These two actions - disregarding actual F/Ns because the Range Arm was not between 2.0 and 3.0 and calling "F/Ns" that were actually ARC break needles - have upset many Preclears.

The outnesses here are:

A.   Not considering Pc indicators as senior.

B.   Not noting Pc indicators when calling an F/N.

C.   Ignoring and giving junior importance to the technology covered in false Range Arms.

Clearing Practitioners have even been led to falsify worksheets (giving Range Arm as in range when it actually was not when calling an F/N) because they might "get in trouble" for calling an F/N in the wrong range, such as 1.8 or 3.2.

The CORRECT procedure for out of range F/Ns is:

1.   Look at the Pc's indicators.

2.   Call the F/N regardless of its range.

3.   Mark down the ACTUAL Range Arm position.

4.   Handle the false Range Arm at the earliest opportunity when it will not intrude into the current cycle on which the Pc isbeing cleared. (You don't interrupt a process, for instance, to handle false Range Arm; you complete it and then, when directed by the C/S, you handle the false Range Arm.)

5.   On any Pc you suspect has had his F/Ns disregarded because of false Range Arm, you C/S for and get run a repair and rehab of this error.

CB Meter cans can affect or change Range Arm position when the palms are too dry or too wet or when the cans are too big or too small or when the wrong hand cream is used. The CB Meter does not read on hand moisture alone as was long believed by people in electronics. But Range Arm depends upon resistance to electrical current in the palms, leads, and meter as well as its main resistance which happens to be mental masses or lack of them.

To simply tell some student Clearing Practitioner, "Always disregard an F/N not in correct range" is to set him up for losses and set the Pc up for crashes.

The correct information is - an F/N which isn't in range is accompanied by the Pc indicators that indicate whether it is an F/N or not. And when you are getting F/Ns with GIs or VGIs with the Range Arm high or low, it is a good idea to get the false Range Arm handled as soon as it won't interrupt the current cycle. AND you always note the Range Arm reading where it F/Ned so the C/S can C/S for false Range Arm handling.

Where an ARC break needle (which looks like an F/N) is observed, whether it is in range or out of range (2.0 to 3.0 or below 2.0 or above 3.0) you LOOK at the Pc and establish the Pc's indicators before falsely calling an F/N. A Pc who is about to cry is NOT an F/Ning Pc, and if you indicate an F/N to that Pc, you will further the ARC break and suppress the emotional charge that is about to come off.

REPAIR

Where the above matters have not been fully understood and errors have occurred on Pcs, it must be assumed that:

1. Clearing Practitioners have falsified their worksheets as to Range Arm position and thus built up withholds and made themselves blowy.

2. Every Pc who has ever had high or low Range Arm trouble has had F/Ns disregarded and ARC break F/Ns falsely indicated.

3. A briefing and drilling of all students and Clearing Practitioners must occur concerning the information in this bulletin.

4. A brief program of clean-up of disregarded F/Ns and falsely called ARC break F/Ns be done on every Pc where this has occurred.

5. Every such Pc be considered as having false Range Arm troubles and these must be C/Sed for and corrected.

6. All Clearing Practitioners and students be drilled on all bulletins relating to Pc indicators.

SAMPLE CLEAN-UP C/S

Disregard Range Arm position, use only F/Ns and Pc indicators in doing this C/S.

1. It has been found that some of your F/Ns (release points) may have been disregarded by past or present Clearing Practitioners.

2. Have you ever felt an F/N (release point or end of an action) had been bypassed?

3. Find and rehab the overrun of the release point to F/N. Check for any other bypassed F/Ns and rehab them.

4. Have you ever felt an F/N should not have been indicated by the Clearing Practitioner when it was?

5. Find the point and get in Suppress on it and complete the action. Check "Are there any other F/Ns which should not have been indicated by the Clearing Practitioner when they were?" and handle as above.

6. Find and run the ARC breaks bypassed, with ARC break handling.

7. Find and handle the false Range Arm in totality.

ALETHANETIC F/Ns

An F/N seen by the Clearing Practitioner in running Alethanetic Clearing Process is not called until the full Alethanetic EP is reached.

A Clearing Practitioner running the Alethanetic Clearing Process is NOT looking for just F/Ns. He is looking for the erasure of the chain or incident and the postulate which is sitting at the bottom of the chain he is running.

The EP of an Alethanetic chain is always the postulate coming off. The postulate is what holds the chain in its place. Release the postulate and the chain blows. That's it.

The Clearing Practitioner must recognize the postulate when the Pc gives it, note the VGIs, call the F/N and end off running that chain.

An F/N seen as the incident is erasing is not called.

The Pc does not have to state that the incident has erased. Once he has given up the postulate, the erasure has occurred. The Clearing Practitioner will see an F/N and VGIs. NOW the F/Nis called. F/Ns are not indicated until the EP of postulate off, F/N and VGIs is reached.

It's the postulate - not the F/N that we are going for in the Alethanetic Clearing.

METERING READING ITEMS

31 JANUARY 1989

It can occasionally happen that a Clearing Practitioner misses a read on an item or question and does not run it as it "has not read." This can hang up a Pc badly if the item was in fact a reading item or question. It does not get handled and exists in records as "No read" when in fact it DID read.

1. An Item or Question is said to "Read" when the needle falls. Not when it stops or slows on a rise. A tick is always noted and in some cases becomes a wide read.

2. The read is taken when the Pc first says it or when the question is cleared. THIS occurrence of a read defines what is a reading item or question. CALLING IT BACK TO SEE IF IT READ IS NOT A VALID TEST as the surface charge may be gone, but the item or question will still run or list.

3. An item does not have to read when the Clearing Practitioner calls it to be a valid item for running engrams or listing if it read when the Pc first said it. The test is did it read when the Pc first said it on originating it or in clearing it?

4. That an item or question is marked as having read is sufficient reason to run it or use it or list it. Pc Interest, in Alethanetic Clearing, is also necessary to run it, but that it did not read again is no reason to not use it. If it read anytime in the past, that is good enough.

5. When listing items the Clearing Practitioner must have an eye on the meter, NOT necessarily the Pc, and must note on the list he is making the extent of read and any blowdown. If it reads when the Pc says it, this is enough to make it a "reading item" or "reading question."

6. In clearing a question, the Clearing Practitioner watches the meter, NOT necessarily the Pc and notes any read while clearing the question.

7. An additional calling of the item or question to see if it read is unnecessary and not a valid action if the item or question read on origination or clearing.

8. That an item is marked as having read on an earlier Alethanetic list is enough (also checking interest) to run it with no further read test.

9. To miss seeing a read on an origin or clearing is a Gross Error.

10. Failing to mark on the list or worksheet the read and any BD seen during Pc origination or clearing of the question is a Gross Error.

EYESIGHT

Clearing Practitioners who miss reads or have poor eyesight should be tested and should wear proper glasses while using the meter.

GLASSES

The rims of some glasses could obstruct seeing the meter while the Clearing Practitioner is looking at the worksheet or Pc.

If this is the case, the glasses should be changed to another type with broader vision.

WIDE VISION

A master Clearing Practitioner is expected to see his meter, Pc and work sheets all at one time. No matter what he is doing he should always notice any meter movement if the meter needle moves.

CONFUSIONS

Any and all confusions as to what is a "reading item" or "reading question" should be fully cleaned up on any Clearing Practitioner as such omissions or confusions can be responsible for case hang-ups and needless repairs.

NO READ

Actually a no-read, a non-reading item or question, means one that did not read when originated or cleared and also did not read when called.

One can still call an item or question to get a read. That it now reads is fine. But if it has never read at all, the item will not run.

It is not forbidden to call an item or question to test it for read. But it is a useless action if the item or question read on origination by the Pc or clearing it with her.

SUMMARY

THERE ARE THREE SITUATIONS WHERE AN ITEM OR QUESTION CAN BE SAID TO HAVE READ:

1.   WHEN THE PC FIRST SAYS IT OR ORIGINATES IT

2.   WHEN AN ITEM OR QUESTION IS CLEARED

3.   WHEN AN ITEM OR QUESTION IS CALLED BY THE CLEARING PRACTITIONER

CLEARING BIOFEEDBACK METER DRILLS

CB METER DRILL 13

31 JANUARY 1989

NAME: FAMILIARIZATION WITH READING A CB METER

PURPOSE: To train the student Clearing Practitioner to recognize accurately, speedily, and with certainty when the Preclear has reacted to something said or asked.

POSITION: The coach and student Clearing Practitioner sit facing each other across a table with an CB Meter set up and the coach with her feet on footplates.

COMMANDS: THE PRECLEAR ORIGINATION SHEET

TRAINING NOTE: The student Clearing Practitioner takes a line from THE PRECLEAR ORIGINATION SHEET and, while looking at the meter, says the line to the coach.

When the student Clearing Practitioner has done this, the coach asks the following question: "What did the needle do while reading the line?" If the student Clearing Practitioner hesitates or is uncertain of what the needle did, then the coach asks the student Clearing Practitioner for the eight main needle actions, getting him to define each briefly; and then the coach has the student Clearing Practitioner repeat the line from the Preclear origination sheet and asks the above question again.

As the student Clearing Practitioner becomes proficient at observing and calling what the needle did, the coach now adds to the above question, "Where did the needle_____?", for each action of the needle reported by the student Clearing Practitioner, until the student Clearing Practitioner not only can report accurately all that the needle did, but also exactly when, in the line read to the coach, the needle did it.

Corrections are given for any previous communication exercise or meter drill error and for comm lags in answering the questions.

This training drill is passed when the student Clearing Practitioner can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the supervisor that he can observe and read accurately all actions which occur on the needle and can report precisely when all such actions occurred.

The student should not become frustrated if she does not get reads. Getting reads is not a requirement of this drill. "No read" or "Clean" are perfectly acceptable answers.

CLEARING BIOFEEDBACK METER DRILLS

CB METER DRILL #14

NAME: WHAT MAKES THE CB METER READ AND CLEANING A READ.

PURPOSE: To teach the student Clearing Practitioner that the CB Meter reacts on thoughts and disagreement. To teach the student Clearing Practitioner how to clean a particular read.

POSITION: The student Clearing Practitioner sits in any posture with the CB Meter held in any way he wants to hold it. Another student sits silently reading a bulletin, while holding the electrodes and answering questions when asked by the student Clearing Practitioner.

COMMANDS: None, except two-way communication.

TRAINING EMPHASIS: While another student sits silently reading a bulletin, the student Clearing Practitioner watches the meter, looking for a tick or read. The student Clearing Practitioner carefully observes the exact characteristic of the read. It could be a quarter inch tick, it could be a double tick or it could be a speeded rise.

Having observed the read and noting its characteristic, the student Clearing Practitioner asks the student reading the bulletin, "Take note of what you just read" and has the student read it in the bulletin again, only out loud now.

It is now the task of the student Clearing Practitioner to find again, on the meter, that exact same read which he observed. To do this the student Clearing Practitioner uses two-way communication concerning what was read to locate the thought the student had in disagreement with what was read in the bulletin. When the exact thought of disagreement with what was read in the bulletin is found, the exact same read will occur. The student Clearing Practitioner can now have the student read that part of the bulletin again. If the student Clearing Practitioner has found the exact read noted, then that read will not occur again as the student reads; however, the student Clearing Practitioner may now note that there is a different read on that same section of the bulletin. He notes the characteristics of that read and now works to recover that read by finding out what new thought of disagreement the student has. The student Clearing Practitioner will cognite that the student reading the bulletin doesn't really understand it and can become quite concerned about it. This is not a clearing session, but it is quite all right for the student Clearing Practitioner to help the other student.

This drill is passed when the student Clearing Practitioner can observe a read, find the same exact read by locating the thought of disagreement, and thus clean that read off the meter. If a student Clearing Practitioner can do this, she will have reality that, when a Preclear thinks something, the CB Meter reads and the CB Meter reads on disagreements. Corrections are given for earlier drills needing improvement.

History: Developed in September 1962 when it was discovered that a majority of Clearing Practitioners believe the CB Meter to read on their own voices or on the Preclear's body or for some other nebulous reason.

CLEARING BIOFEEDBACK METER DRILLS

CB METER DRILL #15

NAME: HOW TO DIRTY AND CLEAN A NEEDLE.

PURPOSE: To teach a student Clearing Practitioner what causes a dirty needle and to train a student Clearing Practitioner how to clean a dirty needle.

POSITION: The student Clearing Practitioner and a student sit facing each other across a table with a CB Meter set up and the student holding the electrodes. The sensitivity is set at 16.

COMMANDS: The following questions are the only ones which the student Clearing Practitioner is allowed to ask of the student:

> What is your name?
> What is your height?
> What is your weight?
> What color is your hair?
> What color are your eyes?
> What is your nationality?
> Are you married or single?
> Where do you live?
> Where are you from?
> What is your occupation?
> What types of work have you done?
> Do you like walking?
> Do you drive?
> Do you like sports?
> Do you read a lot?
> Do you like fiction?
> Do you like non-fiction?
> Do you like television?
> What did you eat for breakfast?
> What color are your shoes?
> Do you have a passport?
> How did you come to this course?
> What kind of house do you live in?
> When did you last go shopping?
> What time is it?
> Did you sleep well last night?
> Do you like the weather?
> Where are you now?
> Is the sun shining?

TRAINING EMPHASIS: The most important thing about clearing by cleaning a question on the CB Meter is to know that the CB Meter reacts first on the session and secondly on the Preclear's bank; therefore, it is very important to maintain a good clearing cycle and a good repetitive cycle on the Preclear. If this is not done, then the CB Meter begins to react on the session and not the Preclear's bank. This reaction on the session is manifested by a dirty needle.

Thus, it becomes very important to know what causes a dirty needle and how a dirty needle is cleaned, when it occurs.

The student Clearing Practitioner in this drill should first of all dirty the student's needle and then clean the needle. The student Clearing Practitioner should dirty and then clean the

needle in each one of the following fashions:

1.   Ask the questions before the student is ready to receive the question, until you have a dirty needle, and then clean the needle.

2.   Ask the questions in such a way that the student will not receive the questions, until you have a dirty needle, and then clean the needle.

3.   Ask the questions in such a way that the student doesn't have a chance to answer any fully, until you have a dirty needle. Now clean the needle.

4.   Ask the questions, let the student answer, and then pretend to misunderstand his answer by saying you don't understand. When the needle becomes dirty, clean it.

5.   Ask the questions of the student and then query all of his answers by checking them on the CB Meter or by asking invalidative or evaluative questions. After you have dirtied the needle, clean it.

6.   Ask the questions but cut all the student's answers with an acknowledgement, until the needle is dirty. Now clean the needle.

7.   Ask the questions of the student but never acknowledge an answer. When the needle becomes dirty, clean it.

8.   Ask the questions of the student but answer them all for him. Clean the needle after you have made it dirty in this fashion.

9.   Ask the questions on the CB Meter, carefully cleaning cleans at every opportunity until you have a dirty needle, and then clean the needle.

10.   Ask the question on the CB Meter. This time miss any and all reads. When the needle is dirty, clean it.

These are some of the major ways to mess up the clearing cycle to cause a dirty needle. There are others which the student Clearing Practitioner should discover by studying the clearing cycle.

The needle is cleaned by getting the student's considerations off with regard to what has been happening in the drill, by maintaining a good clearing cycle while doing so, and by completing the repetitive cycle of getting off his considerations until the needle is clean.

This drill is passed when the student Clearing Practitioner can demonstrate to the supervisor that he can clean a needle, that he does understand what causes a dirty needle, and that he can maintain a good clearing and repetitive cycle while cleaning the needle. Errors in earlier drills should be noted by the instructor and corrected.

CLEARING BIOFEEDBACK METER DRILLS

CB METER DRILL #16

NAME: CB METER STEERING.

PURPOSE: To train a student Clearing Practitioner to assist the Preclear in finding an answer to a question, when difficulty arises, with a "That" each time a latent read duplicates the instant read of a question. To teach the student Clearing Practitioner that this is one method of cleaning a dirty needle.

POSITION: The student Clearing Practitioner and a another student sit facing each other across a table with a CB Meter set up and the student holding the electrodes. The sensitivity can be set at 16 or 32, depending upon the model of the CB Meter, and the sensitivity booster knob can be at any position necessary to ensure reads will be obtained.

COMMANDS: "Consider the events of today."

TRAINING EMPHASIS: Step 1. The student Clearing Practitioner has to give the above command and carefully observe the characteristic of some read which occurs while the student is executing the clearing command. The student Clearing Practitioner must indicate the read he has observed by asking the student, "What was that?" When this is asked of him, the student should not answer but should think of various other things. Having done this, the student now thinks the original thought which produced the read the student Clearing Practitioner questioned, whereupon that same read will re-occur on the CB Meter. When the read re-occurs, the student Clearing Practitioner must indicate that he has observed it by saying, "That was the same thought."

If the student Clearing Practitioner has called the exact same read, what the student is now thinking of will be what he originally thought of when the student Clearing Practitioner first asked him. If this is not the case, then the second read that the student Clearing Practitioner called was not really a duplicate of the one he originally observed. This is naturally a "break," and the student Clearing Practitioner will have to try again, being more careful to observe the exact characteristic of a read and to pick that same read up when it re-occurs.

Step 2. The student Clearing Practitioner should observe the needle behavior of the student on the CB Meter. If the needle is clean (a clean needle is a needle that acts when the Clearing Practitioner speaks and does nothing the rest of the time), the student Clearing Practitioner should get another student.

If the needle is not clean, the student Clearing Practitioner should tell the student that he is now going to clean the needle and will want to know what the student is thinking of when the student Clearing Practitioner says, "That."

The student Clearing Practitioner observes a certain needle characteristic in the dirty needle phenomena (i.e., a particular double tick of a certain size or a stop in a jitter of activity) and proceeds to clean this read off the needle by steering (saying "That" whenever that particular, exact read occurs) and getting the student to say what he was thinking of. When that particular read is cleaned off the needle, then another particular read is noted and handled in the same fashion until the needle is clean.

NOTE: In regular clearing one would only use steering, as given in Step 1 above, when the Preclear was having difficulty answering a rudiment question. Steering is used only when cleaning a needle or cleaning a question on the needle. Further, a Preclear can answer a question whenever he has an answer. The student is asked not to answer the question in Step 1, so as to give the student Clearing Practitioner practice in steering.

This drill is passed when the student Clearing Practitioner can demonstrate the ability to steer correctly and to clean a needle to the satisfaction of the supervisor. Correction is given for any earlier drill or CB Meter drill in error.

History: Developed in 1961 to enable students to assist their Preclears in answering questions which are cleaned by the needle and to enable students to clean a needle more readily and easily.

CLEARING BIOFEEDBACK METER DRILLS

CB METER DRILL #17

NAME: INSTANT READS

PURPOSE: To train the student Clearing Practitioner to recognize and call instant reads.

POSITION: The coach and the student Clearing Practitioner sit facing each other across a table with a CB Meter set up and the coach holding the electrodes.

COMMANDS: The Preclear Origination sheet.

TRAINING EMPHASIS: The student Clearing Practitioner takes a line from the Preclear Origination sheet and, while looking at the meter, says the line to the coach.

When the student Clearing Practitioner has done this, the coach asks him, "Did you get an instant read?" and if yes, "What was it?"

If the student Clearing Practitioner has any doubts about whether it read or did not read, the coach has the student Clearing Practitioner define an instant read and a major thought.

An Instant Read. An instant read is defined as that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the Clearing Practitioner.

Major Thought. By major thought is meant the complete thought being expressed in words by the Clearing Practitioner. Reads which occur prior to the completion of the major thought are "prior reads. " Reads which occur later than its completion are "latent reads."

Note: The word "latent" does not mean "late." It means "hidden" or "below the surface", as in "latent homosexuality." We don't know what the "latent read" is reading on, because what it is reading on is hidden or below the surface. It may or may not be reading on the line or word called out by the Clearing Practitioner; that's why we don't use latent reads. It may be reading on some totally unrelated after-thought of the Preclear.

If the student Clearing Practitioner cannot give the precise definition, the coach reads the definition back to the student Clearing Practitioner, until the definition can be duplicated and proceeds with the drill.

Breaks are given for any previous training drill in error, for hesitation in calling the reads, and for imprecise definitions.

This training drill is passed when the student Clearing Practitioner can demonstrate the accurate reading of instant reads to the satisfaction of the supervisor.

RESPONSIBILITY

KEY TO ALL CASES

28 DECEMBER 1988

It takes at least a certain level of responsibility on the part of the Preclear in order for perpetrations to show up on a CB Meter.

What exactly does the CB Meter read? It reads the degree of mental mass surrounding the Being in a body.

A Being accumulates mental mass, pictures, ridges, circuits, etc, to the degree that he misassigns responsibility. If he does something and then says that it was done by something or someone else, then he has failed to assign cause rightly and, doing so, he is of course left with an apparently uncaused mental mass. This to us is the "bank." To Freud it was the "unconscious." A Being, therefore, has as much bank as he has denied cause. As he is the only cause that could hang himself with a mass, the only misassigned cause, therefore, is self cause. Other people's causation is not aberrative and does not hang up except to the degree that the Pc is provoked to misassigning cause. Other people's cause is, therefore, never Cleared.

Here then we have the anatomy of the reactive mind. The common denominator of all these unwanted ridges, masses, pictures, engrams, etc. is RESPONSIBILITY.

The discovery of the direct anatomy of RESPONSIBILITY is as follows:

Able to admit causation.

Able to withhold from.

This you will recognize as old reach and withdraw and as the fundamental of every successful process. But now we can refine this into the exact process that accomplishes a removal of the reactive mind and re-establishment of causation and responsibility.

A Being will not restore his own ability until he is certain he can withhold from things. When he finds he cannot, then he reduces his own power. He will not let himself be more powerful than he believes he can use power. When he gets mad he, of course, can control nothing; neither can he really direct anything. When he causes something that he thinks is bad, he next seeks to withhold. If he cannot withhold, then he begins to compulsively cause things that are bad and you have perpetrations happening.

What we call responsibility is restored on any subject or in any case by selecting a terminal (not a significance) and running on it:

1. WHAT COULD YOU ADMIT CAUSING A (TERMINAL)?

2. THINK OF SOMETHING YOU COULD WITHHOLD FROM A (TERMINAL).

Perpetrations proceed from irresponsibility. Therefore, when responsibility declines, perpetrations can occur. When responsibility declines to zero, then a person doing perpetrations no longer conceives them to be perpetrations and YOU DO NO EVEN GET A WIGGLE ON THE CB METER NEEDLE when looking for perpetrations and withholds on such a case. Thus some criminals would not register on perpetrations at all, even though they had the loot in their pockets! And it is often necessary on any case to run cause/withhold on present life terminals as given above before the person can conceive of having committed any perpetrations against those terminals.

THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT: No case will run well and many cases will not run at all with present life perpetrations and withholds undisclosed and unflattened. These perpetrations and withholds may not even come into view UNTIL THE VERSION OF RESPONSIBILITY GIVEN HEREIN IS LIBERALLY RUN ON THE CASE. Choose any area where the Pc conceives himself to be a victim. Select a terminal to represent that area that falls on a CB Meter. Run cause/withhold as given herein on that terminal and watch the perpetrations pop into view. It is not necessary to handle these perpetrations when they come up with any other process than cause/withhold since cause/withhold given here is responsibility.

There are other factors on cases that need handling, but these are all handled with responsibility processes. If all the factors involved in a case are well handled as given herein you will have a keyed out Clear who will be able to do a lot of things humans can't do. And if you handled a case totally with this material and its specialized skills then you would have a stable Clear. Fortunately for this universe no Being will let himself go free unless he can operate without danger to others and his responsibility factor is way up on all dynamics.

In view of this material and what is now known of responsibility and perpetrations and what they do to case level, a new kind of justice comes into being, making it completely unnecessary to punish. You can know a person by his case level. Does it advance or doesn't it? Does he elect others as ogres when he himself has been committing perpetrations?

THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING

24 NOVEMBER 1989

RESPONSIBLE 1. able to tell right from wrong; able to think and act reasonably. 2. involving obligations or duties. 3. deserving credit or blame (this definition is rarely used in Alethiology.) 4. able to respond to "what is" in present time.

RESPONSIBILITY 1. the concept of being able to care for, to reach or to be; the ability and willingness to be cause; to accept responsibility for something is to accept that one operates as cause in the matter, clearly distinguished from such lower level considerations as blame or praise, which include the further evaluation of the goodness or badness of the thing caused.

In order to "make up one's mind" to be responsible for things, it is necessary to get over the idea that one is being forced into responsibility.

The power of choice is still senior to responsibility. What one does against his will operates as a perpetration against oneself. But where one's will to do has deteriorated to unwillingness to do anything, lack of will is itself an aberration.

Variations in the reactions of Pcs to responsibility processes stem from the Pc's belief that his power of choice is being or has been overthrown. Where a Clearing Practitioner has a Pc balking against a responsibility process, the Pc has conceived that the Clearing Practitioner is forcing responsibility on the Pc and very little good comes of the session.

There is nothing wrong basically, with doingness. But where one is doing something he is unwilling to do, aberration results. One does, in such a case, while unwilling to do. The result is doingness without responsibility.

In the decline of any state into slavery as in Greece, or into economic strangulation of the individual as in our modern western society, doingness is more and more enforced and willingness to do is less and less in evidence. At length people are doing without being responsible. From this results bad workmanship, crime, indigence and its necessities for welfare-ism. At length, there are many people upon their backs. Where high unwillingness "to do" exists, a Republic, such as ours, is then impossible, for it but votes for the biggest handout.

Where high unwillingness "to do" exists, then we have a constant reactivation of all the things one is really unwilling to do such as perpetrations. Forcing people who do not want to work, to yet work, reactivates the mechanism of perpetrations with, thereby, a higher and higher crime statistic, more and more strikes and less and less understanding of what it is all about.

The individual who has done something bad that he was not willing to do then identifies anything he does with any unwillingness to do - when of course he has done this many times. Therefore all doingness becomes bad. Dancing becomes bad. Playing games becomes bad. Even eating and procreation become bad. And all because unwillingness to do something bad has evolved and identified into unwillingness to do.

The person who has done something bad restrains himself by withholding doingness inthat direction. When at length he conceives he has done many many bad things, he becomes a total withhold. As you process him, you encounter the recurring phenomena of his realization that he has not been as bad as he thought he was. And that's the wonderful part of it. People are never as bad as they think they are, and certainly other people are never as bad as we think they have been.

The basic wonder is that people police themselves. Out of a concept of good, they

conceive themselves to be bad, and after that, seek every way they can to protect others from self. A person does this by reducing his own ability. He does it by reducing his own activity. He does this by reducing his own knowingness.

Where you see a Being who sleeps too much and does too little, where you see a person who conceives bad doingness on every hand, you see a person who is safeguarding others from the badness of himself or herself.

Now there is another extreme. A person who must "do" because of economic or other whips, and yet because of his own concept of his own badness dares not do, is liable to become a criminal. Such a person's only answer to doingness is to "do" without taking any responsibility and this, when you examine the dynamics, falls easily into a pattern of dramatized perpetrations. Here you have a body that is not being controlled, where responsibility for others or even self is lacking. It is an easy step from criminality to insanity, if indeed there is any step at all. Such people cannot be policed since being policed admits of some obedience. Lacking control there is no ability to obey, and so they wind up simply hating police and that is that.

Only when economic grips are so tight or political pressure is so great as it is in Russia do we get high criminality and neurotic or psychotic indexes. Whenever doing is accompanied by no will to do, irresponsibility for one's own acts can result.

Basically, then, when one is processing a Pc, one is seeking to rehabilitate a willingness to do. In order to accomplish this, one must rehabilitate the ability to withhold on the Pc's own determinism (not by punishment) further bad actions. Only then will the Pc be willing to recover from anything wrong with the Pc, since anything wrong with the Pc is self-imposed in order to prevent wrongdoing at some past time.

All types of responsibility processes have this as their goal: to rehabilitate the willingness to "do" and the ability to withhold on one's own determinism.

Thus we have a formula of attack on any given area where the Pc cannot do, is having trouble or cannot take responsibility:

(a) Locate the area.

(b) Find a terminal to represent it.

(c) Find what the Pc has done to that terminal that he thinks he should have withheld.

(d) Reduce all such incidents.

In short all we have to do to rehabilitate any case is find an area where the terminal is still real to the Pc (as shown by a meter read) and then get rid of what he has done andwithheld, and we come up with an improved responsibility.

Of all the responsibility processes, the oldest one is still the best one by test and that is:

"What have you done to a (terminal)?"

"What have you withheld from a (terminal)?"

The processing results depend in large part on the accuracy of assessment, on the willingness of the Clearing Practitioner to process the Pc and upon running the process as flat as it will go before finding another terminal.

Assessment accuracy depends upon skilled use of the CB Meter. A

Perpetration/Withhold Process by Dynamic is best, and a weather eye upon the Range Arm to see what terminal varies it, once one has the dynamic and from that has selected a terminal.

The willingness of the Clearing Practitioner to process depends upon the confidence of the Clearing Practitioner to obtain results. This is established by deletion of things the Clearing Practitioner has done to Pcs and withheld from Pcs in general and this Pc in particular. Thus co-Clearing teams would be right always if they took each other as the terminals to be run first, get these pretty flat (and keep them flat during processing with, "What have you done to me" What have you withheld from me?"); then as the next thing to do run the sex of the Clearing Practitioner off the Pc. For example, for a male Clearing Practitioner, the commands are: "What have you done to a man? What have you withheld from a man?"

Then in searching out areas to run on a case, care should be taken not to over-run a terminal or under-run one. A Pc running out of answers can get very restless. Don't then force her to go on.

Responsibility can be rehabilitated on any case and when it has been, you have a clear and that's all there is to it.

The discovery of the direct anatomy of RESPONSIBILITY is as follows:

Able to admit causation.

Able to withhold from.

A Being will not restore his own ability until he is certain he can withhold from things. When he finds he cannot, then he reduces his own power. He will not let himself be more powerful than he believes he can use power. When he gets mad he, of course, can control nothing, neither can he really direct anything. When he causes something that he thinks is bad, he next seeks to withhold. If he cannot withhold then he begins to compulsively cause things that are bad and you have perpetrations happening.

SUDDEN DEPARTURES

28 DECEMBER 1988

Technology has been extended to include the factual explanation of departures, sudden and relatively unexplained from sessions, positions, jobs, locations and areas.

This is one of the things people thought they knew all about and, therefore, never bothered to investigate, yet, this amongst all other things, gives them the most trouble. They supposedly had it all explained to their own satisfaction and yet their explanation did not cut down the amount of trouble which came from the feeling of "having to leave."

For instance, people are frantic about the high divorce rate, about the high job turn-over in plants, about labor unrest and many other items all stemming from the same source - sudden departures or gradual departures.

We have in mind a person who has a good job, who probably won't get a better one, suddenly deciding to leave and going. We have the view of a wife with a perfectly good husband and family up and leaving it all. We see a husband with a pretty and attractive wife breaking up the affinity and departing.

We have the phenomenon of Preclears in session or students on courses deciding to leave and never coming back. And that gives us more trouble than most of the other things combined.

A person explained this to himself by saying that things were done to him which he would not tolerate and, therefore, he had to leave. But if this were the explanation all anyone would have to do is: make working conditions, marital relationships, jobs, courses and sessions all very excellent and the problem would be solved. But on the contrary, a close examination of working conditions and marital relationships demonstrates that improvement of conditions often worsens the amount of "blow-off," as one could call this phenomenon. Probably the finest working conditions in the world were achieved by Hershey of Chocolate Bar fame for his plant workers. Yet they revolted and even shot at him. This in its turn led to an industrial philosophy that the worse workers were treated, the more willing they were to stay, which in itself is as untrue as the better they are treated, the faster they blow-off.

One can treat people so well that they grow ashamed of themselves, knowing they don't deserve it, and a blow-off is precipitated. Certainly one can treat people so badly that they have no choice but to leave, but these are extreme conditions and in between these we have the majority of departures. For example, the Clearing Practitioner is doing his best for the Preclear and yet the Preclear gets meaner and meaner and blows the session. The wife is doing her best to make a marriage and the husband wanders off on the trail of a tart. The manager is trying to keep things going and the worker leaves. These, the unexplained, disrupt organizations and lives, and it's time we understood them.

People leave because of their own perpetrations and withholds. That is the factual fact and the hardbound rule. A man with a clean heart can't be hurt. The man or woman who must become a victim and depart is departing because of his or her own perpetrations and withholds. It doesn't matter whether the person is departing from a town or a job or a session. The cause is the same.

Almost anyone, no matter his position, can remedy a situation no matter what's wrong, if he or she really wants to. When the person no longer wants to remedy it, his own perpetrations and withholds against the others involved in the situation have lowered his own ability to be responsible for it. Therefore he or she does not remedy the situation. Departure is the only answer. To justify the departure the person blowing-off dreams up things done to him, in an effort to minimize the perpetration by degrading those it was done to. The

mechanics involved are quite simple.

It is amazing what trivial perpetrations will cause a person to blow. A manager caught a staff member one time just before he blew and traced down the original perpetration against the company to his failure to defend the company when a criminal was speaking viciously about it. This failure to defend accumulated to itself more and more perpetrations and withholds such as failing to relay messages, failure to complete an assignment, until it finally utterly degraded the person into stealing something of no value. This theft caused the person to believe he had better leave.

It is a rather noble commentary on humankind that when a person finds himself, as he believes, incapable of restraining himself from injuring a benefactor he will defend the benefactor by leaving. This is the real source of the blow-off. If we were to better a person's working conditions in this light we would see that we simply magnified his perpetrations and made it a certain fact that he would leave. If we punish, we can bring the value of the benefactor down a bit and thus lessen the value of the perpetration. But improvement and punishment are not answers. The answer lies in processing the person up to a high enough responsibility to take a job or a position and carry it out without all this weird hokus-pokus of "I've got to say you are doing things to me so I can leave and protect you from all the bad things I am doing to you". That's the way it is and it doesn't make sense not to do something about it now that we know.

THE PRECLEAR WHO QUITS

6 JANUARY 1989

BLOW (noun) 1. a sudden departure. 2. leave, get out, rush away, cease to be where one should really be. 3. cease to be Cleared.

BLOW (verb) 1. to depart suddenly. 2. leaving, getting out, rushing away, ceasing to be where one should really be. 3. ceasing to be Cleared.

Preclears who blow or cease to be Cleared do so because:

(1)   Nobody noticed the rising ARC Break;

(2)   The proper action was not taken in time.

HANDLING BLOWS

One hast to do three things in handling a Preclear who is about to blow or who blows. These are:

(1)   Notice the condition or circumstances leading to a blow long before the person does. This probably the single hardest thing to teach, according to experience, as it depends on the Clearing Practitioner or Course Supervisor observing and not being so "reasonable" about someone leaving.

(2)   Take the proper action to handle what is causing the blow. By proper action is meant to find out what the circumstances preceding the condition have been and then to fit to those circumstances a course of action. Example: The Preclear has been running Level 0 only. One wouldn't go into Level III or Level IV processes. If the Preclear has been running "Itsa" (Saying "It's a___"), then obviously there is only the Clearing Practitioner's acknowledgement to consider. So one only finds out what hasn't been acknowledge. Example: If the person has only been studying, one finds out what the missed definition was. In short, base the action on what the person who is blowing was doing just before the blow.

(3)   Carry out the course of action effectively. Don't just find out if the person has withholds. Pull them. Example: The Preclear is blowing. The Preclear was running perpetrations. The C/S tells the Clearing Practitioner to find the missed withhold. The Clearing Practitioner comes back and says, "Yes, there was one." The C/S thinks, "That's good -- that's handled." Then the C/S hears that the Preclear went back to Kansas in the middle of the intensive. Checking, the C/S finds that, although a missed withhold registered on the meter and one was pulled, there was a dirty needle afterwards. So there were several missed withholds and the an ineffectual job was done.

REMEDIES

Remedies for threats about blowing or blows are only good if:

(1)   The condition is observed;

(2)   What the person has been doing just before is found out and a course of action

based on that is planned;

(3)   The course of action is effectively carrier out.

Unless these things are done, one often finds the person who is blowing is already beyond reach. Remedies not properly selected or carried out do not seem to work, and so get invalidated.

Remedies are quite workable when the above steps are followed. But a pie that is too sour and requires sugar, doesn't get any sweeter if you pour salt into it; whereas salt is perfectly acceptable when added to a dish that needs salt.

PERPETRATIONS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM

28 DECEMBER 1988

Here is a very basic discovery on the subject of perpetrations.

You can call this the "Cycle of a Perpetration":

4.   A Being appears to have a motivator.

3.   This is because of a perpetration the Being has done.

2.   The Being committed a perpetration because he didn't understand something.

1.   The Being didn't understand something because a word or symbol was not understood.

Thus all caved-in conditions, illnesses, etc., can be traced back to a misunderstood symbol, strange as that may seem.

It goes like this:

1.   A Being doesn't get the meaning of a word or symbol;

2.   This causes the Being to misunderstand the area of the symbol or word;

3.   This causes the Being to feel different from or antagonized toward the user or whatever of the symbol and so makes it all right to commit a perpetration;

4.   Having committed the perpetration, the Being now feels he has to have a motivator and so feels caved in.

Clearing a Pc then consists only of locating the area of the motivator, finding what was misunderstood and getting the word made into clay and explained. The perpetrations blow. Pure magic.

The trick is locating the area where the Pc has one of these.

The cycle is Misunderstood word or symbol - separation from ARC with the things associated with the word or symbol - perpetration committed - motivator felt necessary to justify the perpetration - decline of freedom, activeness, intelligence, well-being and health.

Knowing this and the technology of Clearing, one can then handle and clear these symbols and words and produce the gains we have described as being Clear, for the things causing the decline are cleared out of the Being.

Nature of Withholds

We are not trying to teach you not to have withholds. It is OK not to do everything that occurs to you, good or bad. We are trying to get you out of the tangle you got yourself into: "What do you mean, having such terrible impulses?" Why does the PC have these impulses that he now has to withhold?

The withhold is that area of motionlessness following that area of doingness which you shouldn't have done. This classifies actions into things you should have done and things you shouldn't have done. Of course there are laudable withholds, e.g. not to have gotten angry or done some overt. A laudable withhold is something society expects of you, providing you have these other impulses to do things you "shouldn't", according to society. So all actions divide into laudable and undesirable. A laudable withhold goes with an undesirable action: withholding self from doing it, and the laudable action goes along with an undesirable withhold. So society can always enforce mores by making some actions and some withholds laudable. But since there are so many groups, whose mores conflict, one can get rather confused. The same action in different times or places can be "good" or "bad". There is no action that is good in all times and places, and there is no withhold that should be withheld at all times and places. It all depends on viewpoint.

When sec checking, we must then be dealing with another factor. People compute that good people withhold more than bad people, so the "gooder" you are, the less you communicate, so the "goodest" people are in cemeteries. We must be doing something other than pulling withholds. We are. We are remedying the compulsion or obsession to commit actions that have to be withheld. Sec checking is to remedy unreasonable action, that's all. What you want to rehabilitate is his ability to determine his own actions. This also rehabilitates his communication, as well as covering whatever mores he will wind up with.

Control of communication downgrades into MEST as control of reach. Communication is the ability to control an outflow or inflow or stop it. This downgrades into control of reach. Where you have a person who is unable to leave his house, the trouble is not the house but Picadilly Circus. The PC is afraid that someday he will be in Picadilly Circus and take off all his clothes. But he has forgotten this. All he knows is that he mustn't leave home. He has occluded the overt and the withhold. The mechanism is that the PC can be so worried about taking his clothes off in Picadilly Circus that he will think of nothing but withholding this. This circumscribes his life considerably. [This is the mechanism of phobias.] Having to remember to do some desirable action is a similar attention trap, e.g. the superstitions that kids get into. If we educated the same man never to outflow and never to withhold either, both equally balanced, we would have an insane ridge. He would get stuck in an inaction because he would forget what he wasn't supposed to do and what he was withholding. He would have a covered overt and a covered withhold and be motionless. In some sphere, he would not be free to communicate because he couldn't find out what the desirable action was. The average person is in this condition. He doesn't know what he must reach and what he must withhold, but the habit pattern of caution stays with him. All psychoanalysis trained people to be was cautious.

Someone with an enforced outflow has a similar problem. He must go, or do, or whatever, without knowing why. In order to restore control over one's reach / not reach, be reached / not be reached, one must get these unknowingnesses out of the road or the person will sometimes be nervous to the point of collapse when you ask them to do something or other.

In order to aberrate somebody, establish compulsion to reach or to withdraw (withhold) as an absolute necessity, then shift them in time and place to produce no necessity for this, so they forget it; make an unknowingness out of it all. Do this several hundred thousand times, and the person will start to feel he didn't know what he should be doing. When a person gets very bad off, any decision to act causes him to withhold and vice versa. Government

programs are good examples of this.

Some people are totally susceptible to any inflowing action of any kind. Anything that happens to them in society causes them to have an instant reaction to have that with them. In assessing such pcs, if the auditor suggests some item, they will take it. Even if they are assessed by an auditor with a degree of altitude, they will hold like briars to whatever is found, right or wrong. You can test such an item by getting in suppress, inval, and eval on the item and see if it is still in. The average person is on a gradient scale of this sort of thing. He sees a few things which restimulate him and put him on a total effect basis.

The only thing wrong with that total effect basis is that a person has no command over his reach and withdraw, so he is not master of his actions and can't be sensible about what he does. I.Q. is one's ability to govern one's environment.

Scientology is almost alone in considering that Man should have any self-determinism, because others, falling short of this, have looked on the fact that a criminal has a compulsion to commit crimes. Being unable to do anything for a criminal, they think the only answer is to make the criminal withhold his crimes harder. That philosophy doesn't work. You can compel someone not to do something to the point where he can do nothing else. He withholds so far that the withhold fails, and it becomes a compulsion. That is the danger of the philosophy that the more "good" withholds we have, the better off we are.

The basis of action in human beings is:

1. He doesn't know what his compulsive actions are, so he doesn't know what he is withholding. Not-knowingness is the common denominator of all O/W's that are operative on the individual.

2. The half-knowns that arise in sec checking, where the PC knows and you don't, are also a source of trouble. Withholds are half a "know". If the PC knows something, that is not enough. The auditor has to know it too. The PC will get upset if you go on not-knowing about it when he knows. The half-know is very uncomfortable. It won't duplicate, so it won't blow, so it is an upsetting thing to have.

The withholds don't have to be serious. In session, they can be very trivial bits of non-communication which multiply. They are relatively unknown to the PC as they drift by. An invalidation often betokens a withhold, so check for inval and withhold to keep the ruds in and the needle clean during sec checks and assessments. Withhold is the common denominator of every out rudiment. The only exception is where you are running the session for form's sake and not for the PC, where you are not auditing the PC who is in front of you, where you have disobeyed the Auditor's Code through not being in communication with the PC and have set up an unintentional withhold for the PC throughout the whole session. The PC who cannot talk to the auditor, because the auditor is not really there, is on an unintentional withhold, which still causes an ARC break. You must run the session for the PC. The PC owns the session. Almost all breakage amongst children is due to their being put on an unintentional withhold. All withholds must contain an intention to communicate.

The intention to reach must exist before a withhold can occur. There must have been an intention to communicate before there is an ARC break. Therefore, a PC being audited by someone who is out of comm with him will ARC break. Remember that every session you run is for that PC and by the auditor, and for no one else. In training, you could get auditors to make a long list of all the reasons why they were running a session. You are liable to get fabulous things, not including that it is for the PC. It is the PC who owns the session, not the auditor. If you master that point, you will overcome most of your difficulties with auditing and any distaste you might have for it.

If a PC feels that he can't comm to the auditor, this equates to the fact that he must be withholding. This restimulates other withholds of undesirable action. The restimulated

withhold may be a failed withhold which brings about obsessive action at once, and the PC finds himself in the God-Awful position of engaging in actions he knows are reprehensible and incapable of stopping himself from acting. He wonders how he got in this position as he berates the auditor. He feels bad about the fact that he is doing these actions while he is doing them. So you, by letting him have a session withhold, are likely to get him into this weird action which amazes him most of all. TR-0 and TR-4 are the most important TR's from the standpoint of getting and keeping the PC in session. TR-0 is important from the auditor's viewpoint, TR-4 from the PC's. The way to handle TR-4 is to be sure that it is the PC's session. Just give him the session.

In sec checking, you are trying to discover the actions that are considered undesirable by the PC and the withholds that restrain them. You get off the withhold by blowing the prior confusion. When you are sec checking, you are on the business of the prior confusion and the motionless point. The prior confusion is the overt; the stable datum is the withhold. The anatomy of withhold is:

1. Done undesirable action.

2. Stop undesirable action.

3. Natter. The guy can't reach and he can't withhold, but he can natter.

When you have the withhold, you have the motionless point, but you must get the prior confusion; you must get what the flowed, since this PC is the one who is there being audited. [This is why you must get the done in pulling a withhold.] Use the critical statement to find the overt. But don't pull the unkind thought; pull the overt underlying it. This overt is what gives you a sort of motor action. Natter is not necessarily motivatorish. To get the charge off Step 2 (above), you can ask the PC, "Have you ever done that since?" The PC will think you are asking for more overts, but in fact you are getting him to spot whether he has been withholding himself from doing it ever since. He will be relieved when that withhold is off, because the stress of maintaining the withhold is relieved. He can feel uncomfortable just getting off the fact of having done some undesirable action, because you have unstrapped some of the restraint against doing it again. He won't feel relief from the session, because the full extent of the withhold isn't off yet. So ask the above question. The PC may not be entirely happy about giving up the withhold. Doing this may trigger off ways he was restraining himself without getting the overt. He may be afraid to get all the withhold off because he might do the action! So make it a rule always to find the overt. Also, ask for other times he did it and didn't do it. [Get all.]

What is a Withhold?

The common denominator of withholds is that a withhold is something that a person believes would endanger his self-preservation if it were revealed. This is the reason why whole track memory is occluded. Someone with little whole-track recall considers himself to be in great danger. This gives you the exact reason a PC gets off "Withholds" which aren't withholds, such as other people's withholds. All withholds students tend to get off on each other are "safe" withholds.

We get into this tacit consent on withholds because of overts on other people's withholds, e.g. spreading their overts around, making them guilty for the overt, sort of punishing them for having gotten it off. After doing that, it seems unsafe to get off withholds. The more unsafe you make it to get off withholds, the battier it becomes, until you get a civilization like this one. For instance, laws against perversion can be used by communists as a means of blackmailing people. The state lends itself to punishment of withholds, which lays it open to undermining by the people in high positions who have those withholds. Likewise, if the auditor makes it unsafe for the PC to get off withholds, the PC will only get off "safe" withholds, i.e. non-withholds.

The hyper-individuation of the PC stems only from his withholds. The PC's idea that to get it off would injure his survival is in fact aberrated. It is the aberrated idea of what they dare to get off that brings about the condition of aberration.

Everyone has some withholds which would, in fact, bring harm to him if they were revealed. These get deeply buried -- encysted -- and the others build up on them. If someone comes close to these withholds, one gets the feeling that all Hell will break loose and one will be imprisoned in some dungeon and tortured. So naturally the auditor seems dangerous. In reality, a dangerous auditor is one who doesn't pull withholds. These auditors will always be involved in ARC breaks, cause PC's to natter about auditing, orgs, etc., have loses, etc. The auditor who only gets off "safe" withholds is dangerous.

Pc's whose withholds have been missed do not make their goals and gains. The auditor who cannot get a result with prepchecking will simply not audit. The definition of withhold makes it not OK to let pcs take items off their lists, because those become missed withholds. Because of the PC's considerations about safety, as mentioned above, he will want to withhold items from lists, but you must not let this happen. The items are on the list because they were dangerous at one time and were withheld in the first place. Prepchecking and 3DXX both are devoted to making the PC realize that it isn't dangerous to reveal himself.

The PC will mention some hot area, then, as the auditor starts him looking at it, he will feel a little reactive regret that he brought it up [see page 185, above]. During the time you are going through this regret band, you are still crossing over into the zone of what is unknown. [You hit "should have known" on the way up and you have to get through this to "know".]

In prepchecking, when the PC gives you a motivator, you know you are an hot ground, so you always ask an overt "what" question. Criticalness leads you to look for the overt doingness behind it. Explaining why something happened is a milder phenomenon, but it too requires a new "What" question. If the withhold itself is given, it is the what question.

The withhold is measured by the amount of danger the PC conceives to be present in getting off the withhold. If the withhold is not dangerous, he will just give it. If it is somewhat dangerous, he will explain around it. If it is rather dangerous, he will criticize. If it is super dangerous, he will give you a motivator. We are taking about dangerousness in the eyes of the PC. This gives you an index to the case. A case is as bad off as he considers it dangerous to reveal himself. The insane person is dramatizing total motivator on the subject of punishment. Insanity is the last protest against punishment: "I cannot feel your punishment. I don't know about it. You have driven me out of my mind, etc." Length of time it takes to

achieve a result in auditing is indexed by danger of revelation from the PC's viewpoint.

How can you cut down this length of time? Don't pull safe withholds; use prepchecking. In 3DXX, there is a new line, something like, "What identity would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" A relief line could be, "What identity would it be safe for you to reveal?" to throw the others into view. The PC actually wants the relief of the revelation but doesn't know how to get it safely, so he is always hoping for some one-shot button for clearing without revealing anything. "Unsafe to reveal" type questions give you good zero prepcheck questions, e.g., "Is there anything you have done which would be unsafe to reveal?" gives you "what" questions.

Old age must be the consideration that it is unsafe to show up with a MEST body. At first, you must figure it's safe to show up with a MEST body; then you get the idea that it is unsafe, so you take it down. That must be what old age is. The basic trick of this universe is, "If you withhold it, it won't hurt you," which is a total lie. Offering a fact seems dangerous; withholding the fact is apparently not dangerous. This is a lie. The thetan just builds up mass and gets less space this way. It makes his withhold himself more and more; occupy less and less space; permeate less and less, etc. A "can't go outside" case is someone who has lots of withholds stacked up an one fairly serious one. He is the one who is afraid the police are after him. [Phobias fit in here.]

This is most salient in prepchecking. Some withholds you just let go by: the "safe" withholds, which are really red herrings.

PERPETRATION - MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE

28 DECEMBER 1988

There is an important discovery, made in 1952, on the subject of engrams.

This is the "Perpetration - Motivator" sequence of engrams.

A PERPETRATION is an aggressive or destructive act by the individual against one or another of the 8 dynamics (self, family, group, Mankind, animals or plants, MEST, Life or the Infinite).

A MOTIVATOR is an aggressive or destructive act received by the person on one of the dynamics.

The viewpoint from which the act is viewed resolves whether the act is a perpetration or motivator.

The reason it is called a "Motivator" is because it tends to prompt that one pay it back - it "motivates" a new perpetration.

When one has done something bad to someone or something, one tends to believe it must have been "motivated." A little boy says, "I hit him because he hit me first."

When one has received something bad, he also may tend to feel he must have done something to deserve it.

The above points are true. The actions and reactions of people on the subject are often very falsified.

People go about believing they were in an auto accident when in actual fact they caused one.

Also people may believe they caused an accident when they were only in one.

Some people, on hearing of a death, at once believe they must have killed the person, even though they were far away.

Police in large cities have people turn up and confess to almost every murder as a routine.

One doesn't have to be crazy to be subject to the Perpetration - Motivator phenomena.

Here are the two extremes. One is a person who gives up only motivators (always done to him) and the other is the person who "has done only perpetrations" (done to others).

In running engrams you will find:

1.   All perpetration engrams that hang up (won't clear easily) have also a motivator engram in the same or different incident.

2   All motivator engrams that hang up have a perpetration engram in the same or different incident.

The two types of engrams are PERPETRATION Engrams and MOTIVATOR Engrams.

Example of Perpetration Engram - SHOOTING A DOG.

Example of Motivator Engram - BEING BITTEN BY A DOG.

The rule is that the SUBJECT MATTER MUST BE SIMILAR.

They can be in different points in time.

When you can't run out (erase) a dog bite engram, why then you find the "shoot the dog" engram.

PSYCHOSOMATIC ILLS OR ABERRATIONS THAT DO NOT RESOLVE BY RUNNING ONE SIDE, USUALLY RESOLVE BY FINDING AND RUNNING THE OTHER.

When you can't erase an engram about shooting a dog, why then there's "a bitten by dog."

It's all very simple, really. There are always two sides to the coin. If one won't run, you try the other.

BASICS

Finding the basic engram on a chain also applies to finding the basic perpetration or basic motivator engram.

Engrams then hang up (won't run out) when:

(a)   The other type needs to be run and

(b)   The one found has earlier engrams on it.

NON EXTANT ENGRAMS

An "engram" sometimes didn't exist. A Pc can be trying to run being run over by a car when he never was.

What needs to be done, when the incident won't run, is get the Pc's incident of running over somebody.

It also works in reverse. A Pc can be trying to run an engram of running over somebody, when he was in fact only run over himself and never did run over anyone.

(1) BOTH engrams can exist and be run, or (2) only one side exists and can be run, or (3) with a heavy foul up on perpetrations and motivators, one side can be non-factual and won't run because only the other side exists.

It is easy to visualize this as a matter of flows. A perpetration is an Outflow and a motivator is an Inflow.

SECONDARIES

Secondaries always sit squarely on incidents of actual pain and unconsciousness.

Also secondaries can exist on the perpetration - motivator sequence pattern just as in engrams.

This is the cause of frozen emotions or "unemotional" people. Also some people complain they can't feel any more. These people have committed too many perpetrations.

This works out by perpetration-motivator sequence. A person in grief over loss (grief is always loss) who then can't run it, has caused grief and that perpetration-secondary can be run.

Also a person misemotional over causing grief, has been caused grief. It worked both ways with ALL POINTS ON THE TONE SCALE. Cause grief and you get grief; cause happiness and you get happiness.

It is basically Engram running that resolves all cases in the end, so one had better be pretty good at clearing Engrams and Secondaries, both Motivator and Perpetration.

PERPETRATION MOTIVATOR DEFINITIONS

29 DECEMBER 1988

Perpetrations and motivators involve FLOWS.

They exist with or without intention.

One can add "intentional" or "unintentional" to the definitions.

We can have the intended bad result or the unintended bad result.

A PERPETRATION - An act (intended or unintended) by the person or individual leading to the injury, reduction or degradation of another, others or their beingness, persons, possessions, associations or dynamics.

A MOTIVATOR is an act received by the person or individual causing injury, reduction or degradation of his beingness, person, associations or dynamics.

A PERPETRATION OF OMISSION - a failure to act resulting in the injury, reduction or degradation of another or their beingness, persons, possessions or dynamics.

A motivator is called a "motivator" because it tends to prompt or motivate a perpetration. It gives a person a motive or reason or justification for a perpetration.

When a person commits a perpetration or a perpetration of omission with no motivator, he tends to believe or pretends that he has received a motivator which does not in fact exist. This is a FALSE MOTIVATOR.

Beings suffering from this are said to have "motivator hunger" and are often aggrieved over nothing.

Cases which "cave in hard" suffer from false motivators and resolve on being asked for perpetrations done for no reason.

Cases which do not resolve on actual motivators have perpetrations that have to be handled.

There is also the case with FALSE PERPETRATIONS. The person has been hit hard for no reason. So they dream up reasons they were hit.

Cases that go into imaginary cause (imagining they do or cause things bad or good) are suffering from false perpetrations. They resolve on, "When were you hit (punished, hurt, etc.) for no reason?"

A LIMITED THEORY

29 DECEMBER 1988

Before we would permit you to believe that the perpetration-withhold mechanism was a total way of life, we should point out that it applies only to a limited stratum of existence and that it stems from failures to help.

The theory that "what you do to others will then happen to you" is a punishment-control mechanism peculiar to this universe. Religious movements, particularly, like to use it to control their members. It derives from a deteriorated willingness to duplicate. It is the law of physics of Interaction - for every action there is an equal and contrary or opposite reaction.

"Love thy neighbor," when it is no longer a willingness, is enforced by the theory of P/W (PERPETRATION/WITHHOLD). "Love thy neighbor" can exist only when help, control and communication are high. When all these go, then P/W comes into vogue as a method of enforcing peace.

P/W is a theory which sets in when aberration sets in. It is not a high natural law. It is junior to the various laws of communication, control and help.

P/W can occur only when help has failed. When two Beings who have joined forces to help fail each other, only then does P/W come into existence.

The forces of two Beings cannot come into dispute until after they have first joined. Thus there is no war like that seen between brothers or husband and wife.

The cycle is this:

INDEPENDENT BEINGS
COMMUNICATION
MIS-COMMUNICATION
CONTROL
MIS-CONTROL
HELP
FAILED HELP
PERPETRATIONS AND WITHHOLDS
PERPETRATIONS AND WITHHOLDS BY TRANSFER (See below)
WORRYING OTHERS
WORRYING ABOUT OTHERS
BEING CRITICAL
BEING CRITICAL OF SELF

Basically, P/W is an effort to regain the status of independent Being without taking responsibility for any of the intervening steps.

The reason we run P/Ws is that most Pcs are on P/W by Transfer, which is to say, when they kick George in the head they get a headache themselves. This makes them think they areGeorge. We use P/W since it explains phenomena found at a low humanoid level. We do not use it because it is a senior governing law of the universe.

When a person's ability to Help and receive Help comes up, P/W as a mechanism drops out. We could run a full case, it would appear, with Help. However, in practice, it is better to run lots of P/W with failed help as they complement each other and move the case faster. By running P/W we disclose many new failed helps. Why? Look at the cycle above and see that P/W occurs only when Help has failed.

Similarly, on the same cycle we see that worry undercuts P/W. But if it is run, it should be worked with P/W.

The worry cure has commands as follows:

1.   Get the idea of worrying something

2.   Get the idea of not worrying something

3.   Get the idea of something being worrisome.

People, animals, things can be used in place of "something." The process, going rapidly up toward failed help, is a bit limited and should be run with another process of the type of "Get the idea of attacking something," "Get the idea of not attacking something" to keep it going. The worry process bogs if run too long just by itself. It is a very valuable process as it explains many reactions and undercuts many cases. Worrying something is close to the lowest level of perpetration. It is the lowest effort to individuate.

But just as worry is not a way of life nor an answer to all of life, neither is the P/W mechanism an end-all law.

Many cases are not up to recognizing their perpetrations. They will also have trouble recognizing their failures to help. Usually, then, they can recognize being worried or worrying people and of thinking unkind thoughts and even attacking things.

Failed help also lies as a harmonic below P/W and so runs on any case if assisted with P/W or assisted with the Worry Process as above.

Worrying people is almost a way of life for the juvenile, just as P/W is with a criminal. People who feel childish or act that way are stuck in the violent motion of childhood and worrying others. Many Pcs use their processing just to worry the Clearing Practitioner. Worry is the most easily dramatized P/W.

P/W, whether as worry or being critical (unkind thoughts), is the result of failure to help. P/W is the reason one gets another's valence. P/W is why Pcs have somatics. But P/W is not a high order law.

You will not always have to be careful not to bump Joe. It would be a horrible universe indeed if P/W was its senior law, for one could then never do anything.

Fortunately, it drops out, both as a governing law and a necessity in life.

PREDICTION AND CONSEQUENCES

29 DECEMBER 1988

Probably the reason perpetrations of omission and commission are done at all lies in Man's inability or faulty ability to predict and to realize consequences.

Human beings are so thoroughly fixated in the present and the past and so involved with present time confusions that they rarely foresee anything and are mainly oblivious to any consequences of their own actions or failures to act.

This gives them the appearance of being stupid.

When men become too confused to even stay in the present, they slide into the past and become "psychotic" or, at best, "neurotic."

Most "criminal" types are completely unable to predict and thus have no fear of any consequences, even when they are obvious to a more sane person.

The case that is very bad off, therefore, does not register on a meter. Having no awareness of good or evil due to his low case condition, there is no apparent charge on perpetrations of omission or commission, regardless of who has been hurt.

Humankind is basically good.

When his level of awareness rises, he begins to be able to predict and see the consequences to himself or others of evil actions.

The more he is freed and the higher his intelligence and ability rise, the more "moral" he becomes.

Only when he is beaten down below awareness, as with a chronic condition, does Man commit evil actions.

It is not for nothing that soldiers have to be brutalized and stuck in the present by threat and duress to make them commit harmful actions.

When a person's awareness is improved, he is also able to predict and can foresee consequences on the eight dynamics.

The road from insanity to sanity is a road of recognition of the world around one, the future, and consequences of one's own actions.

Thus the principle of the perpetration motivator sequence will be found to explain, and its techniques remedy, the brutality into which races fall.

WHY PERPETRATION PROCESSING WORKS

29 DECEMBER 1988

Perpetration/withhold processing gives the highest gain in raising cause level because perpetrations are the biggest reason why a person restrains himself and withholds himself from action.

Man is basically good, but the reactive mind tends to force him into evil actions. These evil actions are instinctively regretted, and the individual tries to refrain from doing anything at all. The "best" remedy, the individual thinks, is to withhold. "If I commit evil actions, then my best guarantee for not committing more perpetrations is to do nothing whatever." Thus we have the "lazy," inactive person.

Others who try to make an individual guilty for committing evil actions only increase this tendency to laziness.

Punishment is supposed to bring about inaction, and it does in some unexpected ways.

However, there is also an inversion (a turn about) where the individual sinks below recognition of any action. The individual in such a state cannot conceive of any action and therefore cannot withhold action. And thus we have the criminal who can't act, really, but can only re-act and is without any self direction. This is why punishment does not cure criminality but in actual fact creates it; the individual is driven below withholding or any recognition of any action. A thief's hands stole the jewel, the thief was merely an innocent spectator to the action of his own hands.

So there is a level below withholding that a Clearing Practitioner should be alert to in some Pcs, for these "have no withholds" and "have done nothing." All of which, seen through their eyes, is true. They are merely saying "I cannot restrain myself" and "I have not willed myself to do what I have done."

The road out for such a case is the same as that for any other case. It is just longer. Don't be anxious to see a sudden return of responsibility for the first owned "done" that this person knows he or she has done may be "ate breakfast". Don't disdain such answers, in Level II particularly; rather, in such people, seek such answers.

There is another type of case in all this, just one more to end the list. This is the case who never runs P/W but "seeks the explanation of what I did that made it all happen to me".

This person easily goes into past lives for answers. Their reaction to a question about what they've done is to try to find out what they did that earned all those motivators. That, of course, isn't running the process and the Clearing Practitioner should be alert for it and stop it when it is happening.

This type of case goes into the extreme on guilt. It dreams up perpetrations to explain why. After most big murders the police routinely have a dozen or more people come around and confess. You see, if they had done the murder, this would explain why they feel guilty. As a terror stomach is awfully grim to live with, one is apt to seek any explanation for it if it will only explain it.

One should be very careful not to let the Pc get off perpetrations the Pc didn't commit.

Such a Pc (recognizable by the ease with which they dive into the extreme past) when being processed off a meter, gets more and more frantic and wilder and wilder in perpetrations reported. They should get calmer under processing, of course, but the false perpetrations make them frantic and hectic in a session. On a meter one simply checks for "Have you told me

anything beyond what really has occured?" or "Have you told me any untruths?" or "Have you told me any half-truths?"

The observation and meter guides given on this level are used during a session when they apply but not systematically such as aftereveryPc answer. These observations and meter guides are used always at the end of every session on the Pcs to whom they apply.

THE SCALE OF PERPETRATION PROCESSING

It will be found in processing the various case levels that running perpetrations is very effective in raising the cause level of a Pc.

The scale, on actual tests of running various levels of Pc response, is seen to go something like this:

LEVEL 0 ITSA - Letting a Pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about self with little or no Clearing Practitioner direction.

LEVEL 0 ITSA - Letting a Pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about others, with little or no Clearing Practitioner direction.

LEVEL II REPETITIVE P/W - Using merely "In this lifetime what have you done?" "In this lifetime what haven't you done?" Alternate.

LEVEL III ASSESSMENT BY LIST - Using existing or specially prepared lists of possible perpetrations, cleaning the meter each time it reads on a question and using the question only so long as it reads.

LEVEL IV JUSTIFICATIONS - Asking the Pc what perpetration he or she has done and then in that one instance (if applicable) getting the justifications by finding out why "that" was not a perpetration.

Advice enters into this under the heading of instruction. For example, by saying "You're upset about that person because you've done something to that person."

In Level III one can also direct attention to the various dynamics by first assessing them and then using or preparing a list of possible perpetrations for the dynamic found.

RESPONSIBILITY

There is no reason to expect any great Pc responsibility for his or her own perpetrations below Level IV and the Clearing Practitioner who seeks to make the Pc feel or take responsibility for perpetrations is just pushing the Pc down. The Pc will resent being made to feel guilty. Indeed the Clearing Practitioner may only achieve that, not case gain. And the Pc will ARC break.

At Level IV one begins on this subject of responsibility but again it is indirectly the target. There is no need now to run Responsibility in doing P/Ws, e.g., "What part of that ___(perpetration)___ could you be responsible for?"

The realization that one has really done something is a return of responsibility and this gain is best obtained only by indirect approach as in the processes of this level (For example "What have you done?").

ARC BREAKS

The commonest cause of failure in running perpetrations is "cleaning cleans" whether or not one is using a meter. The Pc who really has more to tell doesn't ARC Break when the Clearing Practitioner continues to ask for one, but may snarl and eventually give it up.

On the other hand, leaving a perpetration touched on the case and calling it clean will cause a future ARC Break with the Clearing Practitioner.

"Have you told all?" prevents cleaning a clean. On the unmetered Pc one can see the Pc brighten up. On the meter you get a nice fall if it's true that all is told.

"Have I not found out about something?" prevents leaving a perpetration undisclosed. On the unmetered Pc the reaction is a sly flinch. On a metered Pc it gives a read.

A Pc's protest against a question will also be visible in an unmetered Pc by a reeling sort of exasperation which eventually becomes a howl of pure bafflement at why the Clearing Practitioner won't accept the answer that that's all. On a meter, protest of a question falls on being asked for: "Is this question being protested?"

There is no real excuse for ARC Breaking a Pc by:

1.   Demanding more than is there or

2.   Leaving a perpetration undisclosed that will later make the Pc upset with the Clearing Practitioner.

ROBOTISM

29 DECEMBER 1988

A technical advance has been made in relation to the inactivity, slowness or incompetence of human beings.

This discovery proceeds from a two and a half year intense study of aberration as it affects the ability to function as a group member.

The ideal group member is capable of working causatively in full cooperation with his fellows in the achievement of group goals and the realization of his own happiness.

The primary human failing is an inability to function as herself or contribute to group achievements.

Wars, political upsets, organizational duress, growing crime rates, increasingly heavy "justice," growing demands for excessive welfare, economic failure and other age long and repeating conditions find a common denominator in the inability of human beings to coordinate.

The current political answer in vogue, in this century and growing, is totalitarianism where the state orders the whole life of the individual. The production figures of such states are very low and their crimes against the individual are numerous.

A discovery therefore of what this factor is that makes the humanoid the victim of oppression would be a valuable one.

The group needs such an answer in order to survive and for its individual members to be happy.

SCALE

Pan-determined
Self-determined

ROBOT   Other-determined
BAND   Oblivious

Insane

NEEDING ORDERS

The individual with an evil purpose has to withhold himself because he may do destructive things.

When he fails to withhold himself, he commits perpetrative acts on his fellows or other dynamics or occasionally loses control and does so.

This, of course, makes him quite inactive.

To overcome this, he refuses any responsibility for his own actions.

Any motion he makes must be on the responsibility of others.

He operates then only when given orders.

Thus he must have orders to operate.

Therefore, one could term such a person a robot. And the malady could be called robotism.

PERCEPTION

Studies of perception undertaken reveal that sight, hearing and other channels of awareness decrease in proportion to the number of perpetrations - and therefore withholds - which the person has committed on the whole track.

By relieving these, sight has been remarkably brightened.

Therefore a person who is withholding himself from committing perpetrations, because of his own undesired purposes, has very poor perception.

He does not see the environment around him.

Thus, combined with his unwillingness to act on his own initiative, there is a blindness to the environment.

DEFECTIVE PRODUCTS

Since he does not act upon orders he is taking responsibility for, he executes orders without fully understanding them.

Further he executes them in an environment he does not see.

Thus when forced to produce he will produce defective products. These are called so because they are not in actual fact useful products, but something no one wants and are perpetrations in themselves - such as inedible biscuits or a "repair" that is just further breakage.

SLOWNESS

The person is slow because he is moving on other determinism, is carefully withholding himself and cannot see anyway.

Thus he feels lost, confused or unsafe and cannot move positively.

Because he produces defective products, he gets slapped around or goes unthanked and so begins a decline.

He cannot move swiftly and if he does, has accidents. So he teaches himself to be careful and cautious.

JUSTICE

Group justice is of some use, but all it really does is make the person withhold himself even harder and, while a necessary restraint, nevertheless does not itself bring a lasting improvement.

Threats and "heads on a pike" (meaning examples of discipline) do however jar the person into giving his attention and channeling his actions into a more desirable path, from the group viewpoint.

Justice is necessary in a society of such people, but it is not a remedy for improvement.

MALICE

Despite the viciousness of the truly insane, there is little or no real malice in the robot.

The truly insane cannot control or withhold their evil purposes and dramatize them at least covertly.

The insane are not always visible, but they are visible enough. And they are malicious.

The robot, on the other hand, does control his evil impulses to a great extent.

He is not malicious.

His danger mainly stems from the incompetent things he does, the time of others he consumes, the waste of time and material and the brakes he puts on the general group endeavor.

He does not do all these things intentionally. He does not really know he is doing them.

He looks in wounded surprise at the wrath he generates when he breaks things, wrecks programs and gets in the way. He does not know he is doing these things. For he cannot see that he is. He may go along for some time (slowly, wasteful) and then carelessly smash the exact thing that wrecks the whole activity.

People suppose he cunningly intended to do so. He seldom does.

He winds up even more convinced he can't be trusted and that he should withhold harder!

FALSE REPORTS

The robot gives many false reports. Unable to see, how can he know what is true?

He seeks to fend off wrath and attract good will by "PR" (public relations boasts) without realizing he is giving false reports.

MORALE

The robot goes into morale declines easily. Since production is the basis of morale, and since he does not really produce much, left to his own devices, his morale sags heavily.

PHYSICAL INERTIA

The body is a physical object. It is not the Being himself.

As a body has mass, it tends to remain motionless unless moved and tends to keep going in a certain direction unless steered or stopped.

As he is not really running his body, the robot has to be moved when not moving or diverted or stopped if moving on a wrong course.

Thus anyone with one or more of such Beings around him tends to get exhausted with shoving them into motion or halting them when they go wrong.

Exhaustion only occurs when one does not understand the robot.

It is the exasperation that exhausts one.

With understanding, one is not exasperated because he can handle the situation. But only if he knows what it is.

PTS

Potential trouble sources are not necessarily robots.

A PTS person generally is withholding himself from a suppressive person or group or thing.

Toward that SP person or group or thing he is a robot! He takes orders from them if only in opposites.

His perpetrations on the suppressive person make him blind and non-self-determined.

BASIC WHY

The basic reason behind persons who cannot function, are slow or inactive or incompetent and who do not produce is:

WITHHOLDING SELF FROM DOING DESTRUCTIVE THINGS, AND THUS UNWILLING TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY AND THEREFORE NEEDING ORDERS.

The exact wording of this WHY must be done by the individual himself after examining and grasping this principle.

If one writes this principle down on the top of a sheet and then asks the person to word it exactly as it applies to himself, one will attain the individual why for inaction and incompetence.

PROCESSING

Physical work in the physical universe, general confronting, reach and withdraw, locational processing and objective processes go far in remedying this condition.

Touch assists regularly and correctly given to proper end phenomena will handle illnesses of such persons.

Word clearing is vital tech to open the person's comm lines, wipe out earlier misunderstoods and increase his understanding.

PTS tech will handle the person's robotism toward SP individuals groups or things.

END PRODUCT

The end product when one has fully handled robotism is not a person who cannot follow orders or who operates solely on his own.

Totalitarian states fear any relief of the condition as they foolishly actively promote and hope for such Beings. But this is only a deficiency in their own causes and their lack of

experience with fully self-determined Beings. Yet some education, advertising and amusements have been designed only for robots. Even religions existed to suppress "Man's evil nature".

Lacking any examples or understanding, many have feared to free the robot to his own control and think even with horror on it.

But you see, Beings are not basically robots. They are miserable when they are.

Basically they prosper only when they are self-determined and can be pan-determined to help in the prosperity of all.

ON CONTROL AND LYING

29 DECEMBER 1988

THE ONLY WAY YOU CAN CONTROL PEOPLE IS TO LIE TO THEM. You can write that down in your book in great big letters. The only way you can control anybody is to lie to them. When you find an individual is lying to you, you know that the individual is trying to control you. One way or another this individual is trying to control you. That is the mechanism of control. This individual is lying to you because he is trying to control you - because if he gives you enough misinformation he will pull you down the Emotion Scale so that he can control you. Conversely, if you see an impulse on the part of a human being to control you, you know very well that that human being is lying to you. Not "is going to," but "is" lying to you.

Check these facts, and you will find they are always true. That person who is trying to control you is lying to you. He's got to tell you lies in order to continue control, because the second you start telling anybody close to the truth, you start releasing him and he gets tougher and tougher to control. So, you can't control somebody without telling them a bunch of lies. You will find that very often Management has this as its greatest weakness. It will try to control instead of lead. The next thing you know, it is lying to the staff. Lie, lie, lie, and it gets worse and worse, and all of a sudden the thing blows up.

Religion has done this. Organized religion tries to control, so, therefore, it must be lying. After a while it figures out (even itself) that it is lying, and then it starts down scale further and further, and all of a sudden people get down along this spring-like bottom (heresy) and say, "Are we going into apathy and die, or are we going to revolt?" And they revolt, because you can only lie to people so long. Unfortunately there is always a new cycle of lying.

CONTINUING PERPETRATIONS

29 DECEMBER 1988

Pity the poor fellow who commits daily harmful acts.

He'll never make it.

A criminal, pilfering the cash box once a week, has himself stopped cold as far as case gains are concerned.

In 1954 we counted some noses. We checked up on 21 cases who had never had any gains since 1950. Seventeen turned out to be criminals! The other 4 were beyond the reach of investigation.

That gave us the first clue.

For some years then, we watched for no-gain cases and carefully followed up those that we could. They had major or minor criminal backgrounds.

This gave the 1959 break-through on the meter checks for perpetrations.

Following it further since 1959, we have finally amassed enough histories to state:

THE PERSON WHO IS NOT GETTING CASE GAINS IS COMMITTING CONTINUING PERPETRATIONS.

While this sounds like a very good "out" for us, we assume that the Clearing Practitioner at least tried something sensible.

So, given processing by Grades (the best case approach we've ever had), we crack the rough ones.

But will that be all cases?

There's still one. The case who continually commits perpetrations before, during and after processing.

He won't make it.

One thing helps this, however.

You have seen the Ethics Codes appear.

By putting a bit of control in the environment, we have enough threat to restrain dramatization.

The phenomena is this: The Reactive Bank can exert stress on the Pc if it is not obeyed. Discipline must exert just a shade more stress against dramatization than the bank does. This checks the performance of the continual perpetration long enough to let processing bite.

Not everyone is a continuous perpetration committer by a thousand to one. But this phenomenon is not confined to the no-gain case.

The slow gain case is also committing perpetrations the Clearing Practitioner doesn't see.

Therefore a little discipline in the environment speeds the slow gain case, the one we're more interested in.

The no-gain case, frankly, is one we are not panting to solve. If a fellow wants to sell his next hundred trillion for the sake of the broken toy he stole, I'm afraid I can't be bothered. We have no contract with anybody to save the world.

It is enough for us to know:

1.   Where bottom is, and

2.   How to help speed slow gain cases.

Bottom is the chap who eats your lunch apple and says the children did it. Bottom is the fellow who sows the environment with secret suppressive acts and vicious generalities.

The slow gain case responds to a bit of "keep your nose clean, please, while I apply the Being-booster."

The fast gain case does his job and doesn't give a hoot about threatened discipline, if it's fair. And the fast gain case helps out and the fast gain case can be helped by a more orderly environment. The good worker works more happily when bad workers see the pitfalls and desist from distracting him.

So we all win.

The no-gain case? Well, he sure doesn't deserve any gain. One Pc in a thousand. And he yaps and groans and says "Prove it works" and blames us and raises hell. He makes us think we failed.

BY THEIR ACTIONS

29 DECEMBER 1988

By their actions you shall know them, whether bad or good, whether on another side or yours.

And what in their actions gives us the keenest insight? Their ability to help.

Some think that help cannot be done. Shun them. Some think that help is always an effort to betray. Process them for here you have the potential criminals of Earth.

Some people cannot help. They can only injure and destroy. And if in the name of help they only injure and destroy, then know them carefully for they are criminals.

What is a criminal? One who thinks help cannot be on any dynamic or uses help on anyone to injure and destroy.

Who are these men with covert ways who bring Earth its pain? They are the men who cannot help. Who are the women who must be helped but who can only maim? They say, these men and women, that they'll help, and then they make a thorough shambles of it all.

From where did Earth conceive her traps and aspects that are grim? Earth would be a lovely place if all men helped to help, not to destroy.

Think heavily on this point. Judge women and men from what they think of help.

The good can help. The bad will not or if they do, they "help" only to betray.

The good of Earth comes from above the point of where help is help, done honestly. The pain of Earth comes from the emotional levels where help does not exist or where it's used to pull us into agony.

Know your friends. Discuss help with them and you'll find their emotion level and whether they are worth a lot as friends.

This is the test that you can use to separate the good from the bad and then, clear-eyed, begin to make a world for yourself in which all life can live.

FAILED HELP

29 DECEMBER 1988

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

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

Failing to help someone or something is a type of perpetration. When we have failed in helping someone, we can feel very bad about it. Also, a person is very critical of an area or person she has failed to help.

This is run as, "Who have you failed to help?" "What have you failed to help?" alternately. More difficult cases run on either one or the other.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No one has yet run 75 hours of failed help on a low level case. So we cannot tell you how much it will take or how far it will go. But we would be prepared to run 75 hours of it of the Who-What version on a case before it could run a havingness process.

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

PSYCHOSIS

29 DECEMBER 1988

About 15% to 20% of the human race, apparently, is insane or certainly a much higher per cent than was estimated.

The truly insane do not necessarily act insane visibly. They are not the psychiatric obvious cases who go rigid for years or scream for days. This is observed only in the last stages or during temporary stress.

Under apparent social behavior, the continual crimes knowingly committed by the insane are much more vicious than ever has been catalogued in psychiatric texts.

The actions of the insane are not "unconscious." They are completely aware of what they are doing.

All insane actions are entirely justified and seem wholly rational to them.

The product of their job duties is destructive but is excused as ignorance or errors.

As cases in normal processing, they rollercoaster continually.

They nearly always have a fixed emotional state. It does not vary in nearly all insane people. In a very few, it is cyclic -- high then low.

All characteristics classified as those of the "suppressive person" are in fact those of an insane person.

The easiest ways to detect the insane are:

1. Pretending to do a job or duties, while the real consistent result is destructive to the group in terms of breakage, lost items, injured business, etc.

2. The case is no gain or rollercoaster and is covered under PTS symptoms.

3. They are usually chronically physically ill. Often this is hidden with drugs or unusual body practices.

4. They have a deep but carefully masked hatred of anyone who seeks to help them.

5. The result of their "help" is actually injurious.

6. They often seek transfers or wish to leave.

7. They are involved in warfare with conflicts around them which are invisible to others. One wonders how they can be so involved or get so involved in so much hostility.

TYPES

The German psychiatric 1500 or so "different types of insanity" are just differentsymptoms of the same cause. There is only one insanity and from it spring different manifestations. Psychiatry erred in calling these different types and trying to invent different treatments.

DEFINITION

Insanity can now be precisely defined.

The definition is:

INSANITY IS THE OVERT OR COVERT, BUT ALWAYS COMPLEX AND CONTINUOUS, DETERMINATION TO HARM OR DESTROY.

Possibly the only frightening thing about it is the cleverness with which it can be hidden.

Whereas a sane person can become angry or upset and a bit destructive for short periods, he or she recovers. The insane mask it, are misemotional continuously and do not recover.

THE NATURE OF MAN

Man is basically good. This is obvious. For when he begins to do evil, he seeks to destroy his memory in order to change and seeks to destroy his body. He seeks to check his evil impulses by inhibiting his own skill and strength.

He can act in a very evil fashion, but his basic nature then makes it mandatory that he lessens himself in many ways.

The towering "strength" of a madman is a rarity and is compensated by efforts at self-destruction.

Man's mortality, his "one life" fixation, all stem from his efforts to check himself, obliterate his memory in a fruitless effort to change his conduct and his self-destructive habits and impulses. Thus, he loses his skills and abilities.

As this rationale proves out completely in processing and fits all cases observed, we have for the first time proof of his actual nature.

As only around 20% are insane, and as those who previously worked in the mental field were themselves mainly insane, Humankind as a whole has been assigned an evil repute. Governments, where such personalities exist, listen to the opinion of the insane and apply the characteristics of 20% to the entire hundred per cent. This gives an 80% wrong diagnosis, which is why mental science itself was destructive when used by states.

It was once thought that the technology of Level II would help the insane. Since the insane person (the psychotic) is never "in session" (interested in own case and willing to talk to the Clearing Practitioner), she will never benefit from any level of processing. That is the barrier to their being healed by Clearing. All the technology of Level II applies to the insane, but they are way below ever being able to benefit from that technology. The greatest value of Level II for the Clearing Practitioner is to be able to spot the insane person so they can betotally avoided. Stay away from the insane and you will have a happy life as a Clearing Practitioner. Always refer anyone who fits the description in this bulletin to a certified therapist or psychiatrist or just send them away. The insane are deadly and dangerous to the Clearing Practitioner.

PATTERN OF BEHAVIOR

The apparent pattern of insane behavior is to "come in" (ask for processing, go on staff, etc.) with the advertised intention of being helped or helping, then mess up either as a Preclear or on a job, then state how bad it all is and leave. It looks obvious enough. He came, found it bad, left.

This is only the apparent behavior. Apparent reasons.

Based on numerous cases, this is the real cycle. Hearing of something good that might help these hateful, awful, rotten, nasty people, the psychotic comes in, wrecks this, upsets that, caves in this one, chops up that one and when somebody says, "No!" the psychotic either:

1.   Caves himself in physically or

2.   Runs away.

The psychotic is motivated by intent to harm.

If he realizes he is harming things he shouldn't, he caves himself in. If he is afraid he will be found out, he runs.

In the psychotic, the impulse is quite conscious.

CONCLUSION

None of this is very nice. It is hard to confront.

Freud thought all men had a hidden monster in them for he dealt mainly with the psychotic and their behavior was what he saw.

All men are not like this. The percentage that are is greater than we supposed but is a long way from all men.

Artists, writers often have these types hanging around them as there is someone or something there to be destroyed. When success, or failure to destroy, or possible detection appears on the scene, they blow, often as destructively as possible.

Organizations are subjected to a lot of this. A psychotic sometimes succeeds in blowing off good staff. And then sooner or later realizes how evil he is acting and sickens or leaves.

The society is not geared to any of this at all. The insane walk around wrecking the place and decent people think it's "human nature" or "inevitable" or a "bad childhood."

PERPETRATION MANIFESTATIONS ON A DOWN SCALE CASE

29 DECEMBER 1988

Every high scale manifestation or activity has a low scale mockery.

There can be an apparent clear reading on a case that has never been successfully cleared. This case is too low on the Emotion Scale to register at all as a Being. The resulting read is therefore that of the body minus a bank. No perpetrations will show up on the needle of this case.

Only when responsibility has been run does this case shift off the low reading and get different range arm and needle responses.

Such a case is fairly easy to recognize. The case has obvious areas of great irresponsibility and yet reads like a Clear. They want to attest to already being Clear or "Natural Clear." But once you scout out the case and process them correctly, this state of affairs becomes upset and the case reads otherwise, and then eventually comes back after an awful lot of sessions and intensives into the Clear range and stays there. But now the case is able, where it was before very apathetic and really useless.

Any Clear check out must include the following exercise and indeed this is the process which gets these low level cases really cracking. This is both a Clear examination and a good entrance to cases. It is also the best way to check out perpetrations when in doubt.

You run on the CB Meter, a dynamic assessment and pick up any dynamic that gives a change of needle pattern, or take any dynamic which makes the needle drop, no matter how slightly.

Having located the dynamic we now ask the Pc for any terminal he or she thinks would represent that dynamic. We take any terminal that has any drop on it as given or suggested by the Pc.

On this terminal we now run perpetration/withhold as follows:

1.   "What have you done to a (terminal)?"

2.   "What have you withheld from a (terminal)?"

This was the terminal most real to the Pc; therefore, when responsibility is increased on it, you have generally increased responsibility.

When we have flattened this off mildly, we go through the whole operation above again.

Before we have done this many times, perpetrations will begin to show up on the case and will be recognized by the Pc.

Doing this well just once unsettles the false Clear reading and that reading will not return until the case is actually cleared.

MORE ON P/W

29 DECEMBER 1988

The Itsa processes for P/W (PERPETRATION/WITHHOLD) are almost unlimited.

There is, however, the distinct "must not" at Level II, as at upper Levels, DON'T RUN A PROCESS THAT MAKES THE PC FEEL ACCUSED.

A Pc will feel accused if he is run above his or her level. And remember that temporary sags in level can occur, such as during ARC Breaks with the Clearing Practitioner or life.

A process can be accusative because it is worded too strongly. It can be accusative to the Pc because the Pc feels guilty or defensive anyway.

At Level II, proper P/W processes can take up the troubles that are described as peculiar to some Pcs, without getting too personal about it.

Here are some varied Level II Processes:

1.   "Tell me some things you think you should not have done."

2.   "Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble."

3.   "What wouldn't you do over again.?"

4.   "What are some things a person shouldn't say?"

5.   "What gets a person into trouble?"

6.   "What have you done that you regret?"

7.   "What have you said you wish you hadn't?"

8.   "What have you advised others to do?

There are many more.

These at Level II all convert to repetitive processes.

At Level III such processes convert to lists.

At Level IV such processes convert to how they weren't perpetrations or weren't really done or justifications of one kind or another.

Care should be taken not to heavily run an out of ARC type process. This is the command which asks for out of Affinity moments, out of Reality moments and out of Communication incidents.

All "after charge" is based on prior ARC. You have to have ARC with a person before you can have an ARC Break with them. Therefore, for a withhold to exist, there must have been communication earlier. "ARC incidents" are basic on all chains. "Out of ARC" are later on the chain. One has to get a basic to blow a chain. Otherwise one gets recurring answers. (Pc brings up same incident over and over as you don't have the basic on the chain.)

You can alternate an ARC command with an out-of-ARC Command. "What have you done?" (means one had to reach for and contact) can be alternated with "What haven't you

done?" (means not reached for and not contacted).

But if one runs the out-of-ARC (not reached for and not contacted) process only, the Pc will soon bog.

On the other hand, an ARC process runs on and on with no bad side effects, i.e., "What have you done?"

"What bad thing have you done?" is a mixture of ARC and out of ARC. Done, reached and contacted. Bad, wished one hadn't.

So, solely accusative commands upset the Pc, not because of social status or insult, but because a Pc, particularly at lower levels of case, wishes so hard he hadn't done it that a real "bad done" is really a withhold and the Pc not only withholds it from the Clearing Practitioner but from himself as well.

CHANGE OF COMMANDS

PERPETRATION-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE

9 DECEMBER 1989

Whereas it is workable to ask for "What have you done" and "What have you withheld." This not the major Grade II process.

The original work on this used the perpetration-motivator sequence and the commands are:

"What have you done?"

"What has been done to you?"

There is a third "leg" which is:

"What has another done to another?"

A fourth leg can also be used:

"What have you done to yourself?"

This can be used, and if not used, may stick as a flow.

This is a matter of flows. (1) Inflow, (2) Outflow, (3) Cross Flow (4) Self Flow.

Therefore, the commands to be used to clean up perpetrations are four in number. They are run one at a time (as a bracket) to a floating needle on the process (not F/N on each leg).

1.   "What has been done to you?"

2.   "What have you done?"

3.   "What has another done to another?"

4.   "What have you done to yourself?"

Moral Codes: What is a Withhold?

No one is non-security checkable. It's just necessary to find the areas where he has what he considers to be overts. If he doesn't read on a standard sec check, it just means those things aren't transgressions against his moral code. A criminal's moral code is about the reverse of a law-abiding person's. All pcs have moral codes against which they have transgressed. You'll only get withholds off a case when you locate the code against which the PC has transgressed.

A withhold is an unannounced transgression against a moral code by which the person was bound. A moral code is that series of agreements to which a person has subscribed in order to guarantee the survival of a group. Man has learned, down the track, that where he has agreed on proper conduct, he has survived, and where he hasn't, he hasn't survived. So people agree on what is moral, i.e. survival-conducive actions.

The U.S. was founded on an agreement, the Constitution. Wherever it has been breached, the country has gotten in trouble. The reason for the trouble is that there aren't any other agreements than the basic agreement. There aren't modified agreements. You start with a moral code, which eventually gets interpreted and altered, and people no longer knew what was moral. It thus got to be a confusion. People tried to enforce it, but the confusion increased. Finally, people dispersed and left the group and formed or entered other groups. There, they got new moral codes, which eventually got diluted. Time marched on and more confusion entered, etc., etc.

The cycle of action of civilizations is:

1.   An agreement on optimum conduct

2.   A disbanding of the group

3.   A formation of a new group with a new agreement on optimum conduct.

4.   A disintegration of this agreement.

The disintegration occurs because of the individuation that results from overts. Moral codes can also disintegrate when attacked by another code that gets imposed on them, e.g. by colonialists on native peoples.

One reason auditors find scientologists harder to audit than non-scientologists is that when you flub you've transgressed against the survival codes of the group. This is why the last two pages of HCOWW Form 3 straighten out old-time scientologists who natter about scientology. The most important code to the person is the one by which he is currently living. If you transgress against the code of your group, you tend to feel like an outsider. If the group is scientology, the transgression prevents one from making progress in auditing.

A transgression of a moral code separates the transgressor from free communication with the group. The seriousness of the transgression is monitored by the degree of cut comm and impossibility of communicating, which is accomplished by pretending to be a member of the group when he's transgressed. He individuates and thus the group disintegrates.

Another element of this is co-action: mutual action toward a common goal. The crew of a ship is no good until it has been through some common danger. A business group could get cohered if management let everyone in on the attacks against them; otherwise not. A group becomes a group when it encounters danger to its survival. The common denominator of the moral codes and of transgression is, "One must not injure the survival of a fellow group member."

Therefore a manager or leader of a group tends to be isolated from the group because of the occasional necessity for injuring the survival of a group member who has transgressed against the others. If the leader has led a slightly detached life so he hasn't been affected by the offender's transgressions, he commits an unmotivated overt when he kicks him out. He gets these undisclosed overts against ex-group members. He seldom tells the group why the ousted group member has to be ousted. because he thinks it will be too enturbulative. This is so widely true that man has accepted the idea of the loneliness of command as natural when it isn't.

You can change a group's leader, but if the new leader changes the mores of the group, there will be trouble. The leader of the group can destroy it. This leads to the popularity of such things as socialism and communism.

Why is the old soldier always degraded? It's not because the military in itself is bad; it's because he's a group member who is no longer part of the group. His old mores no longer apply. He is degraded not even because of his overts. He is degraded because when a person is no longer a part of a group, he feels automatically that he must have overts against it and was driven out of it, even if he didn't have any overts. Because the result exists, people feel that the crime must have existed. people will feel responsible for effects they haven't really caused. This is the same mechanism.

So you'll find yourself processing someone at times who feels he has tremendous overts against a group which you as an auditor can't find on the meter. It's simply because he is no longer a member of the group, whose purpose may have ended. He'll be very happy to get off his transgressions, because it will make his no longer being a member OK. It justifies the state he's in.

What actions are necessary to cohere a group? Co-action in the direction of survival with two or more people inevitably results in a social more. If one of the group dies, the other (in a group of two) will feel he must have transgressed and will be glad to find what his overts were so that it makes sense to be no longer a member. The co-action doesn't even have to be toward mutual survival. It can be opposed, e.g. two fighter pilots who are enemies. They will have a certain fellow-feeling, and if they withhold their failure to kill the other from their own groups, they've got a bit individuated from the groups, etc. So this gets complex, on the basis of agreement.

What is agreement? It is two or more people making the same postulate stick. If they go into mutual action toward survival, they have co-action, and they confuse one with another. They don't quite distinguish whose is whose, and they misown action in their vicinity. Engine drivers start sounding like engines after awhile. They can be un-identified by having them get the idea of mutual action with the motor.

That is the source of overt acts: you have mutual action with something else, you do something cruel to that with which you have mutual action, and you experience the somatic. That's the exact mechanics of the overt-motivator sequence. After you've had a lot of group co-action, you embark upon a cruel action to that with which you have co-acted, and you will get the somatic. The group dramatizes it with, "You must be punished for your act," but that's not part of the mechanism. Religionists who push the Golden Rule are forcing into existence something that already exists.

Overt/motivator sequences become very pronounced when cruel actions against one's group members ars engaged in while withholding. One is really a member of the group but engages in a cruel action against another member and tries to back out. Why does one try to withhold? It is because he doesn't want the effect of the co-action. He tries to individuate, disowns the co-action in an effort to avoid the motivator. He doesn't want the somatics of co-action that experience has taught him will inevitably occur. We're down to fundamentals of non-differentiation and identification. He identifies his action with every group member's action, so he withholds self in an effort to escape.

If you ask him to recognize his co-action with the group member he has injured -- the co-action prior to the overt, the overt will blow. The more commotion, action, withholds, and nonsense preceded his overt act, the more it will hang up and the more he will try to withhold it. He can only suffer from his overt because of former co-action. Because he is involved with mutual action toward survival, every time he has tried to back out of mutual action, he has sought to deny the mutuality of the action. He thinks he can avoid the overt-motivator sequence by denying it, so he individuates. You have to knock out the individuation before he can walk out. The action he takes to escape punishment is the action which settles in the punishment. Withholds and overts will become visible as you uncover the confusion and co-action which preceded the overt. When he blows the withhold, he can move again on the time track. Every time he withholds, he parks himself on the time track, so it eventually becomes one big Now, which is the Reactive Mind.

He has never really succeeded in individuating from any group he has belonged to. Therefore all groups newly formed are formed by transgressors, so if scientologists could get off that mechanism, they could form the first true group since the beginning of the universe!

One reason a withhold sticks on the track is that it's a no-action -- a no-motion point. When the PC has a picture where nothing is happening, get the earlier commotion or confusion, and the overt will show up.

One can withhold oneself as well as data, thoughts, or deeds or objects. Withhold of self is the commonest.

When you clear somebody, you clear the identities which the person has teamed up with and their withholds and now-I'm-supposed-to's.

There's a process that hits at this. Find something the person has identified with something. Tell him to think of a mutual action with first the one thing, then the other, and the identifications will spring apart. Fifteen or twenty other subjects will emerge as you go; don't Q and A with them; stay with the original two. A broader, simpler process would be, "Tell me a group you are no longer part of."

MISSED WITHHOLDS

1 JANUARY 1989

The one item Clearing Practitioners everywhere must get an even greater reality on is MISSED WITHHOLDS and the upsets they cause.

A Pc will be "ARC Breaky" in the presence of a Missed Withhold. A Pc can be dissatisfied because of MISSED WITHHOLDS.

WHAT IS A MISSED WITHHOLD?

A missed withhold is not just a withhold. Please burn that into a stone wall. A Missed Withhold is a withhold that existed, could have been picked up and was MISSED.

The mechanics of this are given in the lecture called THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD.

The person with complaints most often has MISSED WITHHOLDS. The person with entheta most often has MISSED WITHHOLDS. You don't need policies and diplomacy to handle these people. Policy and diplomacy will fail. You need expert clearing skill and a CB Meter and the person on the cans and that person's MISSED WITHHOLDS.

A MISSED WITHHOLD is a withhold that existed, was tapped and was not pulled. Hell hath no screams like a withhold scorned.

A MISSED WITHHOLD program would not be one where an Clearing Practitioner pulls a Pc's withholds. A MISSED WITHHOLD program would be where the Clearing Practitioner searched for and found when and where withholds had been available but had been MISSED.

The withhold need not have been asked for. It merely need have been available. And if it was not pulled, thereafter you have a nattery, combative, ARC Breaky or entheta-inclined person.

THIS is the only dangerous point in Clearing. This is the only thing which makes an occasional error in the phrase, "Any Clearing is better than no Clearing." That line is true with one exception. If a withhold were available but was missed, thereafter you have a bashed up case.

HOW TO CLEAR IT

In picking up Missed Withholds you don't ask for withholds, you ask for missed withholds.

Sample question:

"What withhold was missed on you?"

The Clearing Practitioner then proceeds to find out what it was and who missed it. Andthe CB Meter needle is cleaned of reaction at Sensitivity 16 on every such question.

And if the Pc considers it no perpetration, and can't conceive of perpetrations, you still have "didn't know." Example: "What didn't a Clearing Practitioner know in a Clearing session?"

SAMPLE MISSED WITHHOLD SESSION

Ask the Pc if anyone has ever missed a withhold on him (her) in a Clearing session. Clean it. Get all reactions off the needle at Sensitivity 16.

Then locate first clearing session Pc had. Flatten "What didn't that Clearing Practitioner know?" or "What didn't that Clearing Practitioner know about you?"

For good measure get the other ruds (ARC Break and PTP) in for that first session. In Clearing a Clearing Practitioner, also do the same thing for his or her first Pc. Example: "What didn't that Pc know about you?"

Then pick up any stuck session. Treat it exactly the same way (If you scan the Pc through all his Clearing ever, from the cleaned first session to present time, the Pc will stick in a session somewhere. Treat that session the same as the first session. You can scan again and again, finding the stuck sessions and get the missed withholds in that session and the ruds in as above).

Clean up all sessions you can find. And get what the Clearing Practitioner didn't know, what the Clearing Practitioner didn't know about the Pc, and for good measure, get in the other ruds.

Cleaning up an old session will suddenly give you all the latent gain in that session. It's worth having!

This can be extended to, "What didn't the group know about you?" for those who've had trouble with a group.

And it can be extended to any life area where the Pc has had trouble.

SUMMARY

If you clean up, as above, withholds that have been missed on any Pc or person, you will have any case flying.

This then is not just emergency data for use on flubbed intensives. It is vital technology that can do wonders for cases.

ON ANY CASE THAT HAS BEEN CLEARED FOR PART OF AN INTENSIVE, BEFORE GOING ON, THE CLEARING PRACTITIONER SHOULD SPEND SOME TIME LOCATING WITHHOLDS HE OR SHE MIGHT HAVE MISSED ON THAT PC.

Any Pc that is ending a week's Clearing should be carefully checked over for withholds that might have been missed.

Any Pc that is ending his or her intensive, who is not VGIs, should be most carefully checked out for missed withholds. This makes sudden Clearing gains.

Any case not up to recognizing perpetrations, will respond to "didn't know about you" when the case doesn't respond to "withhold."

Any student can be checked weekly for missed withholds.

Any person who is giving a Clearing Practitioner, the field, the Organization, a course

or group any trouble should be gotten hold of and checked for missed withholds.

It is provenly true on five continents that any other meter reaches only occasionally below the level of consciousness and the CB Meter reaches deeply and well. It is dangerous to clear without a meter, because then you really miss withholds. It is dangerous to clear without knowing how to really use a meter because of missing withholds. It is dangerous to clear with any other meter than a CB Meter. It is SAFE to clear if you can run a meter and if you use a CB Meter and if you pull all missed withholds and don't miss withholds in the first place.

Blow ups with Pcs can be caused by having missed a withhold whether you were using a meter or not, whether you were asking for withholds or not.

Just try it out the next time a Pc gets upset and you'll see.

MISSED AND PARTIALLY MISSED

30 DECEMBER 1988

We don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge.

We don't appeal to reason. Only to faith at the moment. When you have a reality on this, nothing will shake it and you'll no longer fail cases or fail in life. But, at the moment, it may not seem reasonable. So just try it, do it well and day will dawn at last.

What are these natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, lost course members and ineffective motions? They are reactivated but missed or partially missed withholds. If we could just teach you that and get you to get a good reality on that in your own Clearing, your activities would become smooth beyond belief.

It is true that ARC Breaks, present time problems and withholds all keep a session from occurring. And we must watch for them and clear them.

But behind all these is another button, applicable to each, which resolves each one. And that button is the reactivated but missed or partially missed withholds.

Life itself has imposed this button on us. It did not come into being with perpetration/withhold Clearing.

If you know about people or are supposed to know about people, then these people expect, unreasonably, that you know them through and through.

Real knowledge to the average person is only this: a knowledge of his or her withholds! That, horribly enough is the high tide of knowledge for the man in the street. If you know his withholds, if you know his crimes and acts, then you are smart. If you know his future you are moderately wise. And so we are persuaded toward mind reading and fortune telling.

All wisdom has this trap for those who would be wise.

Egocentric man believes all wisdom is wound up in knowing his misdemeanors.

If any wise man represents himself as wise and fails to discover what a person has done, that person goes into an antagonism or other misemotion toward the wise man. So they hang those who reactivate and yet who do not find out about their withholds.

This is an incredible piece of craziness. But it is observably true.

This is the WILD ANIMAL REACTION that makes Man a cousin to the beasts.

A good Clearing Practitioner can understand this. A bad one will stay afraid of it and won't use it.

The end rudiment for withholds for any session should be worded, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

Any ARC broken Pc can be asked, "What withhold have I missed on you?" Or, "Whathave I failed to find out about you?" Or, "What should I have known about you?"

A Clearing Practitioner who attempts to clear perpetrations but cannot read a meter is dangerous because he or she will miss withholds and the Pc may become very upset.

Use this as a stable datum: If the person is upset, somebody failed to find out what that person was sure they would find out.

A missed withhold is a "should have known."

The one reason a person leaves a group is "people failed to find out about him."

Missed Withholds

The toughest thing to do is to get the auditor to ask a simple question: "Have I missed a withhold on you?" It's utterly wild! There is even a case of someone letting someone die rather then saying it. There is even another way to say it: "Is there something I should have found out about you?" Auditors' failure to do this makes LRH feel like he is on an involuntary withhold. He feels like he is screaming in a soundproof room. People will actually let a PC sit there yapping and screaming, as though they, the auditor, had no responsibility for what is going on, when all they have to do is to ask for the missed withhold.

Missed withholds cause a lot of phenomena. Even GPM's are caused by missed withholds! "It is almost as if the basic principle of existence is: When existence is good, thou hast not missed a withhold, and when existence is bad, thou hath missed a withhold.... A missed withhold, properly asked for -- the meter cleaned -- remedies each one of these ... things and many more:"

1. Pc failing to make progress. We know now that PTP's stem from missed withholds, and they stop progress.

2. Pc critical of or angry at the Auditor. A non-withholdy PC won't get angry at an Auditor goof. It doesn't matter whether the auditor was guilty as charged (by the PC) or not. If the PC natters about it, he has had a withhold missed. It is not what is known -- the thing he is nattering about -- that is wrong with the PC. So you dropped his goals list into the spittoon. So what? If he says, "What the Hell are you doing?", he has had a withhold missed earlier in the session. Don't get reasonable about it. Complaints come from missed withholds. Get then pulled. Don't develop them; don't follow them, just pull them and get on with the session.

3. Pc refusing to talk to the auditor. This happens fifteen to twenty minutes before the blow. Refusal to talk is simply the realization that one can't, because one isn't being heard. Failing to acknowledge can stick the PC with an involuntary withhold that becomes missed. You see this in prayer. A guy talking to God is talking to a circuit if God is talking back. Sooner or later the circuit will blow and he will have a fantastic missed withhold. He will get angry at the Catholic Church, or whatever, when he suddenly gets no answer to his communication. One way to handle this is to acknowledge the living daylights out of the PC; another is to ask if you have missed a withhold.

4. Pc trying to leave session. This is a reverse flow of screaming at the auditor. You create a missed withhold with every failure to acknowledge PC originations or answers. Eventually the PC will scream at you. If you refuse to receive communication from the PC, you can create an ARC break.

5. Any needle pattern. If the needle is active regardless of what you are saying or even when you are not talking, the PC has a missed withhold. All needle patterns are caused by missed withholds. [See 6202C15 SHSpec-145 "New TRs", p. 240, below: "A [needle] pattern is a series of missed withholds culminating in a constantly active needle.' It is a dirty needle that can be wide or narrow. You can and should correct such a pattern. Get the ruds back in."]

6. Pc not desirous of being audited. This applies to anybody, not just pcs. But how could you miss a withhold on a stranger, when you haven't even talked to him? Well, you are the one who is supposed to know, [See p. 184, above, on what a non-scientologist thinks knowledge is: knowledge of his withholds.] so it is automatic. If your presence is good enough, you can get past all the argument and actually pull the withhold.

7. Pc boiling off. Mechanically, this is a stuck flow, but the reason for the stuck flow is a missed withhold. A PC even going a little fuzzy has a missed withhold, however minor it

may be.

8. Pc exhausted. This is caused by a missed withhold, as unlikely as it seems.

9. Pc feeling foggy at session end. This is like boil-off. You will get little nit-picky missed withholds, like, "I wanted to take a smoke break an hour ago and didn't mention it." For this, you can preface the missed withhold question with "In this session...".

10. Pc's havingness drops. A missed withhold is a not-reach, isn't it? That's no havingness. Havingness comes up when missed withholds are cleaned up.

11. Pc criticising auditor to others. Here, we are going out into life. Even if the auditor wasn't perceptive, didn't acknowledge, etc., he has still missed his withholds. We only learned this piece of tech fairly recently. And, by the way, people studying scientology think that every time we come out with something new, old things cease to be true, e.g. they think, "The ARC scale [See Scientology 0-8, pp. 102 and 103.] went out because we have just said that the Effects scale exists." This is not true.

12. Pc demanding redress of wrongs. He is saying that you should audit him for free or some such thing. It doesn't matter if everything he says is true. The solution isn't to be found in court but in missed withholds. You can ask, "What should the organization have found out about you?" to handle this.

13. Pc critical of organizations or people of scientology, or of scientology. These things can have enormous effects and yet be trivial, even laudable, in and of themselves. Say a guy donates money to a research foundation and finds out that it has been credited to his account instead. The foundation has missed a withhold on him right there. He has tried to say something and it hasn't been acknowledged. He has tried to communicate something, and the communication has not occurred. Every question you don't answer becomes a kissed withhold. Letter registrars should be aware of this. The missed withhold comes from the "They should know what I'm thinking.... They should have found out." You can end an entheta campaign by sending a detective around to investigate then. They figure you know, and the campaign stops because you have un-missed the withhold. Better out, really find out what as going on and publish the truth. Believe it or not, they won't attack you worse than before. They will leave you alone. The original attack wasn't based on your overts, no matter how many they may have been. It was based only on the withholds missed by you.

14. Lack of auditing results. This is a cousin to #1, above: no progress. Handling this assists organizations immensely. Cleaning up missed withholds gives auditing results, hence new pcs, etc.

15. Dissemination failures. "What have I failed to find out about you?" handles this.

The trouble is that it is too simple, so auditors miss it. The missed withhold extends into virtually every other area of scientology: TR-4, the communication formula, not-knowingness, PTP's, havingness, etc.

The Missed Missed Withhold

[LRH enumerates the many bulletins that have come out on missed withholds, starting in February, 1962. In spite of all this, the subject has not been duplicated by students. People keep picking up withholds, instead of missed withholds.]

All ARC breaks stem from missed withholds. "I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to be brave, squint up your eyes, and plunge." Get the missed withhold.

A missed withhold is a withhold that people nearly found out about but didn't. You want to find out what people almost found out. A withhold is something a PC did and isn't talking about. It is not missed unless someone nearly found out about it. The missed withhold has nothing to do with what the PC did or is doing. It's not the PC's action. It is the other person's action and the PC's wonder about it. It often shows up as a recurring withhold, one which the PC keeps giving you. The charge keeps coming up because of the restimulation, as yet unlocated, of someone possibly finding out. "A missed withhold has nothing to do with the PC. it is another person's action and the PC's wonder about it.... Forget that it is even a withhold.... You are looking for exact moments in the ... lifetime of this PC when somebody almost found out and he's never been sure since whether they did or they didn't. We don't care what they almost found out. We only care that they almost found out something. That is the address to a missed withhold. It's an other-person-than-the-PC's action. It's an other person's action." The PC is stuck in the unknownness of the uncertainty as to whether someone else knew. This blows when the PC spots it. A missed withhold is an overt and a withhold plus a mystery. The magnitude of the overt has nothing to do with its evaporation. The degree of mystery is what holds it in place. If you want to know what is sticking a thetan to something, look for the mystery sandwich. Even overts themselves wind up in the mystery of whether you should have done it. This causes withholding of further action. All things boil down to right conduct.

So when you ask the PC for missed withholds, be alert for whether the PC is giving you withholds or missed withholds. The number of withholds a person has on the whole track is undoubtedly staggering. You don't need to get them all to clear somebody. The whole anatomy of a game is O/W. You gather energies by the mechanism of O/W which result in solid-mass terminals, making a game possible, etc. In spite of all that, you don't have time enough to run nut all the PC's overts, even for one lifetime. General O/W does have its uses. It is useful for getting the PC into session and smoothing things out, but it is generally too lengthy. So to see a case go, "Sproing!", Ask the PC for "nearly-found-outs". "When I tell you to pick up a PC's missed withhold, I want you to pick up another persons action, not the PC's. And it is best characterized as 'nearly found out'.... You are running the almost-discovered track."

"You'll never see anybody quite so upset as somebody who has been just barely missed. Look at a pedestrian who was not hit," or a bear that is biting at a bullet [that just missed him], or an exam that you failed by one or two points. "It's the nearness of the miss" that counts. It is a mis-estimation of effort or thought. A thetan's main attention is on estimation of thought, effort, and look. He wants to know how much look is a look. His certainties are all based on proper estimation of thought, effort, look, etc. When an error is made here, it is upsetting. How much knowledge is knowingness? That is an estimation. How much emotion does it take to be emotional? Enough to create the desired effect. What is a proper symbol? Etc. You can estimate everything except how much mystery constitutes a mystery, because that is a mystery! You are now into the no-estimation band, and it is all mysterious. The not-knowingness of it is upsetting. Not-knowingness that is probably known is especially painful, because of the multiple not-know flows involved. Take a not-knowingness and play with it both ways: They knew, but they didn't or couldn't have known. You know they knew, but you know they didn't know. The four-way flows of a missed withhold are painful to a thetan. This is the stuff of which insanity is made. Insanity in the effort band of the know to mystery scale is "can't reach/must reach". Insanity in the mystery

band is a "did/didn't; must/mustn't know". That is what a missed withhold is and what it is doing to the PC. "It's just pure mystery mucilage, ... and the thetan will stick right to it."

Getting just the overt and withhold off, when there is an added mystery of a missed withhold, doesn't produce an as-isness of the section of track where the PC is stuck, because "the PC is not stuck with the overt [or] the withhold. The PC is stuck with the 'almost found out', so of course nothing as-ises [if you only get the O/W's] and you get a recurring withhold." You could get remarkable results running, "Get the idea of people nearly finding out about you." You could run this on three flows. This process would free up track that the PC had never seen before, but which had been right in front of his nose.

So when pulling missed withholds, it is not what the PC did which is of interest. When pulling withholds, "get the name, rank and serial number of the person who missed it. [I] couldn't care less what was missed. I don't want the PC's action. I want the PC's guess about the other guy." Get who the PC thinks might know, etc., etc. If you have gotten off his overts on something and he still feels a bit weird about it, you are apt to think that he must have more overts, so you keep after him for more. This will send him around the bend, since you are essentially cleaning a clean. You have to find:

1. Who nearly discovered the overt.

2. When.

3. How often. This is what is needed to complete the cycle that was started when the overt was almost discovered. Just as far as time is concerned, it is a mystery sandwich. The thetan is wondering whether a certain punitive track is going to happen. It doesn't, so that time doesn't exist. The result in the creation of mocked-up track that never actually appears on the track and therefore hangs up in time. Not dropping the other shoe is like producing a missed withhold.

So you don't ask, "What have we failed to find out about you?" ask, "What have we nearly found out about you and when did we nearly find it out?" The first gets withholds; the second gets missed withholds. The worst type of missed withhold is where the PC is asking himself, "Which one of my crimes did he (maybe) discover?"

ARC BREAKS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS

30 DECEMBER 1988

The primary error one can make in ARC Break handling is to handle the Pc with ARC Break procedure when the Pc really has a missed withhold.

Some Clearing Practitioners dislike pulling withholds. It is easier to confront the idea that a Pc has an ARC Break than the idea that the Pc has a withhold. Sometimes Pcs use the withhold question to damage the Clearing Practitioner by saying, "Yes, I have a withhold that everybody thinks you have a big nose."

ARC Break finding does work; however, when the Pc doesn't change despite skillful ARC Break handling, locating and indicating, it was a withhold in the first place.

The hardest Pc to handle is the Pc with missed withholds. They ARC Break, but you can't get the Pc out of it. The answer is: the Pc had a withhold all the time and that withhold is at the bottom of all these ARC Breaks.

ARC Breaks occur most frequently on people with missed withholds.

Therefore if a Pc can't be patched up easily or won't stay patched up on ARC Breaks, there must be basic withholds on the case. One then works hard on withholds with any and all the tools that we've got.

In short, the bottom of ARC Breaks can be a missed withhold.

An anti-social act done and then withheld sets the Pc up to become "an ARC Breaky Pc." The accurate statement is "the Pc is a withholdy type Pc that ARC Breaks alot."

If you have a Pc, then, who seems to have a lot of ARC Breaks, the Pc is a "withholdy Pc," not an "ARC Breaky Pc." Any Clearing Practitioner "miss" causes a Pc blow up. The Clearing Practitioner, by calling this Pc an "ARC Breaky Pc," is not using a description which leads to a resolution of the case as thousands of ARC Break assessments leave the case still liable to ARC Break. If you call such a case that ARC Breaks alot, a "withholdy Pc that ARC Breaks a lot" then you can solve the case. For all you have to do is work on withholds and more importantly missed withholds.

The actual way to handle a "withholdy Pc that ARC Breaks alot" after you've cooled off the last of his many ARC Breaks is:

1.   Get the Pc in comm.

2.   Get the Pc to look at what's going on with his sessions.

3.   Get the Pc to look at what's really bugging him.

4.   Get the Pc's willingness to give withholds up on a gradient.

5.   Bring the Pc to an understanding of what he's doing.

6.   Get the Pc's purpose in being cleared in plain view to him or her.

Whenever we see a sour-faced person who has been "trained" or is being "trained" we know one thing - there goes a Pc with lots of withholds. We also know, there is a Pc who ARC Breaks alot in session. And we also know his Clearing Practitioner is weak and flabby as a Clearing Practitioner. And we also know the Course Supervisor doesn't push the student

Clearing Practitioner into finding and clearing withholds and missed withholds.

One sour-faced student, one glance and we know all the above things, bang!

Clearing is a pleasure, but not when a Clearing Practitioner can't tell a withhold from an ARC Break and doesn't know that continual ARC Breaks are caused by missed withholds on the bottom of the chain.

In the case where you were wrong and the Pc really didn't have a withhold or missed withhold, you can always ask, "Am I demanding a withhold you haven't got?". If the Pc really didn't have a withhold, the Range Arm will blow down. If the Pc does have a withhold, the needle and Range Arm remain unchanged.

If the Pc's nattery or ARC Breaky condition continues despite finding and clearing ARC breaks, then of course it is obviously a withhold and usually a missed withhold.

CONTINUOUS PERPETRATIONS

The only case that will really "bug you" is the CONTINUOUS PERPETRATION case. Here's one that commits anti-social acts daily before, during and after Clearing. He's a nut. He'll never get better, his case always hangs up.

Unless you treat his continual perpetrations as a solution to a PTP and find what PTP he's trying to solve with these crazy perpetrations, you'll never solve this case.

BUT, don't go believing Clearing doesn't work when it meets an unchanging or continually misemotional Pc. Both of these types of people are loaded with withholds.

GENERALITIES WON'T DO

30 DECEMBER 1988

The most efficient way to upset a Pc is to leave a Perpetration-Withhold question unflat. This is remedied by occasionally asking, "Has any withhold been missed on you?" and getting what was missed, flattened.

The best way to "miss" on a Perpetration-Withhold question is to let the Pc indulge in generalities or "I thought..."

A Perpetration-Withhold question should be nulled at Sensitivity 16 as a final check or taken to a standard EP.

A withhold given as, "Oh, I got mad at them lots of times" should be pulled down to when and where and the first time "you got mad" and finally, "What did you do to them just before that?" Then you'll really get a null or standard EP.

The Pc who withholds somebody else's withholds and gives them as answers is a person who attracts attention by his wit. But he isn't helped when the Clearing Practitioner lets him do it.

Situation: You ask the Pc for a withhold about Joe. The Pc who says, "I heard that Joe..." should be asked right there, "What have you done to Joe? You. Just you." And it turns out he stole Joe's last girlfriend. But if the Clearing Practitioner had let this Pc go on and on about how the Pc had heard how Joe was this or that, the session would have gone on and on and the Range Arm up and up.

We have Pcs who use "withholds" to spread all manner of lies. We ask this Pc, "Have you ever done anything to the group?" The Pc says, "Well, I'm withholding that I heard..." or the Pc says, "Well, I thought some bitter thoughts about the group." Or the Pc says, "I was critical of the group when..." and we don't sail in and get WHAT THE PC DID, we can comfortably stretch a 5 minute item to a session or two.

If the Pc "heard" and the Pc "thought" and the Pc "said" in answer to a Perpetration-Withhold type question, the Pc's Reactive Bank is really saying, "I've got a crashing big withhold and if I can keep on fooling around by giving
critical thoughts, rumors, and what others did, you'll never get it." And if he gets away with it, the Clearing Practitioner has missed a withhold.

We only want to know what the Pc did, when he did it, what was the first time he did it and what he did just before that, and we'll nail it every time.

THE IRRESPONSIBLE PC

If you want to get withholds off an "irresponsible Pc" you sometimes can't ask what the Pc did or withheld and get a meter reaction.

This problem has bugged us for some time. We finally got very bright and realized that no matter whether the Pc thought it was a crime or not, he or she will answer up on "don'tknow" versions as follows:

Situation: "What have you done to your husband?" Pc's answer, "Nothing bad". CB Meter reaction, null. Now we know this Pc, through our noticing she is critical of her husband, has perpetrations on him. But she can take no responsibility for her own acts.

But she can take responsibility for his not knowing. She is making certain of that.

So we ask, "What have you done that your husband doesn't know about?"

And it takes an hour for her to spill it all, the quantity is so great. For the question releases the floodgates. The meter bangs around.

And with these withholds off, her responsibility comes up and she can take responsibility on the items.

This applies to any zone or area or terminal used in Perpetration-Withhold processing.

Situation: We are getting a lot of "I thought", "I heard", "They said", "They did" in answer to a question. We take the terminal or terminals involved and put them in this blank.

"What have you done that_____(doesn't)(don't) know about?"

And we can get the major perpetrations that lay under the blanket of "How bad everyone is but me."

This prevents your missing a Perpetration-Withhold question. This will shorten the labor involved in getting every question flat.

Every session of Perpetration-Withhold processing, you should ask the Pc in the end rudiments, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" in addition to, "Are you withholding anything" and "half truths, etc." If the Pc has a full EP, you would, of course, skip the end rudiments.

And if your Pc is very withholdy, you can insert, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" every few questions while doing Perpetration-Withhold processing.

Always clear up what was missed.

A Pc can be very upset by reason of a missed Perpetration-Withhold question.

ARC BREAKS - MISSED WITHHOLDS

11 DECEMBER 1989

MISSED WITHHOLDS ARE ONE OF THE MANY CAUSES ARC BREAKS.

Here are some of the manifestations cured by asking for missed withholds:

1.   Pc critical of or angry at Clearing Practitioner.

2.   Pc refusing to talk to Clearing Practitioner.

3.   Pc attempting to leave session.

4.   Pc not desirous of being cleared (or anybody not desirous of being cleared).

5.   Pc telling others the Clearing Practitioner is no good.

6.   Pc demanding redress of wrongs.

7.   Pc critical

8.   Lack of Clearing results.

THE COMMANDS

In case of any of the conditions 1 to 8 above, ask the Pc one of the following commands and CLEAN THE NEEDLE OF ALL INSTANT READS. Ask the exact question you asked the first time as a final test. The needle must be clean of all instant reaction before you can go on to anything else. It helps the Pc if each time the needle twitches, the Clearing Practitioner (on seeing the same read repeat while the Pc is looking) says, "That" or "There" quietly but only to help the Pc see what is twitching. One doesn't interrupt the Pc if he or she is already giving it. This prompting is the only use of latent reads - to help the Pc spot what reacted in the first place.

The commonest questions:

"In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?"

"In this session have I failed to find out something?"

"In this session is there something I don't know about you?"

The best beginning rudiments withhold question:

"Since the last session is there something you have done that I don't know about?"

More Withhold Questions:

"Has somebody failed to find out about you who should have?"

"Has anyone ever failed to find out something about you?"

"Is there something I failed to find out about you?"

"Have you ever successfully hidden something from a Clearing Practitioner?"

"Have you ever done something somebody failed to discover?"

"Have you ever evaded discovery in this lifetime?"

"Have you ever hidden successfully?"

"Has anyone ever failed to locate you?"

Most missed withholds clean up at once on two-way comm providing the Clearing Practitioner doesn't ask leading questions about what the Pc is saying. Two-way comm consists of asking for what the meter showed, acknowledging what the Pc said and checking the meter again with the missed withhold question. If Pc says, "I was mad at my wife," as an answer, just ack and check the meter with the missed withhold question. Don't say, "What was she doing?"

To get Clearing into a state of perfection, all we have to do is:

1.   Know our basics (Axioms, scales, codes, the fundamental theory about the Being and the mind);

2.   Know our practical (CEs, Model Session, CB Meter and Clearing routines).

Knowing these things, one also needs to know that all one has to do is clean the CB Meter of missed withholds to make any Pc sit up and get cleared smoothly, and all is as happy as a summer dream.

We are making all our own trouble. Our trouble is lack of precise application of our technology. We fail to apply it in our lives or sessions and try something bizarre and then we fail too. And with our CEs, Model Session and meters we are most of all failing to pick up and clean up MISSED WITHHOLDS.

We don't have to clean up all the withholds if we keep the missed withholds cleaned up.

Give a new Clearing Practitioner the order to clean up "missed withholds" and he or she invariably will start asking the Pc for withholds. That's a mistake. You ask the Pc for missed withholds. Why stir up new ones to be missed when you haven't cleaned up those already missed? Instead of putting out the fire, we pour on gunpowder. Why find more, you can then miss, when you haven't found those that have been missed?

Don't be so confounded reasonable about the Pc's complaints. Sure, they may all be true, BUT he's complaining only because withholds have been missed. Only then does the Pc complain bitterly without relief.

Whatever else you learn, learn and understand this please. Your Clearing future hangs on it. The fate of our technology hangs on it. Ask for missed withholds when sessions go wrong. Get the missed withholds when life goes wrong. Pick up the missed withholds when staffs go wrong. Only then can we win and grow. We're waiting for you to become technically perfect with CEs, Model Session, and the CB Meter, to be able to do Clearing techniques, and to learn to spot and pick up missed withholds.

MISSED WITHHOLDS, ASKING ABOUT

1 JANUARY 1989

Since a Pc can give a motivator response to the question, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and since a Pc's case can be worsened by permitting the Pc to get off motivators rather than perpetrations, the following must sometimes be used in asking for Missed Withholds:

"What have you done that I haven't found out about?"

Use "done", not "missed a withhold" in all Missed W/H questions if the Pc tends to give motivator type answers.

The prior confusion (the "done" or perpetration) aspect will be found to operate and the missed withhold will blow because the withhold came after the perpetration.

In short, use "done," not "missed withhold," in the rudiment question, if the Pc tends to give motivator answers, and stress doingness rather than withholdingness.

HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS

30 DECEMBER 1988

Clearing withholds in this bulletin is reduced to a rote formula which contains all the basic elements necessary to obtain a high case gain without missing any withholds.

These steps are a way to clear a withhold or missed withhold.

CLEARING PRACTITIONER OBJECTIVE

The Clearing Practitioner's objective is to get the Pc to look so that the Pc can tell the Clearing Practitioner.

The Clearing Practitioner's objective is not to get the Pc to tell the Clearing Practitioner. If the Pc is in session, the Pc will talk to the Clearing Practitioner. If the Pc is not in session, the Pc won't tell the Clearing Practitioner a withhold. A professional never has any trouble getting the Pc to tell her a withhold. She sometimes has trouble getting the Pc to find out about a withhold so the Pc can tell it to her. If the Pc will not tell the Clearing Practitioner a withhold (and the Pc knows it), the remedy is rudiments. One must always assume, and correctly, that if the Pc knows about it, the Pc will tell the Clearing Practitioner. The Clearing Practitioner's job is to get the Pc to find out so the Pc has something to tell. The chief Clearing Practitioner blunder in pulling withholds stems from the Clearing Practitioner assuming the Pc already knows when the Pc does not.

If used exactly, this system will let the Pc find out and let the Pc get all the charge off of a withhold as well as tell the Clearing Practitioner all about it.

Missing a withhold or not getting all of it should be the sole source of ARC breaks in this procedure.

Get a reality on this now. All trouble you have or have ever had or will ever have with ARC breaky Pcs stems only and wholly from having restimulated a withhold and, yet, having failed to pull it. The Pc never forgives this. This system steers you around the rock of missed withholds and their bombastic consequences.

WITHHOLD SYSTEM

This system has five parts:

0.   The Area or Difficulty being handled.

1.   What the withhold is.

2.   When the withhold occurred.

3.   All of the withhold.

4.   Who should have known about it.

Numbers (2) (3) and (4) are repeated over and over, each time testing (1) until (1) no longer reacts.

(2) (3) and (4) clear (1). (1) straightens out (0).

(0) is cleaned up by finding many (1)'s and (1) is straightened up by running (2) (3) and (4) many times.

These steps are called (0) Difficulty (1) What (2) When (3) All (4) Who. The Clearing Practitioner should memorize these as What, When, All and Who. The order is never varied. The questions are asked one after the other. None of them are repetitive questions.

USE A CB METER

The whole operation is done on a CB Meter. Use no other meter as other meters may read right electronically without reading mental reactions well enough.

Do this whole system and all questions at sensitivity 16.

THE QUESTIONS

0. The suitable question to find the Difficulty the Pc is having. Meter reads. The question might be, "Are you having any difficulties?". The Pc says, "My job" with a long fall on the meter. "Your job" is the item used.

1. What. "What are you withholding about your job?" Meter reads. PC answers with a withhold, large or small. Work this over until you get a perpetration. A perpetration is something the Pc actually did, not just an idea he had like, "I think my job stinks."

2. When. "When did that occur?" or "When did that happen?" or "What was the time of that?" Meter reads. Clearing Practitioner can date in a generality or precisely on meter. A generality is best at first, a precise dating on the meter can be used later in this sequence on the same w/h.

3. All. "Is that all of that?" or "Have you told me all of that?" Meter reads. Pc answers.

4. Who. "Who should have known about that?" or "Who didn't find out about that?" Meter reads. PC answers.

Now test (1) with the same question that got a read the first time. (The question for (1) is never varied on the same W/H.)

If needle still reads ask (2) again, then (3), then (4), getting as much data as possible on each. Then test (1) again. (1) is only tested, never worked over except by using (2), (3) and (4).

Continue this rotation until (1) cleans on needle and thus no longer reacts on a test.

Don't forget, if it is not cleaning up, you can go earlier similar and repeat the procedureabove with every withhold you find.

As needed, treat withholds you find (or have found) in this fashion always.

(Note: To practice with this system, take a withhold a Pc has given several times to you or you and other Clearing Practitioners. Treat the question that originally got it as (1) and clean it as above in this system. You will be amazed).

MISSED WITHHOLD RUNDOWN

30 DECEMBER 1988

1.   Complete a list on the following question:

"In this lifetime what have you done that you have withheld from someone?"

2.   On each withhold listed ask:

(a)   "When was it?"

(b)   "Where was it?"

(c)   "Who failed to find out about it?"

(d)   "Who nearly found out about it?"

(e)   "Who still doesn't know about it?"

Of course, if the withhold doesn't F/N, take it earlier similar with, "Is there an earlier similar withhold" and repeat steps (a) to (e) on each earlier similar withhold.

WITHHOLDS, OTHER PEOPLE'S

30 DECEMBER 1988

Now and then, quite rarely, you find a Clearing Practitioner who, in being cleared, "gets off" other people's withholds.

Example: "Yes, I have a withhold for you. Charley said you were insane."

Example: "Yes, I have a withhold. Mary Agnes has been in prison."

One also finds Pcs trying to do this occasionally.

The facts of the case are that it doesn't do anybody any good case-wise to "get off" other people's withholds. Essentially, a withhold, by definition, is something the Pc did that was a perpetration, which the Pc is withholding and thus keeping secret.

Thus, getting off things that somebody else did is not helpful to a case as such things aren't aberrative to the Pc.

But now let's look at this more closely.

If a Pc is "getting off" other people's withholds, HE HIMSELF MUST HAVE A CHAIN OF SIMILAR PERPETRATIONS AND WITHHOLDS that are his own. Getting off other people's withholds is then seen as a symptom of the Pc withholding similar actions of his own.

Let us then complete the two examples above:

Clearing Practitioner: "Do you have a withhold?"

Pc: "Charley said you were insane."

Clearing Practitioner, correctly: "Do you have a similar withhold of your own?"

Pc: "Er-uh--well actually I told the class you were crazy last month."

Clearing Practitioner: "Do you have a withhold?"

Pc: "Mary Agnes has been in prison."

Clearing Practitioner: "Ok. Do you have a similar withhold of your own?"

Pc: "Er-uh-well-I spent two years in a reform school and I've never told anybody."

You can assume that any Pc who is trying to get off withholds someone else had is a sort of an out-of-valence effort to avoid giving his own withholds. This applies, of course, to all perpetrations as well. Somebody giving other people'sperpetrations (which aren't aberrative to him) is actually failing to give perpetrations of his own which are aberrative to him.

This is the mechanism behind the fact that if a Pc is nattering about somebody, the Pc has perpetrations on that somebody. The natter is "other people's perpetrations." Getting these off does not help the Pc. Getting the Pc's off does.

Never be misled by a nattering Pc. Never be hooked into letting him get off other people's perpetrations and withholds.

RECURRING WITHHOLDS AND PERPETRATIONS

30 DECEMBER 1988

DEFINITION

The definition of a recurring withhold or perpetration is a perpetration or withhold that keeps coming up, repeats again, or shows up again. Before a recurring withhold or perpetration can be handled, it must be understood what one is. It is simply a withhold or perpetration that has already been gotten off and comes up again as an answer to an apparent reading withhold or perpetration question. The Pc may also become exasperated at having to get off a perpetration or withhold that has already been gotten off. The Pc may become upset, seem resigned or even protest a recurring perpetration or withhold. These are just a couple of the signs of a recurring withhold or perpetration.

METHODS AND HANDLINGS

1A.   When a Pc gets upset with a withhold being demanded that they already got off and they get into protest, then "there is obviously a false read as the Pc is getting off perpetrations already gotten off."

HANDLING: Check for false reads on perpetrations by asking the Pc what perpetration he or she has gotten off more than once and tracing it back with the Pc to what Clearing Practitioner or person said something read when it didn't (You could say, "Did I or some other Clearing Practitioner say something read when it didn't?"). You would clean all these up.

1B.   When number 1 above doesn't handle the recurring perpetration or withhold:

HANDLING: "Who said or seemed to infer something read when it didn't?" Then this would be dated to a blow and located to a blow.

2.   When a Pc gets upset with getting off withholds or perpetrations or mentions he or she felt his or her perpetrations weren't accepted.

HANDLING: Ask who wouldn't accept it E/S.

3.   The Pc has been invalidated for getting it off.

HANDLING: Find out who invalidated the Pc for getting off perpetrations or withholds. (Note any terminals for later handling on the PTS RUNDOWN.)

4.   The Pc has been punished for getting it off.

HANDLING: Find out who punished the Pc for getting off perpetrations and withholds.

Craftsmanship -- Fundamentals

A session missed withhold is anything the PC thought but didn't tell the auditor. That is fins for the session, but in prepchecking, you want meat, not skim milk. You want meaningful acts. It isn't necessarily antisocial or unmannerly acts like masturbation or nose-picking -- embarrassing acts -- that you are looking for. What you are looking for is overts, not just seamy withholds. There is a difference.

You can have a chain based on a not-knowingness, even if there is nothing there to be not-known. This isn't common. [Missed withhold of nothing.]

You never give up on the fundamentals. When the PC gets nattery, he has a missed withhold, whether the natter has any basis in reason or not. Not many. You audit by those. You should get your own reality on this. It can be crammed down your throat, but it is better understanding, since a stable datum fixed in by a confusion and not by understanding isn't available in a tight spot. This leads to auditing by being reasonable. Fundamentals are meant to be used. If I tell you something is a fundamental, don't just believe it is. Find out if it is or is not in your own universe. It will be, but if you never find this out for yourself, You will just keep going on by rote and ritual. If you do find this out for yourself, you will not need all your old stable data or superstitions.

"What I expect of an auditor is to audit the PC that is right there in front of him by the most fundamental fundamentals that he can command and understand." He will always get wins that way, and he won't be in a fog about any of it. He will be able to evaluate importances in the ritual.

In prepchecking, your "What" question will often miss the mark by a bit, because, after all, until you have done the prepcheck, you don't know exactly what the chain is. And if it is that unknown to the PC, how could you know all about it before you found out from the PC? Besides, all basic incidents must be unknown at least in part, or the chain would blow. Auditing by fundamentals, you know enough about the chain to formulate a "what" question that will come close enough to get what you need. As you go earlier, you find yourself asking about similar things, but not the exact same overt at the earlier time. You get a "what" question that describes the incident in workably general terms and go from there, hoping for the best. All you have to null is the incident that you got the "what" question from.

Prepchecking is not an exact activity. It depends on the PC in front of you. Because it is inexact, you must do it in the framework of total exactitude that is given in Model Session, TRs, metering -- all your fundamentals that must be known solidly. When you have that, you can play by ear with confidence and results.

Any craftsman can create the illusion of terrific ease and offhandedness. However, the common denominator of all great art is "a great ability to do a small detail." If one tries to shortcut the ability to do the details and just does the offhanded action, the result is slop. An auditor's tiny details consist of the meter, TRs, Model Session, etc.

How do you get to be a superb auditor? By knowing all these small parts perfectly. If you find yourself wondering about any one of them, you must practice, drill to get it straightened out. You can go over these items and ask yourself if any of them have been shaky in recent sessions, and work on what you find. Don't let embarrassment stop you from finding out [what needs to be worked on]. Only when you have mastered the detail will you be free to audit the PC in front of you. You won't be free to audit the PC in front of you as long as you are enslaved by "don't knows" among your auditing tools, because you get a chain of error that mounts in She session, based on the basic not-knowingness.

Don't think that you will get results, real, honest-to-God results, if you are anything less than a master of the craft. That is the discouraging point of auditing. The running of

repetitive processes without attention on the PC, hoping far the best, does make a lot of people well, as does engram running. This could get long-time auditors stuck in a win. But we haven't had techniques prior to 1962 that reached all cases. We have them now, but they require precision auditing, a master's touch. You have to find out that the technology we have does give the PC wins. You find that out by auditing and seeing the results. If you know all the parts: TRs, metering, Model Session, etc., then you can audit by fundamentals with confidence and ease. There is no more tension.

PROCLAMATION

POWER TO FORGIVE

1 JANUARY 1989

A minister who has been duly trained and certified in the Confessional procedure is invested with the power to forgive the admitted sins of an individual to whom she has administered full Confessional procedure.

Confessionals have been part and parcel of religion nearly as long as religion has existed.

It has been broadly recognized down through the ages that only when a person has owned up to his sins can he experience relief from the burden of guilt he carries because of them.

In Alethiology we have had, since the early years, procedures whereby an individual is able to confess his withholds and the perpetrations underlying them. We have long known that confessing one's perpetrations is the first step toward taking responsibility for them and seeking to make things right again.

The acknowledgement that follows each confession is an assurance to the person that his confession has been heard.

Such assurance helps him to end cycle on the bad things he has done and unsticks him from a preoccupation with his guilt over them to where he can then put his attention on constructive activities.

That is the purpose of any Confessional.

There is another element that further helps the individual to accomplish this.

Thus, at the end of a Confessional, when it has been fully completed, the Alethiology Clearing Practitioner who has administered the Confessional must inform the person that he is forgiven for the sins he just confessed, and that he is cleared of these sins and free of them.

The statement that is used is:

"By the power invested in me, any perpetrations and withholds you have fully and truthfully told me are forgiven."

ON ANY ADVERSE REACTION TO THE PROCLAMATION OF FORGIVENESS, GET THE REST OF THE WITHHOLD OR REPAIR THE WITHHOLD SESSION.

When the minister doing a Confessional or Repair List acknowledges the confession and informs the person that his confessed perpetrations and withholds are forgiven, the usual response is instant relief and VGIs. Rarely the person may react adversely, such as not being able to accept forgiveness or still feeling bad. This is because something has been missed. The person is still stuck in the shame, blame and regret of the unconfessed perpetration orwithhold and will not feel better until all is told. The minister encountering this in session must get the rest of the withhold or repair the withhold session. Should the person show this reaction later, outside of session, the folder must be turned in to the C/S to handle immediately.

An incomplete confession can be due to the following errors:

(a)   Did not tell "all."

(b)   Thought of one perpetration but told a different perpetration.

(c)   Told part of a withhold but not the rest.

(d)   A perpetration or withhold was not taken earlier similar to basic.

(e)   During the session a perpetration or withhold was restimulated but not asked for or gotten off (a withhold was missed).

(f)   There have been errors in the Confessional such as withholds gotten off more than once, false reads, out-CEs, invalidation, evaluation, etc., and these must be cleaned up.

The above categories and the Confessional Repair List are useful to a C/S in correcting any adverse reaction to the Power to Forgive Proclamation by ensuring that the person gets the full relief and VGIs which invariably accompany a complete confession and forgiveness.

TYPES OF CLEARING PRACTITIONERS

1 JANUARY 1989

It is time we spent time on improving Clearing skill.

We have the technology. We can make Clears with it, as you will find out. Our only remaining problem is getting it applied skillfully.

Looking over incoming students we find we have, roughly, two general categories of Clearing Practitioner, with many shades of grey between:

1.   The natural Clearing Practitioner.

2.   The dangerous Clearing Practitioner.

The natural Clearing Practitioner ties right into it and does a good job. He or she gets lots of bulletin and tape passes in ratio to flunks, absorbs data well and gets it into practice, does a passable job on a Pc even at the start of training, and improves case-wise rapidly under skilled training and Clearing. This is true of the Clears and releases that come on course as well as those who have had much less case gain prior to this training. These, the natural Clearing Practitioners, make up more than half the incoming students.

The other category we will call the "dangerous Clearing Practitioner." The severe examples of this category make up about 20% of the incoming students and are very detectable. In shades of grey the other 30% are also, at the start, to be placed in the category of "dangerous Clearing Practitioner" unless tightly supervised.

We have found out what makes a Pc suffer a deterioration of the Personality Profile and have found out why a dangerous Clearing Practitioner is dangerous; therefore, there are no barriers to our handling the matter as even the dangerous Clearing Practitioner, oddly enough, wants to be a good Clearing Practitioner but doesn't quite know how. Now we can fix it up.

The difference between a natural Clearing Practitioner and a dangerous Clearing Practitioner is not case level, as we have supposed, but a type of case.

The earliest observation on this came in training courses. About 1% of the students (say two students every course) could be counted on to be miserable if his or her Pc made gains and happy if the Pc was collapsing. This was an observation. What were these students trying to do? What did they think they should accomplish in a session? They are an extreme case of "dangerous Clearing Practitioner."

Here is how to detect a "dangerous Clearing Practitioner" in any shade of grey. Any Clearing Practitioner who:

(a)   cannot achieve results on a Pc,

(b)   who finds items slowly or not at all,

(c)   who gets low marks on tape tests,

(d)   who has a high flunk-to-pass ratio on taking tests for classification,

(e)   whose own case moves slowly,

(f)   who does not respond well to a "think" process,

(g)   who chops a Pc's comm,

(h)   who prevents a Pc from executing a Clearing command,

(i)   who obsessively changes process before one is flat,

(j)   who apologizes or explains why he or she got no results session after session,

(k)   who tries to make Pcs guilty,

(l)   who blames someone for processes not working,

(m)   whose Pcs are always ARC breaking, and/or

(n)   who will no longer Clear people at all, is suffering not from withholds but from the reverse of the withhold flow which is, "afraid to find out."

The person with withholds is afraid he or she will be found out. The other type of case may have withholds but the dominant block is exactly the reverse. Instead of being afraid he or she will be found out, the opposite type of case is afraid to find out or afraid of what he or she may find out. Thus it is a type of case that makes a dangerous Clearing Practitioner. He or she is afraid of finding out something from the Pc. Probably this case is the more usual in society, particularly those who never wish to do Clearing.

A person with withholds is afraid to be found out. Such a person has clearing difficulties as a Clearing Practitioner, of course, because of restraint on their own comm line. These difficulties sum up to an inability to speak during a session, going silent on the Pc, failures to ask how or what the Pc is doing. But this is not the dangerous Clearing Practitioner. The only dangerous thing a Clearing Practitioner can do is miss withholds and refuse to permit the Pc to execute Clearing commands. This alone will spin a Pc.

The dangerous Clearing Practitioner is not afraid to be found out (for who is questioning him or her while he or she is clearing?). The dangerous Clearing Practitioner is the Clearing Practitioner who is afraid to find out, afraid to be startled, afraid to discover something, afraid of what they will discover. This phobia prevents the "Clearing Practitioner" from flattening anything. This makes missed withholds, in the Pc he is clearing, a certainty. And missed withholds create ARC breaks.

All cases, of course, are somewhat leery of finding things out and so any old time Clearing Practitioner could have his quota of ARC breaks on his or her Pcs. But the dangerous Clearing Practitioner is neurotic on the subject and all his or her clearing is oriented around the necessity to avoid data for fear of discovering something unpleasant. As Clearing is based on finding data, such a Clearing Practitioner retrogresses a case rather than improves it. Such a Clearing Practitioner's own case moves slowly also as they fear to discover something unpleasant or frightening in the bank.

Today, the increased power of Clearing makes this factor far more important than it ever was before. Old processes could be done with minimal gain but without harm by such a Clearing Practitioner. Today, the factor of fear-of-discovery in a Clearing Practitioner makesthat Clearing Practitioner extremely dangerous to a Pc.

In prepchecking, this becomes obvious when a Clearing Practitioner will not actually clean up a button or skids over withholds, thus "completing" the case by leaving dozens of missed withholds and an accordingly miserable Pc.

The Pc is never permitted to reveal anything by the dangerous Clearing Practitioner. And so "Clearing" fails.

The remedies for the dangerous Clearing Practitioner, by class of process, are:

CLASS I- REPETITIVE PROCESS (RUN IN SEQUENCE)

REVELATION PROCESS XI

1.   What could you confront?

2.   What would you permit another to reveal?

3.   What might another confront?

4.   What might another permit you to reveal?

5.   What would you rather not confront?

6.   What would you rather not reveal?

7.   What might another hate to confront?

8.   What might another object to your revealing?

9.   What should be confronted?

10.   What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?

Class II - ZERO QUESTIONS

Have you ever prevented another from perceiving something?
(Other such Zero Questions are possible on the theme of fear-of-discovery.)

Class III

Who or What would be afraid to find out?

Who or What would prevent a discovery?

Who or What would startle someone?

Who or What would be dangerous for another to reveal?

SUPPRESSORS

1 JANUARY 1989

The discovery of the "other side of withholds" type of case, the person who is afraid to find out, brings to view the reason behind all slow gain cases.

Our first bulletin (TYPES OF CLEARING PRACTITIONERS) was directed at Clearing because good Clearing is, of course, our primary concern at the moment.

But let us not overlook the importance of this latest discovery. For here is our roughest case to clear, as well as our roughest Clearing Practitioner.

Every case has a little of "afraid to find out." So you may have taken what was said more personally than you should have. BUT everyone's Clearing can be improved, even the master Clearing Practitioner's, and adding a full willingness to find out one's other clearing qualities will certainly improve one's clearing ability.

Here is what a well known master Clearing Practitioner has to say about the "afraid to find out" phenomenon:

"My own 'afraid to find out' is minimal, and so I had no reality on it as a broadly held difficulty. Where I ran into it was in trying to account for differences amongst students and in Clearing Practitioners who sought to clear me. Some could, some couldn't. And this was odd because my ability to as-is bank is great; therefore, I should be easy to clear. But some could clear me and some couldn't. Two different Clearing Practitioners found me reacting as two different Pcs; therefore, there must have been another factor. It was my study of this and my effort to understand "bad Clearing" on myself as a Pc that gave the primary lead in. I made a very careful analysis of what the Clearing Practitioner was doing who couldn't or wouldn't clear me, an easy Pc. The answer, after many tries and much study of students, finally came down, crash, to the "afraid to find out" phenomena. Thus my first paper on this (TYPES OF CLEARING PRACTITIONERS) enters the problem as a problem of Clearing skill."

THE ROUGH PC

The characteristic of the rough Pc is not a Pc's tendency to ARC Break and scream, as we have tended to believe but something much more subtle.

The first observation of this must be credited to John Sanborn, Phoenix, 1954, who remarked in a Clearing Practitioner's conference, "Well, I don't know. I don't think this Pc is getting on (the one he was staff clearing). I keep waiting for him to say, 'Well, what do you know!' or 'Gosh!' or something like that and he just grinds on and on. I guess you'd call it 'No cognition' or something." John, with his slow, funny drawl, had put his finger on something definite.

The Pc who makes no gain is the Pc who will not as-is. Who will not confront. Who can be cleared forever without cognition on anything.

The fulminating or dramatizing Pc may or may not be a tough Pc. The psychologist has made this error. The agitated person is always to blame, never the quiet one. But the quiet one is quite often the much rougher case.

The person whose "thought has no effect on his or her bank" has been noticed for years. And now we have that person. This person is so afraid to find out that he or she will not permit anything to appear and therefore nothing will as-is, therefore, no cognition!

The grind case, the process forever case is an afraid to find out case.

We need a new word. We have withholds, meaning an unwillingness to disclose past action. We should probably call the opposite of a withhold, a "suppressor." A "suppressor" would be the impulse to forbid revelation in another. This of course, being a perpetration, reacts on one's own case as an impulse to keep oneself from finding out anything from the bank, and of course suppresses as well the release of one's own withholds, so it is more fundamental than a withhold. A "suppressor" is often considered "social conduct" in so far as one prevents things from being revealed which might embarrass or frighten others.

In all cases, a suppressor leads to suppression of memory and environment. It is suppression that is mainly overcome when you run havingness on a Pc. The Pc is willing to let things appear in the room (or to some degree becomes less unwilling to perceive them). The one command insanity eradicator, "Look around here and find something that is really real to you" (that sometimes made an insane person sane on one command) brought the person to discharge all danger from one item and let it reveal itself. Now, for any case, the finding of the suppressor mechanism again opens wider doors for havingness processes. "Look around here and find something you would permit to appear" would be a basic havingness process using the suppressor mechanism.

Thus we have a new, broad tool, even more important in half the cases than withholds.

Half the cases will run most rapidly on withholds; the other half most rapidly on suppressors. All cases will run somewhat on withholds and somewhat on suppressors, for all cases have both withholds and suppressors.

Withholds have been known about since 1950, suppressors have been wholly missing as a pat mechanism. Thus we are on very new and virgin research ground.

Additionally, adding to the data another symptom of a dangerous Clearing Practitioner {see bulletin "Types of Clearing Practitioners" for types (a) through (n)} would be:

(o) one who Q's and A's with a Pc and never faces up to the basic question asked but slides off of it as the Pc avoids it and also avoids it as a Clearing Practitioner. All dangerous Q and A is that action of the Clearing Practitioner which corresponds to the Pc's avoidance of a hot subject or item. If the Pc seeks to avoid by sliding off, the Clearing Practitioner, in his questions, also slides off. Also, the Clearing Practitioner invites the Pc to avoid by asking irrelevant questions that lead the Pc off a hot subject.

Also add (p) who fails to direct the Pc's attention. The Pc wants to cut and run, the Clearing Practitioner lets the Pc run.

Also add (q) who lets the Pc end processes or sessions on the Pc's own volition.

Also add (r) who will only run processes chosen by the Pc.

Also add (s) who gets no somatics during processing.

Also add (t) who cannot, himself, see pictures.

The common denominator of the dangerous Clearing Practitioner is "action which will forestall the revelation of any data."

Because the Clearing Practitioner is terrified of finding out anything, the whole concentration of the Clearing Practitioner is occupied with the suppression of anything a process may reveal.

Some Clearing Practitioners suppress only one type of person or case and clear others

passably. Husbands as Clearing Practitioners tend more to fear what wives may reveal to them and wives as Clearing Practitioners tend to suppress more what their husbands may reveal to them. Thus husband-wife teams would be more unsuccessful than other types of clearing teams as a general rule, but this is not invariable and is now curable if they exclusively run on each other only suppressor type processes.

ADD CLASS II:

REVELATION PROCESS X2

1. What wouldn't you want another to present?

2. What wouldn't another want you to present?

3. What have you presented?

4. What has another presented?

SESSION MUST-NOTS

1 JANUARY 1989

As a matter of record, the following session must-nots should be taught in letters of fire to any new Clearing Practitioner.

I

NEVER tell a Pc what his present time problem is.

The Pc's PTP is exactly and only what the Pc thinks or says it is.

To tell a Pc what his PTP is and then clear what the Clearing Practitioner said it was will, inevitably, ARC break the Pc.

This of course is under the heading of Evaluation in the Clearing Practitioner's Code and is one way of evaluating, a very serious way too.

II

NEVER set a goal for a Pc.

Don't set a session goal, a life or livingness goal or any other kind of a goal.

To tell a Pc what goals to set for a session or for life is to upset the Pc.

If you don't believe it, trace some Pc's upsets with her parents and you will find these usually trace back to the parents having set life and livingness goals for the child or youth.

The Pc's session and life and livingness goals are the Pc's and for a Clearing Practitioner to deny, refute, criticize or try to change them gives ARC Breaks; and for a Clearing Practitioner to dream up a brand new one for the Pc is especially evaluative.

III

NEVER tell a Pc what's wrong with him physically or assume that you know.

What's wrong with the Pc is whatever the Pc says or thinks is wrong physically.

This applies of course only to processing, for if you weren't clearing the person, and if the person had a sore foot and you found a splinter in it and told him so, it would be all right. But even in this case the person would have had to tell you he had a sore foot.

The main reason society has such a distaste for medical doctors is the MD's continuous "diagnosis" of things the person has not complained of. The violence of surgery, the destruction of lives by medical treatment rather educates people not to mention certain things. Instinctively, the patient knows that the treatment may leave him or her in much worsecondition and so sometimes hides things. For the medical doctor to cry "Aha" and tell the person he or she has some undefinable ill is to drive many into deep apathy and accounts for the high frequency of operational shock wherein the person just doesn't recover.

So NEVER tell a Pc what is physically wrong with him. If you suspect something is physically wrong that some known physical treatment might cure, send the Pc for a physical check-up just to be safe.

In the field of healing by mental or spiritual means, the Pc is sick because he or she has had a series of considerations about being sick. Deformity or illness, according to the tenets of mental healing, traces back to mentally created or re-created masses, engrams or ideas which can be either de-activated or erased completely. De-activation results in a temporary recovery for an indefinite period (which is nonetheless a recovery). Erasure results in permanent recovery.

The reality of the Clearing Practitioner is often violated by a Pc's statement of what ails him. The Pc is stone blind, but the Pc says he has "foot trouble." Obviously, from the Clearing Practitioner's viewpoint, it is blindness that troubles this Pc. BUT IF THE CLEARING PRACTITIONER TRIED TO CLEAR THE AILMENT THE PC HAS NOT OFFERED, AN ARC BREAK WILL OCCUR.

The Pc is ailing from what the Pc is ailing from, not from what the Clearing Practitioner selects.

For it is the statement of the Pc that is the first available lock on a chain of incidents and to refuse it is to cut the Pc's communication and to refuse the lock. After that you won't be able to help this Pc and that's that.

PERMITTED CLEARING PRACTITIONER STATEMENTS

There are, however, two areas where the Clearing Practitioner must make a statement to the Pc and assume the initiative.

These are in the PERPETRATION-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE and in the ARC BREAK.

A

When the Pc is critical of the Clearing Practitioner, the organization or any of many things in life, this is always a symptom of perpetrations priorly committed by the Pc.

The Pc is looking for motivators. These criticisms are simply justifications and nothing more.

This is a sweeping, fully embracive statement - and a true one. There are no criticisms in the absence of perpetrations committed earlier by the Pc.

It is quite permissible for the Clearing Practitioner to start looking for the perpetration, providing the Clearing Practitioner finds it and gets it stated by the Pc and, therefore, relieved.

But even here the Clearing Practitioner only states there is a perpetration. The ClearingPractitioner NEVER says what the perpetration is for that's evaluation.

You will be amazed at what the Pc considered was the perpetration. It is almost never what we would think it should be.

But also, a Clearing Practitioner, whose Pc is critical of him or her in session, who does not say "It sounds like you have a perpetration there. Let's find it." is being neglectful of his job.

The real test of a professional Clearing Practitioner, the test that separates the unskilled from the skilled is: CAN YOU GET A PERPETRATION OFF THE PC'S CASE WITHOUT ARC BREAKING THE PC AND YET GET IT OFF.

The nice balance between demanding the Pc get off a perpetration and getting it off and demanding the Pc get off a perpetration and failing to get it off, but ARC Breaking the Pc, is the border line between the unskilled and the professional.

If you demand it and don't do it, you'll ARC Break the Pc thoroughly. If you fail to demand it, for fear of an ARC Break, you'll have a lowered graph on the Pc. The pro demands the perpetration be gotten off only when necessary and plows on until it's gotten off and the Pc brightens up like a lighthouse. The amateur soul searches himself and struggles and fails in numerous ways - by demanding the wrong perpetration, by accepting a critical comment as a perpetration, by not asking at all, for fear of an ARC Break, by believing the Pc's criticism is deserved - all sorts of ways. And the amateur lowers the Pc's graph. An ARC Break is the only thing that will lower an APA graph.

Demanding a perpetration is not confined to just running P/W (PERPETRATION/WITHHOLD) or some similar process. It's a backbone Clearing tool that is used when it has to be used. And not used when it doesn't have to be.

The Clearing Practitioner must have understood the whole of the perpetration-motivator theory to use this intelligently.

B

Indicating by-passed charge (BPC) is a necessary Clearing Practitioner action which at first glance may seem evaluative.

However, the by-passed charge is never what the Pc says it was if the Pc is still ARC Broken.

By-passed Charge is, however, found by the meter and the Pc has actually got it or it wouldn't register. So the Pc has really volunteered it in a round-about way - first by acting like he or she has by-passed charge and then by bank reaction on the meter.

Always indicate to the Pc the by-passed charge you find on the meter.

Never tell a Pc what the by-passed charge is if you don't know.

If you find it on the meter, telling the Pc what the by-passed charge is, is not evaluation. Telling the Pc "what it is" without having found it, is evaluation of the worst sort.

MORE ON Q and A

1 JANUARY 1989

A great deal has been said about "Q and A-ing," but few Clearing Practitioners know exactly what it is and all Clearing Practitioners have done it without exception up to now.

With a better understanding of it, we can eradicate it. Q and A means ASKING A QUESTION ABOUT A PC'S ANSWER.

A SESSION IN WHICH THE CLEARING PRACTITIONER Q's and A's IS A SESSION FULL OF ARC BREAKS.

A SESSION WITHOUT Q and A IS A SMOOTH SESSION.

It is vital for all Clearing Practitioners to understand and use this material. The gain for the Pc is reduced enormously by Q and A and Clearing is not just stopped, it is prevented.

THREE TYPES OF Q AND A

There are 3 types of Q and A. They are:

1.   Double questioning.

2.   Changing because the Pc changes.

3.   Following the Pc's instructions.

THE DOUBLE QUESTION

This occurs on Rudiment Type questions and is wrong.

This is the chief Clearing Practitioner fault and must be cured.

The Clearing Practitioner asks a question. The Pc answers. The Clearing Practitioner asks a question about the answer.

This is not just wrong. It is the primary source of ARC Breaks and out rudiments. It is quite a discovery to get this revealed so simply, as we know that if it is understood, Clearing Practitioners will do it right.

The commonest example occurs in social concourse. We ask Joe, "How are you?" Joe says, "I've been ill." We say, "What with?" This may go in society but not in a Clearing session. To follow this pattern is fatal and can wipe out all gains.

Here is a wrong example:

Clearing Practitioner: "How are you?"

Pc: "Awful."

Clearing Practitioner: "What's wrong?"

In Clearing you just must never do this. All Clearing Practitioners have been doing it. And it's awful in its effect on the Pc.

Here is a right example:

Clearing Practitioner: "How are you?"

Pc: "Awful."

Clearing Practitioner: "Thank you."

Honest, as strange as this may seem and as much of a strain on your social machinery as you'll find it, there is no other way to handle it.

Below Level III, here is how the whole drill must go.

Clearing Practitioner: "Do you have a present time problem?"

Pc: "Yes" (or anything the Pc says).

Clearing Practitioner: "Thank you. Tell me about it."

Pc: "I had a fight with my wife last night."

Clearing Practitioner: "Thank you."

If it F/Ns, the Clearing Practitioner indicates the F/N; if it doesn't F/N, she takes it earlier similar.

The way Clearing Practitioners have been handling this is this way, very wrong:

Clearing Practitioner: "Do you have a present time problem?"

Pc: "I had a fight with my wife last night."

Clearing Practitioner: "What about?"

That is incorrect and a Q and A.

The rule is NEVER ASK A QUESTION ABOUT AN ANSWER IN CLEANING ANY RUDIMENT.

If the Pc gives you an answer, acknowledge it and get the Pc to tell you about it. Don't ever ask a question about the answer the Pc gave, no matter what the answer was.

Bluntly you cannot clean rudiments easily so long as you ask a question about a Pc's answer. You cannot expect the Pc to feel acknowledged and therefore you invite ARC Breaks. Further, you slow a session down and can wipe out all gain. You can even make the Pc worse.

If you want gains in a session, never Q and A on rudiments type questions.

Take what the Pc said. Ack it. Get the Pc to tell you about it. If no F/N, go earlier similar.

Apply this rule severely. Never deviate from it.

Handle all rudiments exactly in this way. You'll be amazed how rapidly the Pc gains if you do, and how easily the rudiments go in and stay in.

CHANGING BECAUSE THE PC CHANGES

This is a less common Clearing Practitioner fault, but it exists even so.

Changing a process because the Pc is changing is a breach of the Clearing Practitioner's Code. It is a flagrant Q and A.

Getting change to occur in the Pc often invites the Clearing Practitioner to change the process.

Some Clearing Practitioners change the process every time the Pc changes.

This is very cruel. It leaves the Pc hung in every process run.

It is the mark of the frantic, obsessive alter-ising Clearing Practitioner. The Clearing Practitioner's impatience is such that he or she cannot wait to flatten anything but must go on.

The idea of Clearing by the Range Arm was the method of preventing this.

SO LONG AS YOU HAVE RANGE ARM MOTION, CONTINUE THE PROCESS.

CHANGE THE PROCESS ONLY WHEN YOU HAVE RUN OUT ALL RANGE ARM MOTION.

Don't hang a Pc up in a thousand unflat processes. Flatten a process before you change.

FOLLOWING THE PC'S INSTRUCTIONS

There are "Clearing Practitioners" who look to the Pc for all their directions on how to handle the Pc's case.

As aberration is composed of unknowns, this results in the Pc's case never being touched. If the Pc only is saying what to do, then only the known areas of the Pc's case will get cleared.

A Pc can be asked for data on what's been done by other Clearing Practitioners and for data in general on his reactions to processes. To this degree one uses the Pc's data, when it is also checked on the meter and from other sources.

While clearing a master practitioner, Clearing Practitioners have now and then demanded of him, while he's being a Pc, instructions as to how to do certain steps in Clearing. This puts the poor Pc right out of session. Of course, snapping the Pc's attention toward the Clearing Practitioner is bad enough. But asking a Pc what to do, or following the Pc's directions as to what to do is to discard, in its entirety, session control. And the Pc will get worse in that session.

Don't consider the Pc a boob to be ignored, either. It's the Pc's session. But be competent enough at your craft to know what to do. And don't hate the Pc so much that you take his or her directions as to what to do next. It's fatal to any session.

SUMMARY

"Q and A" is slang. But the whole of Clearing results depends upon clearing right and not "Q and A-ing." If you Q and A your Pc will not achieve gains from Clearing. A session without ARC Breaks is a marvelous thing to give and receive.

THE CURE OF Q AND A

MAN'S DEADLIEST DISEASE

1 JANUARY 1989

Q and A is a dreadful malady which has to be cured before a Clearing Practitioner (or an Administrator) can get results.

THE DISEASE OF Q AND A

Here is an example:

Clearing Practitioner: "Look at that wall."

Pc: "My neck hurts."

Clearing Practitioner: "Has it been hurting long?"

Pc: "Every since I was in the Army."

Clearing Practitioner: "Are you in the Army now?"

Pc: "No but my father is."

Clearing Practitioner: "Have you been in comm with your father lately?"

Pc: "I miss him."

Clearing Practitioner: "That F/Ned, end of process."

The Clearing Practitioner has failed to note that he never got the Pc to look at the wall or that he has run the Pc all over the track flattening nothing, restimulating the Pc.

When a Clearing Practitioner asks a question and F/N's something else, he can mess a Pc up badly.

Another example:

Clearing Practitioner: "Do you have a withhold? That reads."

Pc: "It's just a 2D perversion. What I was really thinking about was the raise I got today."

Clearing Practitioner: "That F/Ns."

Pc (later in session): "You run a lousy group here. Charge too much....."

Clearing Practitioner, in mystery, caves in. THAT IS SIMPLY Q AND A IN ANOTHERCOAT.

ADMINISTRATIVE DELIRIUM

When an administrator Qs and As, it puts him straight down scale and into a spin.

Director: "You have a target here to move the file cases."

Staff Member: "I didn't understand some of the words."

Director: "We'll send you to Dave for some word clearing."

(Next day.) Director: "Did you go to Dave for word clearing?"

Staff Member: "I'm going to a doctor now."

Director: "How long have you been ill?"

Staff Member: "Since the Personnel Director was mean to me."

Director: "I'll go see about your personnel folder....."

And there goes the old soccer game. NO TARGET DONE BECAUSE THE EXECUTIVE COULD NOT HANDLE Q AND A.

C/S Q AND A

Case Supervisors (blush for the thought) are often guilty of Q and A.

Pc to Examiner: "I have a cold."

C/S: Run spot spots to cure his cold.

Pc to Clearing Practitioner: "It's really that I'm PTS to my Aunt."

C/S: Do PTS RD on Aunt.

Pc to Examiner: "It's really my foot."

C/S: Do touch assist on foot......

What C/S ever got a Pc's program done that way?

Where you find undone programs in folders, you find goofing Clearing Practitioners and Q and A type Case Supervisors.

THE CURE

There are definite cures for this dreadful and disgraceful malady. It must be handled as it results in bogged cases and blows, high and low range arms and very red faces when the gross income (GI) is counted.

The Cure is pretty tough and very few have courage enough to go through with it as their confront at the beginning is too low, what with their past drug incidents in reactivation or no CE's to begin with or no Supervisor when they took the Course.

The direct result of all this is a symptom known as "patty-cake." This is a child game of clapping hands and putting palms together and has meant, since 1950, NOT HANDLING CASES. The signs of patty-cake are a weak slouching posture, bags under the eyes, a bowed spine and hangdog pathetic eyes. The respiration is quick and panicky, the palms sweat and one starts at pins dropping in the next room.

However, for those students who really want to handles things, going through this program will help:

1.	This Bulletin	_____

2.	Other "Q and A" Bulletins	_____

3.	WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL Bulletin	_____

4.	ALL LEVELS Q & A Bulletin	_____

5.	PURIFICATION PROGRAM	_____

6.	CE 0 - 9 cycling through	_____

7.	A Complete DRUG RUNDOWN	_____

8.	THE ADMINISTRATIVE CE's	_____

9.	Full PRODUCT CLEARING	_____

For, of course, the reason the person Qs and As is that he can't confront or see the existing scene and so can't handle it.

Q and A is a DISEASE OF DODGING LIFE.

When such a person tries to get a question or program done and the other person says or does something else, the Q and A'er goes into a sort of overwhelm or cave-in and just rides along at the effect.

PEOPLE WHO GET THINGS DONE ARE AT CAUSE. When they are not, they Q and A.

Thus it IS a kind of illness which leads to chronic overwhelm. It is cured by making oneself strong enough in confront and handle things in life.

ANTI-Q AND A DRILL

2 JANUARY 1989

COMMAND: Basically "Put that (object) on my knee." (A book, piece of paper, ashtray, etc. can be used for object).

POSITION: Student and Coach sit facing each other at a comfortable distance and one at which the Coach can reach the Student's knee with ease.

PURPOSE:

(a)   To train Student in getting a PC to carry out a command using formal communication, NOT Tone 40.

(b)   To enable the Student to maintain his CEs while giving commands.

(c)   To train the Student to not get upset with a PC under formal Clearing.

MECHANICS: Coach selects a small object (book, ashtray etc) and holds it in his hand.

TRAINING EMPHASIS: Student is to get the Coach to place the object that he has in his hand on the knee of the Student. The Student may vary his commands as long as he maintains the Basic Intention (not Tone 40) to get the Coach to place the object on the Student's knee. The Student is not allowed to use any physical enforcement, only verbal commands. The Coach should try and get the Student to Q and A. He may say anything he wishes to try and get him off the track of getting the command executed. The Student may say what he wishes in order to get the command done, as long as it directly applies in getting the Coach to place the object on the student's knee.

The Coach gives breaks for:

(a)   Any communication not directly concerned with getting the command executed.

(b)   Previous CEs out.

(c)   Any upset demonstrated by Student.

OUT TECH

1 JANUARY 1989

The five Gross Clearing Errors (GCE's) are:

1.   Can't handle and read a CB Meter.

2.   Doesn't know and can't apply Technical data.

3.   Can't get and keep a Pc in session.

4.   Can't complete a Clearing cycle.

5.   Can't complete a repetitive Clearing cycle. (Including repeating a command long enough to flatten a process.)

These are the only errors one looks for in straightening up the Clearing of a Clearing Practitioner.

On the other hand, the six things that can be wrong with a Pc are:

1.   The Pc is Suppressive. If this is the case, get him or her out of your life and practice as soon as possible. This is the Clearing Practitioner destroyer and the cause of "burn out" in Clearing Practitioners.

2.   The Pc is a Potential Trouble Source. The Pc is ALWAYS a Potential Trouble Source if he rollercoasters and only finding the RIGHT suppressive will clean it up. No other action will. There are no other reasons for a Rollercoaster (loss of gain obtained in Clearing).

3.   The Pc is ARC Broken. One must never clear an ARC Broken Pc for even a minute but must locate and indicate the by-passed charge at once. To do otherwise will injure the Pc's case.

4.   The Pc has a present time problem of long duration which prevents good gain and sends the Pc into the Back Track.

5.   The Pc has a withhold (which has been missed) or a Misunderstood word. The only reasons a Pc is critical are a withhold or a misunderstood word, and there are NO reasons other than those. And in trying to locate a withhold, it is not a motivator done to the Pc but something the Pc has done.

6.   Continuing perpetrations hidden from view are the cause of no case gain (see number 1, Suppressive).

IN TECH

In getting in Tech, one need only locate in the Clearing Practitioner (or self as a Clearing Practitioner) which of the 5 GCE's are being committed and, in the Pc, which of the above 6 is out. There are no reasons exterior to the 11 given.

Getting Tech In requires getting the 5 in for Clearing Practitioners and the six in for Pcs and after that, watching the 5 for Clearing Practitioners and the 6 for Pcs while running standard processes.

If you look for other reasons, this is itself a gross goof. There are no others.

DIRTY NEEDLES

1 JANUARY 1989

If your Pc has a dirty needle, its cause is CUT ITSA or session ARC Break.

A Clearing Practitioner whose Basic Clearing is poor (who Qs and As, cuts Itsa, invalidates or evaluates, or who misses meter reads on rudiments or prepchecks or cleans cleans or misses withholds) can be spotted by his Pc's dirty needle. It's an invariable sign.

If the Pc has a dirty needle, the Basic Clearing of the Clearing Practitioner is bad.

That Clearing Practitioner ought to put one of his sessions on tape and listen to it and analyze it.

Oddly enough, a Clearing Practitioner could run perfect technique and yet be so poor in Basic Clearing that the Pc is always ARC Breaking. This would be spotted by the Pc's chronically dirty needle.

DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS

1 JANUARY 1989

Recently there have come up many instances of Clearing Practitioners asking odd non-process questions while "doing a process" and giving odd orders.

Example: While running a process a Clearing Practiioner also kept asking, "Is your attention on something else?"

This is, of course, a daffy thing to do. The Clearing Practitioner's CE's or metering go out. Then the Clearing Practitioner badgers the Pc with strange irrelevant questions. These are distractions, nothing more nor less. Not all the silly questions in the world substitute for lack of CE's and proper metering. A question like, "What else are you doing?" does not substitute for having by-passed an F/N or running an uncharged item.

Giving Orders that are not part of any process is very bad.

Example: Clearing Practitioner has missed a read, by-passed an F/N and goofing it generally. Pc gets dull, disinterested. Clearing Practitioner says, "Come back into the room!"

Evaluation fits into this set of bad tricks. Like, "You are really Clear and you know it. You just think you're aberrated," or "You'd better tell the Examiner you are really Clear," or "You are in pretty bad shape unless you can see the whole building." These, of course, are suppressive Evaluations.

In 1950 there was a general observation. ALL CLEARING PRACTITIONERS TALK TOO MUCH.

As we seem to be in a period of additive questions and comments, the observation can be made again.

MUZZLED Clearing means stating only the model session patter and commands using CEs. It ALWAYS gets the best results.

Do NOT add a lot of questions or orders to a session to cover up goofs in standard tech.

THE PRECLEAR MUST GET WINS

5 JANUARY 1989

In order to help anyone, much less make Clears, it is necessary to keep the Pc getting Clearing.

That sounds rather easy at first glance with all the dazzling goals that can be set for him or her. But in actual fact this is the only place Clearing Practitioners fall down.

Obviously you can't clear anybody, regardless of the techniques you have, if the Preclear won't keep on getting Clearing.

Give a Clearing Practitioner a Preclear to clear and Clearing Practitioners do very well indeed.

But when the Pc blows, or just doesn't turn up anymore, what then? That's the end of Clearing, isn't it?

THE BASIC PROBLEM

So the basic problem of making Clears is not getting Preclears to have Clearing. That's easy, really. It's getting Preclears to KEEP ON getting Clearing.

And that is where Clearing Practitioners, yes and Case Supervisors, fall down.

THE PRECLEAR MUST GET WINS

There are several reasons why it is hard to get a Pc to go on getting Clearing.

They add up under the heading, WINS.

If a Pc is not getting wins, then two things happen:

(a)   Since the Pc is not getting more able, the Pc is not earning fast enough or finding the additional time necessary to have Clearing; and

(b)   The goal of attaining a higher state is thwarted, and this ARC breaks the Pc.

If a Pc is getting wins, then:

(a)   The Pc gets more able, earns more or finds more wherewithal, and accomplishes more in a given period of time, leaving more time to use for Clearing: and

(b)   The minor upsets or discomforts which accompany even the smoothest Clearing are disregarded.

ECONOMICS

We are sorry to have to mention economics, but it plays a role. Operating in a society full of economic traps and snares, one has to have a solution to them or falter. And this applies to both the Clearing Practitioner and the Pc, regardless of whether there is any charge for the Clearing or not. Freedom from economic, acute duress means freedom to get cleared or clear, and such freedom is bought more easily by ability than chance. But a person's progress improves the person's control over things long before Clear is realized.

THE ROAD IS LONG

People don't realize how long the road is---they don't want to confront it. But there's an awful lot of aberration between an ordinary Being and a release, much less a Clear. A release is one who knows he isn't going to get worse.

The command of a release over his time and possessions, while not overwhelmingly great compared to a Clear's, is yet fabulous compared to one who was never cleared at all.

THE NECESSITY FOR WINS

So it is vitally necessary to keep the Pc getting wins, no matter how small, to keep the Pc getting cleared. This is sometimes hard to do. For the traps of life are always yawning for the person near the bottom. In fact the closer the person is to the bottom, the more likely he or she is to fall into one of life's snares.

Therefore, the closer to the start the person is, the more necessary it is to get him wins; for the easier it is for him to be thrown about in his routine daily existence. As catastrophe is simply arrived at just in day to day living while quite uncleared and as the person's answers in that state are not likely to have a high percentage of accuracy, the easier it is for him to get into a condition where he can't receive further Clearing for economic, social or other reasons. It takes win to surmount all that.

If a Being at any point on the route "blows (departs) for good," they've lost the final attainment, even if they did have benefits.

THE FUNDAMENTAL BASICS

Given any kind of competent training, the Clearing Practitioner must realize only these things:

(a)   If a Pc can be kept getting Clearing, the most dazzling results can be obtained by following The Life Expansion Chart;

(b)   If the Pc can't be kept clearing, no results can be obtained;

(c)   That the Pc who gets regular wins, acceptable to the Pc, will keep on being Cleared;

(d)   That the Pc who doesn't get his small quota of wins will blow; and

(e)   That the blowing Preclear is the only remaining, generally unhandled problem in any Clearing activity;

(f)   That the Preclear can be handled so as not to blow and to get wins.

THE PTP, PERPETRATION AND ARC BREAK

7 JANUARY 1989

The three general areas which prevent wins are:

(1)   The PTP (Present Time Problem)

(2)   The Perpetration (with its withholds of all varieties)

(3)   The ARC Break (a sudden drop in Affinity, Reality and Communication)

The following facts are some of the best substantiated facts in the whole of our technology.

THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

The presence of a Present Time Problem in a session, unless handled, will prevent all gain. If a "PTP" exists in the Preclear and you try to do Clearing on something else and ignore the PTP, the Preclear's Personality Profile will show no change, the Range Arm will not move well, the Preclear will not make his or her session goals and Clearing may eventually cease.

THE PERPETRATION

In the presence of a Perpetration undisclosed to the Clearing Practitioner and withheld from him, no matter how openly it may once have been done, the Clearing Communication Cycle between Clearing Practitioner and Preclear (as in CE's 0 to 4) cannot occur, as the Preclear is withholding. Therefore, nothing can vanish in the Preclear's reactive mind and Clearing becomes painful. The Personality Profile will not change, nor will the Range Arm move well.

THE ARC BREAK

In the presence of an ARC Break, the Preclear's attention is so distracted by the reactive charge that has been by-passed (restimulated, but overlooked by both the Preclear and the Clearing Practitioner) that the strain of splitting attention between the charge in the bank and the Clearing Practitioner will operate to worsen the Preclear's case, reduce the Preclear's Personality Profile graph and freeze the Range Arm of the CB Meter. Therefore, one must not pursue a Clearing cycle during an ARC Break, but may only locate and indicate the by-passed charge.

If the Clearing Practitioner doesn't handle these three things competently, the Preclear will eventually cease to be Cleared.

Recognizing that these three things, the PTP, the Perpetration and the ARC Break, are all that really forestall continue Clearing, it becomes necessary for the Clearing Practitioner to be skilled in handling these three things in order to be successful as a Clearing Practitioner.

There is no attempt here to give all the anatomy and ways of handling the three demons named above. The technology for handling all three is covered in the Level 0 to IV materials.

If a Preclear gets wins, he or she will get more Clearing. If he or she gets enough steady Clearing on the standard processes of the Life Expansion Chart, he or she will go all the way to Clear and beyond. Only the PTP, Perpetration and ARC Break can prevent the wins and cause the blows. So, to release, healing and Clear one has to be an expert on blows, their cause and cure.

LEVEL II

RUDIMENTS

1 JANUARY 1989

A rudiment is that which is used to get the Pc in shape to be cleared in that session.

For Clearing to take place at all the Pc must be in session which means:

1.   Willing to talk to the Clearing Practitioner.

2.   Interested in own case.

That is what you want to accomplish with rudiments. You want to set up the case to run by getting the rudiments in, not use the rudiments to run the case.

ARC breaks, present time problems (PTP) and withholds all keep a session from occurring. It is elementary Clearing knowledge that clearing over the top of an ARC break can reduce a Personality Profile graph, hang the Pc up in sessions or worsen his case. In the presence of PTP's, perpetrations and missed withholds (a reactivated, undisclosed perpetration) no gains can occur. Thus these are the rudiments we are most concerned with getting in at the beginning of a session so that Clearing with gains can occur.

GETTING THE F/N

If you know bank structure, you know it is necessary to find an earlier item if something does not release.

If a rud doesn't F/N, then there is an earlier (or an earlier, or an earlier) lock which is preventing it from F/Ning.

Thus we have the procedure and the rule:

IF A RUD READS, YOU ALWAYS TAKE IT EARLIER SIMILAR UNTIL IT F/N's.

The question used is:

"Is there an earlier similar (ARC Break) or (Problem) or (Missed Withhold)?"

If, at the beginning of a session, the rudiments are in (the needle is floating and the Pc is VGI's), the Clearing Practitioner goes directly into the major actions of the session. If not, the Clearing Practitioner must fly a rud or ruds, as ordered by the C/S. Even if the C/S does not order ruds to be flown, the Clearing Practitioner must "Fly a rud" if needed.

ARC BREAKS

ARC: A word from the initial letters of Affinity, Reality and Communication whichtogether equate to Understanding.

ARC BREAK: A sudden drop or cutting of one's affinity, reality or communication with someone or something. Upsets with people or things come about because of a lessening or a violent breaking apart of affinity, reality, communication or understanding.

While the earlier similar rule fully applies to ARC breaks, there is an additional action

taken in handling ARC breaks that enables the Pc to spot precisely what happened that resulted in the upset.

An ARC break is called an "A-R-C break" instead of an upset because, if one discovers which of the three points of understanding have been cut, one can bring about a rapid recovery in the person's state of mind.

You never clear over the top of an ARC break. But they can be slow-assessed (Listen Style) to locate which of the basic elements of ARC the charge is on.

Thus to handle an ARC break, you assess affinity, reality, communication and understanding to find which of these points the break occurred on.

Having determined that, you assess the item found (A or R or C or U) against the CDEINR Scale (curious, desired, enforced, inhibited, no and refused).

With this assessment the actual by-passed charge can be located and indicated even more accurately, thus enabling the Pc to blow it.

The assessment is done on every ARC break as you go earlier similar until the rudiment is in with F/N and VGIs.

The Pc must be thoroughly educated on this procedure before it is attempted.

The first rudiment question is :

1.   "Do you have an ARC break?"

2.   If there is an ARC break, get the data on it by saying, "Tell me about it."

3.   Find out by slow assessment (Listen Style) which point the ARC break occurred on:

       "Was that a break in

                     Affinity?

                     Reality?

                     Communication?

                     Understanding?

       You slow assess it Listen Style once (watching the meter) by asking the Pc each line. Let the Pc answer and get the read (or the largest read) on, say, communication.

4.   On each line that reads or gives a blowdown, check it with the Pc by asking: "How was as it a break in (Communication)?", etc. Let him tell you about it. Now determine whichline gave the biggest read or most Range Arm action (blow down). Then give it to him by indicating it, i.e., "I'd like to indicate that was a break in communication." If the Pc doesn't buy it, then find one that reads that he will accept. This is all being done Listen Style, so encourage the Pc to talk about it.

       PROVIDED THE RIGHT ITEM HAS BEEN GOTTEN, the Pc will brighten up, even if ever so slightly, on the very first assessment.

Note: On Step 4 the Pc may originate: "Yes, I guess it was communication but to me it's really more like a break in reality," for example. The wise Clearing Practitioner then acknowledges and indicates it was a break in "reality."

5. Taking the item found in Step 4 above, slow assess it Listen Style against the CDEINR Scale by asking the Pc directly:

Was it:

Curious about	(Communication)?
Desired	(Communication)?
Enforced	(Communication)?
Inhibited	(Communication)?
No	(Communication)?
Refused	(Communication)?

6. As in Steps 3 and 4 above, slow assess it once, get the biggest reading item (items) and check with the Pc:

"How was it (desired) communication?", etc. on each reading line.

Indicate the biggest reading item to the Pc. If the Pc doesn't buy it, give him another one that reads.

7. If no F/N at this point, you follow it earlier with the question: "Is there an earlier similar ARC break?"

8. Get the earlier similar ARC Break, get in ARCU, CDEINR, indicate. If no F/N, repeat Step 7, continue to go earlier, always using ARCU, CDEINR until you get an F/N.

When you get the F/N and VGI's you have it.

PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

PROBLEM: A conflict arising from two opposing intentions. It's one thing versus another thing; an intention-counter-intention that worries the Preclear.

PRESENT TIME PROBLEM: A special problem that exists in the physical universe now, on which the Pc has his attention fixed. Any set of circumstances that so engages the attention of the Preclear that he feels he should be doing something about it instead of being cleared.

A violation of "in-sessionness" occurs when the Pc's attention is fixed on some concern that is "right now" in the physical universe. The Pc's attention is "over there" and not on his case. If the Clearing Practitioner overlooks and doesn't handle the PTP, then the Pc is never in session, grows agitated, and eventually ARC breaks. And no gains are made because he is not in session.

The second rudiment question is:

1. "Do you have a present time problem?"

2. If there is a PTP, have the Pc tell you about it.

3. If no F/N take it earlier with the question:

   "Is there an earlier similar problem?"

4. Get the earlier problem and if no F/N, follow it earlier similar, earlier similar to F/N.

MISSED WITHHOLDS

PERPETRATION: An intentionally or unintentionally committed harmful act committed in an effort to solve a problem. An act of omission or commission which does the least good for the least number of dynamics. That thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you.

WITHHOLD: An undisclosed harmful (contra-survival) act. Something the Pc did that he isn't talking about.

MISSED WITHHOLD: An undisclosed contra-survival act which has been reactivated by another but not disclosed. This is a withhold which another person nearly found out about, leaving the person with the withhold in a state of wondering whether his hidden deed is known or not.

Missing a withhold or not getting all of it is one source of ARC breaks.

A missed withhold is observable by any of the following:

1. Pc not making progress.

2. Pc critical of, nattery or angry with the Clearing Practitioner, refusing to talk to the Clearing Practitioner, not desirous of being Cleared.

3. Pc going unconscious, exhausted, foggy at session end, dropped havingness.

4. Pc telling others the Clearing Practitioner is no good, demanding redress of wrongs, critical.

5. Lack of Clearing results, dissemination failures.

The Clearing Practitioner must not overlook any manifestations of a missed withhold.

Thus, if the Pc has a missed withhold you get it, get all of it using the system described below, and use the same system on each earlier similar missed withhold until you get the F/N.

The third rudiment question is:

1. "Has a withhold been missed?"

2. If you get a missed withhold, find out:

   (a) What was it?

   (b) When was it?

   (c) Is that all of the withhold?

(d)   WHO missed it?

(e)   What did (he/she) do to make you wonder whether or not (he/she) knew? or How did (he/she) miss it?

(f)   Who else missed it? (Repeat (e) above.)

Get another and another who missed it, using the Suppress button as necessary, and repeating (e) above.

Questions (a) through (e) are not rote questions and can be varied to suit the Preclear. For example, (e) How did (he/she) miss the withhold?

3.   Clean it to F/N, or if no F/N, take it earlier similar with the question:

"Is there an earlier similar missed withhold?"

4.   Handle each earlier similar missed withhold you get per Step 2, above, until you get an F/N.

SUPPRESS

If a rudiment doesn't read and is not F/Ning, put in the Suppress button, asking the Pc: "On the question 'Do you have an ARC break?' has anything been suppressed?" If it reads, take it and ask ARCU, CDEINR, earlier similar, etc.

Use Suppress in the same way for non-reading PTP and missed withhold rudiments.

FALSE

If the Pc protests, comments, or seems bewildered, put in the False button. The question used is:

"Has anyone said you had a _____ when you didn't have one?" Get who, what, when and take it earlier, if necessary, to F/N.

The "false" question is not rote and can be varied to suit the Pc. For example, "Did my asking you about ARC breaks cause you to think that you had an ARC break when you really didn't?".

Use the false button in the same way for PTP and Missed Withhold rudiments.

END PHENOMENA

In ruds when you've got your F/N and the charge has moved off, indicate the F/N. Don't push the Pc on for some other "EP." When the Pc F/Ns with VGI's, you've got it.

HIGH OR LOW RANGE ARM

Never try to fly ruds on a high or low Range Arm. Seeing a high or low Range Arm at session start, the Clearing Practitioner up to and including Class II does not start the session but sends the folder back to the C/S for a higher classed Clearing Practitioner to handle (after checking for and handling any false Range Arm). The C/S will order the required correction list to be done by a Clearing Practitioner of Class III or above.

HAVINGNESS

1 JANUARY 1989

This issue gives the beginning Clearing Practitioner a working knowledge of the subject of havingness.

HAVINGNESS: 1) that which permits the experience of mass and pressure; 2) the feeling that one owns or possesses; 3) can be simply defined as ARC with the environment; 4) the ability to duplicate that which one perceives, or to be willing to create a duplication of it; 5) the concept of being able to reach or not being prevented from reaching; 6) a process which is run when needed to stabilize the Pc in her/his present time environment after a process or at the end of session.

The above are all valid, but the final definition of havingness can be simply stated as:

1)   HAVINGNESS IS THE CONCEPT OF BEING ABLE TO REACH.

2)   NO-HAVINGNESS IS THE CONCEPT OF NOT BEING ABLE TO REACH.

Inherent in the ability to reach is the willingness and ability to duplicate. That which makes communication work in processes is the duplication part of the communication formula.

The position of a Being on the Scale of Emotions is determined by his ability to reach (and thus his willingness and ability to duplicate, to communicate and experience). The lower the position of the Being on this scale, the less willing he is to reach, communicate with and experience his present time environment, and the less willing he is to reach and duplicate events of the past or permit them to happen again.

This is remedied by Objective Havingness Processes. These are processes that deal with observing and touching objects in the room or in the environment. They are "look around" or physical contact processes, used to remedy a low or "no-havingness" condition.

Thus we find the Pc's Havingness Process early on in Clearing and use it to gain or remedy havingness before or after processes or at session end.

FINDING AND RUNNING THE PC'S HAVINGNESS PROCESS

The Preclear's Havingness Process is found with the meter by testing the various Havingness Processes in an exact way. You test the Havingness Processes using the needle with can squeezes from the Pc.

1.   Set the sensitivity for 1/3 of a dial drop when the Pc squeezes the cans. (See CB Meter Drill 4)

2.   Run 5 to 8 commands of the first Havingness Process from A LIST OF HAVINGNESS PROCESSES, with the Pc on the meter.

3.   Then have the Pc squeeze the cans, noting the size of the needle read now. If this second can squeeze shows the needle looser (wider swing) than the first can squeeze did, you've got it. The Havingness Process you've tested is the Havingness Process for the Preclear and may be used to remedy his havingness as necessary. If the Pc F/N's during this test just indicate the F/N and end off. You have found the right Havingness Process.

4.   If the process tightens the needle during the test, don't use it. Don't bridge off. Just get off the process now and test the next process, or the next, continuing until you find a Havingness Process that does loosen the needle and gives a wider swing. One will be found among the list of Havingness Processes in A LIST OF HAVINGNESS PROCESSES.

5.   The correct Havingness Process selected is then run 10 to 12 commands at a time, usually just before ending off a session.

A Pc's Havingness Process can change as the Pc changes with Clearing. If at some point in Clearing the Havingness Process which has been being used fails to get the desired results, simply re-test for a new Havingness Process, find one that works and use it.

Even the right Havingness Process, if run too much at one time (more than 10 or 20 commands) will start running the bank. It doesn't harm the Preclear but that isn't its use, as there are other processes that run the bank better.

The purpose of a Havingness Process is to get the Preclear stabilized in his environment.

A LIST OF HAVINGNESS PROCESSES

2 JANUARY 1989

The following Havingness Processes are tested in the order giving here. (Ref:HAVINGNESS)

H-1.   Look at that (room object).

H-2.   Point out something.

H-3.   Where is the (room object)? (Pc points)

H-4.   Look around here and find an object you are not in.

H-5.   Look around here and find something you can agree with.

H-6.   Point out something around here that is like something else.

H-7.   Where isn't that (indicated object)?

H-8.   What is that (indicated object) not duplicating?

H-9.   What scene could that (indicated object) be part of?

H-10. What bad activity is that (indicated object) not part of?

H-11. Look around here and find something you could have.

CONFRONT COMMANDS

2 JANUARY 1989

The Confront Process gets the Preclear to present time from areas on the Track where his attention was fixed by an earlier process. The Confront Process for the Preclear is located by Range Arm. If eight or ten commands of a Confront Process moves the Range Arm, that is the Confront Process for the Preclear to be used after other processes and before The Havingness Process is run. If the needle floats while testing a Confront Process, indicate the F/N and end off the process. That is the Preclear's Confront Process. If a Confront Process fails to move the Range Arm or F/N in 8 to 10 commands during testing, stop using it immediately and test the next one.

These are the Confront Processes in order of test:
(Where there are two commands, run them alternate repetitive)

C1. "Tell me something I am not doing to you."

C2. "What beingness could you confront?"
     "What beingness would you rather not confront?"

C3. "What beingness could others not confront?"

C4. "What unkind thought have you withheld?"

C5. "Tell me something you might not be confronting."

C6. "What would deter another?"
     "Where would you put it?"

C7. "What unconfrontable thing could you present?"

C8. "What is a bad object?"

C9. "Point out a place where you are not being confronted."

C10. "Recall somebody who was real to you."
      "Recall somebody you really liked."
      "Recall somebody you could really communicate with."

C11. "What intention failed?"

C12. "What would be betrayal?"

C13. "What would you rather not duplicate?"

C14. "What is understandable?"
      "What is understanding?"

C15. "What have you done?"
      "What have you withheld?"

C16. "What past beingness would best suit you?"
      "What past thing would best suit you?"

C17. "What could you confront?"
      "What would you rather not confront?"

LEVEL II

STYLES OF CLEARING

2 JANUARY 1989

There is a style of Clearing for each class. By style is meant a method or custom of performing actions.

A style is not really determined by the process being run so much. A style is how the Clearing Practitioner addresses his task.

Style is how the Clearing Practitioner Clears. The real expert can do them all, but only after he can do each one. Style is a mark of Class. It is not individual. In our meaning, it is a distinct way to handle the tools of Clearing.

LEVEL ZERO - LISTEN STYLE CLEARING

At Level 0 the style is Listen Style Clearing. Here the Clearing Practitioner is expected to listen to the Pc. The only skill necessary is listening to another person. As soon as it is ascertained that the Clearing Practitioner is listening (not just confronting or ignoring) the Clearing Practitioner can be checked out. The length of time a Clearing Practitioner can listen without tension or strain showing can be a factor. What the Pc does is not a factor considered in judging this style. Pcs, however, talk to a Clearing Practitioner who is really listening.

Here we have the highest point that old time mental therapies reached (when they did reach it), such as psycho-analysis, when they helped anyone. Mostly they were well below this, evaluating, invalidating, interrupting. Avoidance of these three things is what the instructor in this style should try to put across to the beginning student.

Listen Style should not be complicated by expecting more of the Clearing Practitioner than just this: Listen to the Pc without evaluating, invalidating or interrupting.

Adding on higher skills like "Is the Pc talking interestingly?" or even "Is the Pc talking" is no part of this style. When this Clearing Practitioner gets in trouble and the Pc won't talk or isn't interested, a higher classed Clearing Practitioner is called in, a new question given by the supervisor, etc.

It really isn't "Itsa," to be very technical. Itsa is the action of thePc saying "It's a this or It's a that." Getting the Pc to Itsa is quite beyond Listen Style Clearing Practitioners where the Pc won't. It's the Supervisor or the question given by the C/S that gets the Pc to Itsa.

The ability to listen, learned well, stays with the Clearing Practitioner up through the levels. One doesn't cease to use it even at Level IV. But one has to learn it somewhere and that's at Level Zero. So Listen Style Clearing is just listening. It thereafter adds into the other styles.

LEVEL ONE - MUZZLED STYLE CLEARING

This could also be called rote or repetitive style Clearing.

Muzzled Clearing has been with us many years. It is the stark total of CEs 0 to 4 and not anything else added.

It is called so because Clearing Practitioners too often added in comments, Qed and Aed, deviated, discussed and otherwise messed up a session. Muzzle meant a "muzzle was put

on them," figuratively speaking, so they would only state the Clearing command and acknowledge.

Repetitive Command Clearing, using CEs 0 to 4, at Level One is done completely muzzled.

This could be called Muzzled Repetitive Clearing Style but will be called "Muzzled Style" for the sake of brevity.

It has been a matter of long experience that Pcs who didn't make gains with the partially trained Clearing Practitioner who was permitted to "two way comm," did make gains the instant the Clearing Practitioner was muzzled: to wit, not permitted to do a thing but run the process, permitted to say nothing but the commands and acknowledge them and handle Pc originations by simple acknowledgement without any other question or comment.

At Level One we don't expect the Clearing Practitioner to do anything but state the command (or ask the question) with no variation, acknowledge the Pc's answer and handle the Pc originations by understanding and acknowledging what the Pc said.

Those processes used at Level One actually respond best to muzzled Clearing and worst to misguided efforts to "Two Way Comm."

Listen Style combines with Muzzled Style easily. But watch out that Level One sessions don't disintegrate to Level Zero.

Crisp, clean repetitive commands, muzzled, given and answered often are the road out - not Pc wanderings.

A Pc at this Level is instructed in exactly what is expected of him, exactly what the Clearing Practitioner will do. The Pc is even put through a few "do birds fly?" cycles until the Pc gets the idea. Then the processing works.

A Clearing Practitioner trying to do muzzled repetitive Clearing on a Pc who, through past "therapy experience" is rambling on and on is a sad sight. It means that control is out (or that the Pc never got above Level Zero).

It's the number of commands given and answered in a unit of Clearing time that gets gains. To that add the correctly chosen repetitive process and you have a release in short order, using the processes of this level.

To follow limp Listen Style with crisp, controlled Muzzled Style may be a shock. But they are each the lowest of the two families of Clearing styles - Totally Permissive and Totally Controlled. And they are so different that each is easy to learn with no confusion. It's been the lack of difference amongst styles that confuse the student into slopping about. Well, these two are different enough - Listen Style and Muzzled Style - to set anybody straight.

LEVEL TWO - GUIDING STYLE CLEARING

An old time Clearing Practitioner would have recognized this style under two separate names: (a) Two Way Comm and (b) Formal Clearing.

We condense these two old styles under one new name: Guiding Style Clearing.

One first guides the Pc by "two way comm" into some subject that has to be handled or into revealing what should be handled and then the Clearing Practitioner handles it with formal repetitive commands. Finding terminals to run by two way comm and then running those terminals with formal repetitive commands is Guiding Style Clearing.

Guiding Style Clearing becomes feasible only when a student can do Listen Style and Muzzled Style Clearing well.

Formerly the student who couldn't confront or duplicate a command took refuge in sloppy discussions with the Pc and called it Clearing or "Two Way Comm."

The first thing to know about Guiding Style is that one lets the Pc talk and Itsa without chop, but also gets the Pc steered into the proper subject and then gets the job done with repetitive commands.

We pre-suppose the Clearing Practitioner at this Level has had enough case gain to be able to occupy the viewpoint of the Clearing Practitioner and therefore to be able to observe the Pc. We also pre-suppose at this level that the Clearing Practitioner, being able to occupy a viewpoint, is therefore more self-determined, the two things being related. (One can only be self-determined when one can observe the actual situation before one, otherwise a being is delusion-determined or other-determined).

Thus in Guiding Style Clearing, the Clearing Practitioner is there to find out what's what from the Pc and then apply the needful remedy.

The result for the Pc is a far-reaching re-orientation in Life.

Thus the essentials of Guiding Style Clearing consist of Two Way Comm that steers the Pc into revealing a difficulty or terminal, followed by a repetitive process to handle what has been revealed.

One does expert CEs, but one may discuss things with the Pc, let the Pc talk and in general one Clears the Pc before one, establishing what that Pc needs and then doing it with crisp repetitive Clearing, but all the while alert to changes in the Pc.

At Level II one expects to handle a lot of chronic PTPs, perpetrations, ARC Breaks with Life but not session ARC Breaks. Handling session ARC Breaks is an assessment by needle action. Session ARC Breaks are sorted out by a higher classed Clearing Practitioner if they occur.

To get such things done (PTPs, perpetrations and other remedies) in the session the Clearing Practitioner must have a Pc "willing to talk to the Clearing Practitioner about his difficulties." That pre-supposes we have a Clearing Practitioner at this level who can ask questions, not repetitive, that guide the Pc into talking about the difficulty that needs to be handled.

Great command of CE 4 is the primary difference in CEs from Level I. One understands, when one doesn't by asking more questions, and by really acknowledging only when one has really understood it. Guided comm is the clue to control at this Level. One should easily guide the Pc's comm in and out and around without chopping the Pc or wasting session time. As soon as a Clearing Practitioner gets the idea of finite result or, that is to say, a specific and definite result expected, allthis is easy. Example: Pc has a PTP. Clearing Practitioner has to have the idea he is to locate and deactivate the PTP so Pc is not bothered about it (and isn't being driven to do something about it) as the finite result.

The Clearing Practitioner at II is trained to Clear the Pc before him, get the Pc into comm, guide the Pc toward data needful to choose a process and then to run the process necessary to resolve that thing found, usually by repetitive command and always by needle action and range arm. One listens, but only to what one has guided the Pc into. One runs repetitive commands with good CE 4. And one may search around for quite a while before one is satisfied he has the answer from the Pc needed to resolve a certain aspect of the Pc's case.

DEFINITION PROCESSES

2 JANUARY 1989

CLEARING STYLE

Each level has its own basic Clearing style.

The Clearing Style of Level II is Guiding Style. The Secondary Style is GUIDING SECONDARY STYLE or Guiding S Style and is used for Assists.

ASSISTS

An assist is different from formal Clearing in that it may lack any Model Session. Assists are normally short periods of Clearing but not always. We have seen a Touch Assist go on for months at the rate of 15 minutes a day, two or three days a week. And it may take hours to do a Touch Assist on an accident victim. What characterizes an assist is that it may be done rapidly, informally and anywhere.

"Coffee Shop Clearing" isn't really an assist as it is usually done over coffee too casually to be dignified by the name of Clearing. The Pc is never informed at all of the existence of a session.

The Pc in an assist is, however, informed of the fact and the assist is begun by "This is the Assist" and ended by a "That's it," so an assist, like a session, has a beginning and an end.

The Clearing Practitioner's Code is observed in giving an assist and the Clearing Comm Cycle is used.

As a Clearing Practitioner one sets out in an assist to accomplish a specific thing for the Pc, like relieve a hurt finger or make the ache in the leg better. So an assist also has a very definite purpose.

SECONDARY STYLES

Every level has a different primary formal STYLE OF CLEARING. But sometimes in actual sessions or particularly in assists, this style is altered slightly for special purposes. The style altered for assists is called a SECONDARY STYLE. It doesn't mean that the primary style of the level is merely loosely done. It means that it is done in a precise but different way to accomplish assists. This variation is called the SECONDARY STYLE of that level.

REMEDIES

A remedy is a means of removing or relieving any bad condition in a Preclear. For example, if a Preclear is not progressing well in Clearing and we know that she has had a recent history of taking water-insoluble drugs such as marijuana and LSD which hang up in the fatty tissue, we would put the Preclear on a Sweat Out or Purification Program. Since the Purification Program is a remedy, we would not recommend it unless normal Clearing was not working as it should. There are many other remedies and some are used in regular Clearingsessions, but only to remedy a bad condition and never as a part of normal Grade Chart actions.

A remedy is not necessarily an assist and is often done in regular session. It is the remedy itself which determines what Clearing style is used to administer it. Some remedies, as well as being used in regular sessions, can also be used as assists.

In short, that a process exists as a remedy has no bearing on whether it is used in an assist or a Model Session.

GUIDING STYLE

The essence of Guiding Style is:

1.   Locate what's awry with the Pc;

2.   Run a Repetitive Process to handle what's found in 1.

In essence - steer the Pc into disclosing something that needs Clearing and then clear it.

GUIDING SECONDARY STYLE

Guiding Secondary Style differs from proper Guiding Style and is done by:

1.   Steering the Pc toward revealing something or something revealed;

2.   Handling it with Itsa.

Guiding Secondary Style differs from Guiding Style only in that Guiding Secondary Style handles the matter by Steer + Itsa. Guiding Style Proper handles the matter with Steer + Repetitive Process.

DEFINITIONS PROCESSING

The first thing to know about DEFINITION PROCESSES is that they are separate and distinct and stand by themselves as processes.

Definition Processes, when used as remedies, are normally processed by Guiding Secondary Style.

Both Remedies A and B are Guiding Secondary Style in their normal application.

These two remedies are A and B because they handle a major source of worry to Supervisors and Clearing Practitioners.

One would expect them to be used by a Class II Clearing Practitioner.

One would expect the assist to last 10 or 15 minutes, perhaps more, but less than a regular session would take.

One would expect that any student in a class that was getting nowhere would be handled by the Instructor with Guiding Secondary Style using Remedies A and B as precision processes.

REMEDY A PATTER

One would not expect the person or student in trouble to be turned over to another student for handling. It's too fast, sharp and easy to handle that trouble oneself if one is Class II or above and far more certain. You can do it while you'd be finding another student to do the Clearing. It would be uneconomical in terms of time not to just do it right then - no meter - leaning up against a desk.

The Instructor's or Clearing Practitioner's patter would be something like what

follows.

Instructor: "I am going to give you a short assist. All right, what word haven't you understood in your materials?"

Student: "Well, it's 'Preclear'."

Instructor: "Okay, explain what it means to you."

Student: "Er, Ah, I'm not really sure. Maybe, it's like a patient."

Instructor: "Okay, I see you are having trouble, so let's look that up in the dictionary."

The student looks up "Preclear" in the dictionary and reads the definition aloud to the Instructor. Any words not understood in the definition are also cleared.

Instructor: "Fine. Now what does 'Preclear' mean?"

Student: "It means a person who is learning more about herself through Clearing. She is not yet a Clear but is progressing toward the state of Clear by releasing and erasing the Reactive Mind through the process of Clearing. I had that mixed up with the idea of a patient and now I see they are totally different things. Thanks!"

In between the above total of Clearing patter, the student may have hemmed and hawed and argued and cognited. But one just steered the Pc straight along the subject selected and got it cleared and cleaned up. If the student gave a glib text book definition after challenging the word Preclear, we wouldn't buy it but would give the student a Demo Kit and say "Demonstrate that." And then carry on as it developed.

And that would be Remedy A.

You see it is precision Clearing and is a process and does have a Clearing Style. And it works like a dream.

You see this is Steer + Itsa as to its style. It addressed the immediate subject.

What makes a Remedy A is not that it handles definitions, but that it handles the immediate subject under discussion or study.

REMEDY B

Remedy B seeks out and handles a former subject, conceived to be similar to the immediate subject, in order to clear up misunderstandings in the immediate subject or condition.

Remedy B, run on some person or student, would simply be a bit more complex than Remedy A, as Remedy B looks into the past.

A person has a continuous confusion with the subject being studied. The confusion doesn't clear up by clearing words in the present subject as in Remedy A. So one runs Remedy B like this:

Instructor: "I'm going to give you an assist. Okay?"

Student: "Sounds okay with me."

Instructor: "All right. What subject were you studying before this one (Alethiology)?

I'm sure there is one."

Student: "I studied Spiritualism for awhile."

Instructor: "Okay. Spiritualism. Fine. What word in Spiritualism didn't you understand? You can think of it."

Student: "Well, I never did understand what they meant by 'Ectoplasm'."

Instructor: "Good. 'Ectoplasm.' All right, there's a dictionary over there, let's look it up."

Student: (after looking in the dictionary) "It doesn't have 'Ectoplasm'."

Instructor: "I'm sorry it doesn't give the Spiritualist definition. Look up the root word 'ecto' and tell me what that means."

Student: (after looking up 'ecto') "It says 'ecto' means 'outside'."

Instructor: "Let's look up 'plasm'."

Student: (after looking up 'plasm') "It means 'mound or covering'."

Instructor: "Now put the two roots together and tell me what you get."

Student: "'Ecto' means 'outside' and 'plasm' means 'mound or covering'." (Note: You don't always break up words into parts for definitions in A & B Remedies.)

Instructor: "Yes, I've got that. Now what do you think Spiritualists meant by it?"

Student: "I think it means sheets over people that make ghosts. I can recall being scared as a child."

Instructor: "All right, what did the Spiritualists mean, then?"

Student: "The Spiritualist uses it to describe a gooey substance that encases people. Gee, that's really strange. I got it. Beings don't need to be cased in goo. I had 'ectoplasm' mixed up with engrams and I see that Beings don't have to have a bank and can be naked."

Student departs still cogniting. She enters Alethiology, now having left Spiritualism on the Back Track. She doesn't keep on trying to make every bulletin studied solve "ectoplasm," the buried misunderstood word that kept her stuck in Spiritualism.

THE PURPOSE OF DEFINITIONS PROCESSING

The purpose of definitions processing is fast Clearing of stuck ideas (jammed thinking because of a misunderstood or misapplied datums) preventing someone from getting on with Clearing.

Remedies A and B are not always used as assists. They are also used in regular sessions. But when so used they are always used with Guiding Secondary Style - Steer+Itsa.

As a comment, when people who seek to liken something to Alethiology ("Oh, Alethiology is like Christian Science.") don't say, "Oh no! It isn't like Christian Science!" Just nod and mark them for a fast assist or a session the moment the chance offers, if they seem very disinterested or aloof when asked to do a Course.

We have made definitions easy for them by compiling a dictionary.

But those that don't come along at all are so wound up in some past subject they can't hear or think when that earlier subject is reactivated. And that earlier subject is held down only by some word or phrase she didn't grasp. She is stuck in some earlier practice she got stuck in with mis-definition of its terms.

You see, we inherit some of the effects of the whole dullness of Man when we seek to open the prison door and say, "Look. Sunshine in the fields. Walk out." Some, who need Remedy B say: "Oh no! The last time somebody scratched the wall that way I got stupider." Why say, "Hey, I'm not scratching the wall. I'm opening the gate?" Why bother? She can't hear you. But she can hear Remedy B as an assist. That's the channel to her comprehension.

UNDERSTANDING

When a person can't understand something and yet goes on facing up to it, she gets into a "problems situation" with it. There it is over there, yet she can't make it out.

Infrequently (fortunately for us) the Being halts time right there. Anything she conceives to be similar presented to her view is the puzzle itself (A=A=A).

And she goes stupid. This happens rarely in the life of one Being, but it happens to many people.

Thus there aren't many such messes in one person in one lifetime that have to be cleaned up. But there are a few in many people.

The cycle of Mis-definition is:

1.   didn't grasp a word, then

2.   didn't understand a principle or theory, then

3.   became different from it, commits and committed perpetrations against it, then

4.   restrained herself or was restrained from committing those perpetrations, then

5.   being on a withhold (inflow), pulled in a motivator.

Not every word somebody didn't grasp was followed by a principle or theory. A perpetration was not committed every time this happened. Not every perpetration committed was restrained. So no motivator was pulled in.

But when it did happen, it raised havoc with the mentality of the Being when he was trying to think about what seem to be similar subjects.

You see, you are looking at the basic incident and its locks, as in a chain of incidents. The charge that is apparently on the lock in present time is actually only in the basic incident. The locks borrow the charge of the basic incident and are not themselves causing anything. So you have a basic misunderstood word which then charges up the whole subject as a lock; then a subject charging up similar subjects as locks.

Every nattery or non-progressing student or Pc is hung up in the above 1,2,3,4,5 cycle. And every such student or Pc has a misdefined word at the bottom of that pile. If the condition is new and temporary, it's a word that's awry. If natter, no progress, etc, is continuous and doesn't cease when all is explained or when attempts to straighten up words

fail, then it's an earlier subject at fault. Hence, Remedies A and B. Hence Guiding Secondary Style. Hence, the fact that Definition Processes are processes. And VITAL processes they are if one wants a smooth organization, a smooth record of wins on all Pcs and if one wants to bring people into Alethiology who seem to want to stay out.

Of course these Remedies A and B are early-on processes, to be cleared by a Class II or above on a Level 0 or I Pc or student; however, some in Alethiology, as of this date, are studying slowly or progressing poorly because A and B haven't been applied.

Now that Instructors and Clearing Practitioners have this data, there will be nobody at upper levels with his or her definitions dangling.

WHAT IS A TERMINAL?

2 JANUARY 1989

TERMINAL 1. Anything that can receive, relay or send a communication.

A terminal is anything that can receive, relay or send a communication. So a "person" is a terminal because a "person" can receive a communication, relay a communication or send a communication. Any living entity could be considered to be a terminal as long as it can receive, relay or send a communication.

Examples of specific terminals:

Mary
Pete
Harry
My Brother
My Father
My Mother
Quincy

Examples of general terminals:

A Waitress
A Truck Driver
A Teacher
A Brother
A Father
A Mother
A Dog

Terminals are used in Clearing processes to run out the charge on specific persons and living entities or generalized persons and living entities.

For example:

How could you help Harry? (specific)

or

How could you help a teacher? (general)

The Guiding Style Clearing of Level II is used to first locate a specific or general terminal. The terminal is then run in a process to reduce or eliminate the charge connected with that terminal.

This is a very powerful technique as it allows a Clearing Practitioner to rapidly clean up specific areas of a Preclear's case.

CB METER DRILL - FINDING TERMINALS

2 APRIL 1988

PURPOSE: To train the Level II student Clearing Practitioner to ask for terminals, to write down the terminal and to note the meter reaction when the terminal is given by the coach.

POSITION: The coach and the student Clearing Practitioner sit facing each other across a table with a CB Meter set up and the coach holding the electrodes.

COMMANDS: The Prepared Assessment Sheets (no actual or made up items are allowed) The items on the lists are not actual terminals; they are just "pretend" terminals.

TRAINING EMPHASIS: The student Clearing Practitioner writes the question from The Prepared Assessment Sheet at the top of a sheet of blank paper and then places The Prepared Assessment Sheet on the table in front of the coach. The coach should not look at the list of items at this point. The student Clearing Practitioner clears the question with the coach and notes any read on clearing the question. The student Clearing Practitioner then asks the coach the question with the intention of getting items from the coach. The coach gives items from The Prepared Assessment list somewhat slowly, comm lagging once in a while and mostly looking off into space. The coach should, however, give an item at the same instant that she sees it on the list so as not to spoil the read. If the coach looks at an item and doesn't say it at exactly the same instant, the read will probably occur at that instant and then not occur when the coach says it at a later time. The coach can give items randomly from the list but should instantaneously say the item as she sees it. As the coach says an item from the list, the Clearing Practitioner should write down the item and any read (SF, F, LF or LFBD) that goes along with the item. The coach should, once in while, comment on the item, express pretended emotion about it, laugh, grimace or repeat the item to make the drill more realistic. Any read which occurs while the coach's attention is on the item is a valid read and should be noted down by the Clearing Practitioner. In the case of an LFBD, the amount of blowdown should be noted (a BD is any downward motion of the range arm). The coach should give 10 to 15 items off the list. The coach then gives a "That's it" and checks out the student Clearing Practitioner's list of items and reads. The Clearing Practitioner should have noted whether the original question read or not and should have a list of all the items given with reads noted or an "X" where no read occurred. The coach then asks the student Clearing Practitioner to number the items in the order they would be run in a process (largest read first).

No "Breaks" are given during the drill. Once the drill is complete, the coach gives the student Clearing Practitioner a critique of her performance. If the student's performance of the drill is not perfect, the student is given any necessary correction and then she does the drill again. This is continued until the student has mastered the process of finding terminals.

SOME HELP TERMINALS

2 JANUARY 1989

A simple and very satisfactory way of making a Pc happy and getting results is to ask the Pc what he thinks is wrong with him and run whatever the Pc says - providing it's a terminal - in a general form. If it's not a terminal, get the Pc to convert it to one.

Example:

Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

Pc: "My wife."

Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run 'a wife'."

Example:

Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

Pc: "I'm impatient."

Clearing Practitioner: "Can you think of somebody who was impatient?"

Pc: "My Father."

Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run 'a Father'."

Example:

Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

Pc: "Well, I think I'm hostile."

Clearing Practitioner: "Did you ever know a hostile person?"

Pc: "Yes."

Clearing Practitioner: "Who was it?"
Pc: "George James."

Clearing Practitioner: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one)
"What was George James?":

Pc: "A loafer!"

Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run help on 'a loafer,' all right?"

Pc: "Fine."

When "a loafer" is flat, we do the same assessment again and as above get a new general terminal.

Use a process such as Concept Help.

Example:

"Think of a father helping you."

"Think of you helping a father."

"Think of another helping a father."

"Think of a father helping another."

"Think of a father helping a father." etc.

Run as a bracket. Flatten it to a standard EP.

TERMINALS BY PROFESSION

There are, however, some "professional" terminals you can run which do a lot for a case.

Find out what the Pc was professionally in this lifetime and sort out what this profession helped as a terminal and run that.

Then run the beingness of the Pc in this lifetime as a terminal and you've cleaned up a lot of track.

Always use, of course, the general form of any terminal - not "Aunt Agatha," but "an Aunt." Not "the works mechanic at Pullman," but "a works mechanic or a mechanic." The less adjectives the better.

This does much for a case, and rapidly.

ASSESSMENT BY GOALS

A Pc also gets very happy when you run a beingness the Pc is trying to be or hopes to be or even once hoped to be.

For instance, the Pc wants to be a painter or wishes he were a painter or wishes he could be a painter again. Fine, just run help on "a painter."

The Pc wanted to be a singer. Run it as "a singer."

The Pc is trying to be a good housewife or husband. Fine, run "a housewife" or "a husband."

In short, when you explore why the Pc wants to be processed, the Pc often is either trying to correct something wrong (see above) or is trying to be something. Your assessment is done when you establish either item and the Pc will recover, do better and be very happy with you.

RECOVERY OF PAST SKILLS

When a Pc is getting processed to be able to recall Sanskrit or German, if the Pc is in good shape by reason of other processing as above, you can recover it for him by finding out what spoke the language or had the skill and run Concept Help on that terminal.

Example: (typical) Pc can't learn Spanish, desperately wants to learn Spanish. The CB Meter will tell you it's perpetrations against the Spanish people (or Iberians) that occludes it all. Perpetrations, run, will improve the situation but help, neglecting the perpetrations, should

recover the ability. Run "Think of helping the Spanish people (or Spain or whatever falls hardest on the perpetrations)" and "Think of the Spanish people (or the same as first command terminal) helping you." Level it off with a version of Continuous Confront ("What could you continue to confront?" "What would you rather not continue to confront?") and Havingness on the room and you should attain the goal.

It is better to use a general form of a terminal than a specific form. It is better to run "a young man" than "Joe." If the CB Meter reacts to "Joe," it is best to find out what Joe is to the Pc and find the general form that reacts most ("a friend," "a young man," "a bum") and run that, not "Joe." You will get a lot further than when you run a specific close to present time terminal. The general terminal covers a lot more Time Track than the specific terminal.

HELP AS A VALENCE PROBLEM

When people become a valence, they do so for at least two reasons.

First and probably most powerful: The Being takes a valence that he believes will help others or the universe.

Second and more mechanical: The Being tries to help something or somebody and fails and the valence is the last stage of his effort to mock up a picture of the thing and try to help it.

There are various aspects of all this, more and more complicated. The Being becomes a man to help women. He fails and thinks men can't help women. So he restrains men, or he becomes a woman.

A Being can become very involved with his computations on the subject of help. One black case is seeking to help others by absorbing all the blackness in the universe!

Find out what a Being is being and find out what that beingness helps and not helps by using the command, "What would _____ help?" "What would _____ not help?"

There is a general form which discovers beingnesses in a Pc. Find out something, very general, that a Pc is trying to help or has failed to help and run "What would help _____?" "What would not help _____? on the discovered terminal. The Pc will get cognitions on what he or she is being and what the Pc is restraining himself or herself from being.

FINISHING OFF A DIFFICULT TERMINAL

Any terminal that is being run on help that was unwisely chosen can be eased off byrunning old perpetration/withhold, alternate confront or responsibility. This is a crude way out, but it will work.

In any event, any session should contain general alternate confront "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" and havingness. These take the edge off unwise choices, any rough Clearing and make the case feel better.

If the Pc can do it, responsibility can get a Pc off a bad choice fastest (If a Pc can run responsibility easily). The Pc has to be running rather well in general before it can be attempted. The Pcs who are suffering because of a Clearing Practitioner choice of wrong terminal usually can't run responsibility easily. Of course, successful Clearing is "What you can get away with."

The best and smoothest way to get off a bogged terminal is alternate confront. But when the case has, afterwards, been run on other terminals with help, it's best to go back and clean up the ones that earlier bogged with help by running more help on them.

GENERAL PROCESSES

The general processes which assist help sessions are alternate confront - "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" and Havingness, "Look around here and find something you could have." All this is Clearing Practitioner judgment established by observation. As it is the help in any form that does it, remember to use help to advance the case, and alternate confront and havingness to make the Pc feel good.

Alternate confront and havingness improve a case, of course, but are long, long hauls as processes if we think of clearing with them.

Help on near present time terminals is far less effective in clearing than help on general terminals that have a lot of Track to them. As general terminals can get a Pc into a lot of confusion on the Back Track, alternate confront and havingness keep the Pc from getting too bogged to run.

There are lots of help processes and many ways to run them. They all win to some degree. It is the amount of help run rather than the number of terminals cleared that clears the case.

Help basically sheds valences. Therefore havingness is needed. But the valences are all "can't-haves" because valences keep the Pc from being herself. So when the valence is off at last havingness of the Pc comes up.

Almost any brand of help run long enough by good Clearing should clear a Pc.

Hence, the idea is to run help and run it flat.

CONCEPT HELP

2 JANUARY 1989

Concept processing is very old (1953). The original version of concepts goes:

> "Get the idea of _____."

The modern version of Concept Help goes:

> "Think of a _____helping you."

> "Think of you helping a _____."

Five-way Concept Help would go:

(a) "Think of _____helping you"

(b) "Think of you helping a _____."

(c) "Think of a _____helping others"

(d) "Think of others helping a _____."

(e) "Think of a _____helping a _____."

Concept Help has the value of being below, in its effect, the level of articulate thought which, of course, means that it bangs away at reactive thought.

Just exercising a Pc in thinking a command is of great value. People have more trouble with creating than thinking and concepts are more in kind with confronting than with creating. Making a Pc invent answers is, of course, right on his worst button; therefore, Concept Help goes a long way on a case. It is quite unlimited, no matter what form is run, so long as some attention is paid to flow direction. (A flow run too long in one direction gets stuck and gives anaten-unconsciousness, remember?).

FINDING HELP TERMINALS

2 JANUARY 1989

Here is a summary of questions which are useful in finding help terminals (Ref:SOME HELP TERMINALS).

"What do you think is wrong with you?"

"What has been your main profession this lifetime?"

"What did (does) that profession help?"

"What are you being?"

"What do you think your main beingness is?"

"What have you wanted to be?"

"What have you wanted to do?"

"What have you wanted to have?"

"What have you wanted to learn?"

"What have you wanted to know?"

"What are your goals?"

"What beingness helps others?"

"What are you trying to help?"

"What have you failed to help?"

"When you first got involved in Clearing, what were you trying to achieve?"

These questions and others will help you to find terminals for processes like Concept Help.

THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP

2 JANUARY 1989

Help does not flatten very easily on a late specific terminal. Of course, this is true of all processes. But help is a peculiar process and is slower on late terminals than other buttons, and here is why.

Help resolves cases because it is the basis of all association, and as you know, association leads to identification. And identification is the basis of all mental upsets. The action of help is not aberrative. The failure to help is what does it, or the lack of things to help; however, all valences and all identification stem from this button and no other. Now do lights dawn and bells ring? Help is the button which, if run, settles all difficulties with association and identification and all problems of beingness (valence).

Thus there is something peculiar about help which is not true of any other button. Any help run is a gain, even if it is left wholly bogged with a half hour comm lag. All bits of help run are chewing away at all tangles of identification. So chew away and to the Dickens with it. Any help run is better than no help run. And because the Pc is a bundle of aberrated identifications, any help run untangles some of him.

So that's why help run in any old way will sooner or later make the grade. But this is no reason to believe there are not also smart ways to run help.

Any late specific terminal, being so confounded far from basic-basic on the Time Track, runs tough and endlessly; therefore, as always, it is better to run general terminals than to run specific terminals; however, in the case of a PTP you can go ahead if you have to run help on the PTP personnel, but as soon as the edge is off the PTP, for Heaven's sake shift to the general form of the specific terminals you have been running, and flatten those a lot or a little.

It is almost a waste of time to run specific terminals, but still you must run things that are real to the Pc, and if only yesterday was real to him, then you are stuck with running the Pc on later terminals or even specific terminals.

A much faster way to run help is sorting out real terminals on a CB Meter. Do an assessment on the Pc using help and the dynamics, and find a person or thing that is entirely "off dynamic" ("off dynamic" means it doesn't fit on that dynamic, like a cat on the 8th dynamic) and that the Pc can't imagine helping. This is a trigger to a case. Unusual results happen very fast.

Another way to go about this is a simple questioning of the Pc on the subject of his dislikes. Watch the meter and when you get a silly reaction on a dislike, like a rock slam or a heavy drop or a sudden theta bop, then pick this out, make a general form out of it that registers like the first one he mentioned, and run that on the Pc. This is a rather loose and sometimes misleading assessment. But remember that all help run leads to untangling all buttons and so it is a perfectly good approach, and as the Pc gets run on something, he is awful darn sure he ought to be run on, he is often very happy and co-operative in this. Whereas, on a dynamic assessment he is made intensely curious as he didn't know he was aberrated on what you found out. In other words just asking the Pc what is wrong with him, getting it into a general form that registers on the meter and running Help P/W or concept help on it, is good,reasonably fast processing. It is better than assessing for just a terminal that drops or for a specific late terminal that drops.

As a comment it should be noted that HELP is the last thing that folds up in the dwindling spiral of aberration. About the first thing that folds up is INTEREST. But when it is gone, there are still three buttons left on which the person can function. The next one to go

is COMMUNICATION. This becomes a contest of perpetrations as in the ARC breaky case. Anybody below this lives his or her life this way. The next one to vanish is CONTROL. So don't be surprised to find somebody around who does plenty of perpetrations and who can't stand control who can yet be run on help and who can still function in life. When INTEREST, COMMUNICATION, CONTROL and HELP are gone, that's it. You haven't got a person left. So beware of people who are below help. Beware of them in living. But in Clearing, when you can't get HELP to bite at all (and if he can talk to you, you can get help to bite) you have nothing left but the Communication Exercises (CEs). You can make it on them too, but with tremendous investment in hours. And when you've got the CEs, flat then you can start running help.

TERMINAL STABLE DATA

2 JANUARY 1989

Terminals chosen must:

     Fall on meter

     Fit Pc's case (interest)

Avoid adjectives

If "man" is run, then sometime in the future, "woman" and then "human being" must be run, then "body" must be run.

Run any terminal assessed flat with processing before any reassessment.

EARMARKS OF A HOT TERMINAL
2 JANUARY 1989

The following hints on how to recognize a "hot" terminal on an assessment have been summarized by Clearing Practitioner Jan Halpern:

CB Meter:

1.   Shift of Range Arm.

2.   Decent drop of needle.

3.   Change of Pc's usual needle pattern.

Body:

1.   Sudden noticeable, physical change in Pc. For example, feet get restless; face flushes; whole bodily attitude shifts.

Emotion:

1.   Sudden marked emotional change in Pc. For example, he line-charges; bursts into tears.

2.   Pc has minus tone scale attitude toward terminal - pity, shame, blame, regret, failure.

Knowingness:

1.   Pc knows an extraordinary amount of data about something having little to do with his current life. For example, he's neither a race horse breeder, trainer, nor jockey. He doesn't even attend, or bet on, horse races. But he can recite the name and pedigree of every major handicap winner of the past 50 years or knows the complete history of a famous person.

2.   Pc knows nothing at all about something well within his ordinary sphere of knowledge. For example, Pc is a patroness of the arts, knows all about painting, sculpture, literature, ballet, etc. - but is a complete and total blank on music.

3.   Pc has "goofy ideas about something." For example, he places gem stones on the 5th dynamic because "they twinkle so brightly they must be alive."

Mock ups:

1.   Pc can't mock-up an item at all.

2.   Pc can only mock it up in heavily altered or destroyed form. For example, you tell him to mock-up a woman. The only women he mocks-up have no heads, or dogs' heads, or are skeletons, or corpses.

3.   Pc can't control mock-up. For example, you tell him to mock-up a woman, and he gets hordes of women flying by. Or, the woman he has mocked-up then pulls out a gun and shoots herself, turns into a dragon, and crawls off - without his intending to do anything more then simply mock-up a woman.

Time:

1.   Pc misplaces terminal in time. For example, he insists that Napoleon flourished in 50 B.C.

Problem:

1.   The terminal plays a leading role in a present time, or chronic this life, problem.

TERMINALS

2 JANUARY 1989

When running any process that has anything to do with terminals, such as present time problems, etc., there is one main stable datum which must always be observed by the Clearing Practitioner at all times: "Any terminal which is run must be real to the Preclear." If it seems that it is the obvious terminal to run but is unreal to the Preclear, then that terminal must be made real to the Preclear or a real one found and run.

An easy definition of a terminal is: "Anything which is used in a communication system." That is, something which has mass in it - a somethingness. A condition could be defined as "A circumstance regarding a terminal."

Running a terminal raises havingness. Running a condition reduces havingness.

The terminal should be sought out of two-way comm and "stripped" of conditions so it can be run. As an example: some Pc says his problem is "the staff" at the office. Now "staff" is a condition and should not be accepted. Look further and find the exact terminal or terminals involved; it may be his boss, or the clock, or the girl that sits next to him; or all of them. Or, as another example, a Pc has a swollen leg. "Swollen" is a condition; the leg is the terminal. You would run the leg and not "swollen" or "swollen leg."

It is better to run a terminal than plural terminals. Example: you would run a man instead of men. This helps to produce a reality and maintain it.

Conditions can be run, but it is a sticky proposition and unless his havingness is very, very good, it tends to drop havingness and introvert the Preclear. In order to run a condition, it takes skillful clearing and a Pc who is not in bad shape.

The safest method of Clearing is handling terminals only. That is, a single terminal which is real to the Preclear. It has to be real to the Pc to start with - don't expect to start with an unreal terminal and have it become real because of the process being run. Get a reality on the terminal, THEN use it.

SELECTED PERSONS PERPETRATION RECALL PROCESS

2 JANUARY 1989

It is not only unreasonable but impossible to run engrams or higher processes than Selected Persons Perpetration Recall on people who have low reality and low responsibility. Selected Persons Perpetration Recall raises both reality and responsibility and some of the cases around will only start to respond after four to five weeks of Selected Persons Perpetration Recall. But the main point is that they do, repeat, do respond.

We have got it made in Selected Persons Perpetration Recall. Let's not lose it.

Selected Persons Perpetration Recall goes like this:

1.   Select a person (terminal) that is real to the Preclear.

2.   Run alternately (one question after the other):

> "Recall something you have done to (terminal)." and

> "Recall something you have withheld from (terminal)."

Wherever the person has a misidentification or a fixated terminal on any dynamic, that terminal should be selected out and flattened by Selected Persons Perpetration Recall. We will raise these unresponsible cases.

Do not graduate into General Perpetrations until Selected Person Perpetration Recall is flat. When is Selected Persons Perpetration Recall flat? It is flat when the Preclear has come up tone through shame, blame, regret, and a recognition of his own failures and preferably 4.0 on the Scale of Emotions.

Minimize the two-way communication, clean up present time problems with the same process, using the terminals involved in the present time problem, and if in doubt MUZZLE the Clearing Practitioner.

It is better to find and run generalized terminals, except in the case of a present time problem where running specific terminals is acceptable.

HOW TO SELECT SELECTED PERSONS

2 JANUARY 1989

The process for Selected Persons Perpetration Recall is:

1.   Recall a time when you did something to _____.

2.   Recall a time when you withheld something from _____.

In Selected Persons, there is an element of diagnosis. How does one select the "selected persons"?

Every time this process misses on a Preclear, one of the two things is at fault, either:

1.   The Pc was cleared over out-rudiments.

2.   The wrong person was selected for the process.

The whole thing is a matter of attention units (1950). If the Preclear has his attention totally fixed on a terminal, little else is real to him. Look at one object only in a room. How real are the other objects? If a Preclear's attention is all bound up in some person, how can he find reality elsewhere.

How do we find, then, the "selected person"?

The most loaded question is:

"Is there anyone in your life who is to blame for the condition you're in?"

Other similar questions produce the "selected person" you then run on Selected Persons Perpetration Recall.

"Is there any person who really had it in for you?"

"Is there anyone you know that you'd really hate to be?"

"Did you know anyone in the past who you'd really hate to be?"

"Is there anyone you'd like to get even with?"

"Is there anyone in your life who has harmed you?"

"Is there anyone who causes you to get angry when you think about them?"

"Do you have any enemies?"

"Do you have any regrets about a past relationship?"

Once you get the idea, you can make them up by the dozen.

If the Pc to any of the above or all of them says, "myself," just acknowledge. Do not run "myself" as a terminal.

Select a new person each time Pc EPs the one you're running. You'll find some amazing valence shifts.

FINDING A TERMINAL

2 JANUARY 1989

Find what the person thinks is wrong with him.

Find a terminal he believes represents it. If it's a specific terminal, convert it to a generalized form. Run that terminal with Perpetration-Withhold Recall:

1.   Recall a time you did something to _____.

2.   Recall a time you withheld something from _____.

HOW TO DO A DIAGNOSIS BY DYNAMIC RECALL

2 JANUARY 1989

Here are the steps for A Diagnosis by Dynamic Recall:

0.   Clear each dynamic (one to eight) with the DICTIONARY.

1.   Ask the Preclear to describe the dynamics from one to eight. We don't care about them being sequitur; any way you want to break it up, we don't care.

2.   Ask the Preclear to describe each one of these dynamics, one at a time. Starting with the first dynamic. For example: "Tell me about the first dynamic." and/or "Tell me about yourself" and/or "Tell me what's going on in your personal life." Find a question that gets the Pc to talk about the dynamic. Keep making up questions until the Pc tells you about that dynamic. When you've gotten him to talk about the first dynamic, then go on and do the same thing with each dynamic up through dynamic eight.

The Clearing Practitioner is watching the CB Meter for a change in pattern. Therefore, you have to carefully isolate the change of pattern before you can tell whether or not the pattern's charged. But more important than that, you are looking for a dynamic on which he makes mistakes while trying to describe it; a dynamic he cannot describe; a dynamic that he won't even approach; a dynamic that he is very leery of. His statement is confirmed by the CB Meter reading. In other words, you look at the statement of the Pc and the change of meter needle pattern in Diagnosis by Dynamic Recall.

A change of meter needle pattern might be that the needle was clean and now it's dirty or the needle was still and now it's very active or it didn't read and now it reads. It's a change, any change.

3.   Now we go all the way through, asking for terminals on these dynamics and we finally get a repeat of the same needle pattern or read we saw in 2. For example: "Tell me some objects or people that would be on this dynamic?" or some such question will get terminals.

As we are asking the Pc for terminals on these dynamics, we'll get the same dynamic to read again with the same pattern or read. The basic rule which sorts this out is - any dynamic which doesn't clear by the Pc talking about it, has to have its terminals run by Help and Perpetration Withhold processes. Simple as that. Any dynamic which doesn't clear by the Pc talking about, has to be run. You could even Prepcheck the dynamic or some aspect of it. The main idea is to work it over with processes until the Pc is clear on that dynamic. Any process that does that is valid.

4.   The terminal or terminals found above are now run, using the various Help and Perpetration Withhold processes or Prepchecking as described elsewhere.

Don't run a terminal that is totally unreal to the Preclear. Another stable datum is "never run a terminal that's sensible." Never. If a terminal belongs on the dynamic, you can almost say you'll get nowhere running it. We are not interested at this level in running the sane and rational ideas of the Pc. We want to run the insane and irrational ideas. So, you are looking for terminals that the Pc gives you for a dynamic which don't belong on the dynamic at all. For example, the Pc puts his pet dog Fido on the 8th dynamic.

Remember, generalized terminals are better than specific terminals.

Now, if that terminal is real to the Pc, you will get a tremendous change in the case. If

that terminal is totally unreal to the Pc and if it does belong on the dynamic, why, you're not going to get any change on the case so why run it? Might as well run some other process. It is neither a long process nor an invariable process. Given enough skill you could undoubtedly find one of these on every case. Given enough skill. But it is limited by Clearing Practitioner skill.

ANALYSIS OF CASES

29 SEPTEMBER 1988

A primary skill required of an accomplished Clearing Practitioner would be analysis of a case. The basic error is overestimating the case's ability. All failures stem from a failure to undercut the reality of a case. If that reality level is reached, the case will improve. If not, the case remains stagnant.

THE DEFINITION OF RESULTS: The Preclear achieves a reality on change of case, somatic behavior or appearance, for the better.

THE DEFINITION OF BETTER: Negative gain. Things disappear that have been annoying or unwanted.

THE DEFINITION OF ABILITY GAINED: Pc's recognition that Pc can now do things she could not do before.

THE DEFINITION OF INTELLIGENCE GAIN: Loss of reactivation of stupidity by reason of attempts to confront or experience the problems of life. Intelligence appears when stupidity is keyed out or erased. Intelligence is a confronting ability.

FAMILIARITY: Familiarization permits intelligence to manifest. Reaching and withdrawing are more possible when stupidity is keyed out or erased. Increasing ability to reach and withdraw increases intelligence.

It can be seen that when attention is fixed, the ability to reach and withdraw decreases; therefore, intelligence decreases, therefore the ability to change decreases, therefore no "case gain."

Unfixing attention is done in various ways. As hypnotism is done by fixing attention, a parallel observation is that a person wakes up, receives less fixed effect, when attention becomes unfixed.

Unfixing attention must be done by increasing ability to reach and withdraw from the specific thing or person on which attention is fixed in the bank. The bank merely expresses a recording of past attention fixations.

Shocks of various kinds can unfix attention but always lead to a decrease in ability over a period. Unfixing attention by violence throws a case downscale. As the case goes upscale the attention refixes on things violence unfixed it from.

Clearing is a gradient process of finding places where attention is fixed and restoring the ability of the Pc to place and remove attention under his own determinism.

Case Analysis consists then of the determination of where Pc's attention (at current state of case) is fixed on the track and restoring Pc's determinism over those places.

This is done by:

1.   Present Time Problem running.

2.   Preclear Interview and remedy of fixed points by processing those areas found.

3.   Selected items and persons survey and unfixing other-determined attention at those points by processing.

There are many ways of doing a survey to determine what the Pc's attention is fixed upon now. The CB Meter and interviewing of the Pc are the main methods of finding the fixed attention. The PTS interview is also a good way to locate fixed attention. The PTS interview, however, is always done after a full PTS C/S-1.

"What has your attention been fixed on lately (or 'in this Life')?" would elicit a reply that could then be used in further questioning.

"Recall a time when you did something to (items or person so located)." "Recall a time when you withheld something from (item or person so selected)."

If you find the exact item or person on which attention is fixed, you achieve immediate case gain, which is to say reality, which is to say interest, in-sessionness and success.

If any Pc you are running has not manifested case gain, reality, interest and in-sessionness, then one of two things is true:

1.   Your haven't found the item or person on which Pc's attention is other-determinedly fixed and haven't run it yet, or

2.   Pc is too low on the Scale of Emotions.

This may be of some small assistance in learning how to analyze a case.

PRESENT TIME PROBLEM PROCESSES

2 JANUARY 1989

Perpetration-Withhold Recall on terminals involved in the PTP is the only other process allowed other than the PTP Rudiment for handling Present Time Problems. Terminals selected must be real to the Pc and must be specific, not generalized, e.g.:

Specific: "My Dad"

Generalized: "A Father"

Run all the terminals located in the problem with Perpetration-Withhold Recall until flat.

A problem is flat when the Pc no longer has to do something about it, and the problem no longer exists for him in present time.

The commands for Perpetration-Withhold Recall are:

1.   Recall a time you did something to_____.

2.   Recall a time you withheld something from_____.

COMMUNICATION PROCESSES

2 JANUARY 1989

Always run the general form of the particular terminal you are running when using "From where could you communicate to a _____?"

This rule applies with Help as well. Find all the terminals and run the generalized form of each terminal.

This means you mustn't run specific terminals. The exception to this rule is given in the bulletin called PRESENT TIME PROBLEM PROCESSES.

If the trouble with Joe is his wife, Mary, don't run Mary. She can't be very aberrative to him. Remember he has been having difficulty with wives for a very long time - so run "From where could you communicate to a wife?"

THE FOUR MAGIC QUESTIONS

2 JANUARY 1989

In all the 35 years of Clearing practice, there is one set of commands which have proven to be superior to all others. That set of commands is THE FOUR MAGIC QUESTIONS (4MQs).

Only four questions are required. These questions work like magic. They never fail to produce results. They are as follows:

1. What did (the item) do that wasn't all right?

2. What did (the item) fail to do?

3. As far as (the item) is concerned, what did you do that wasn't all right?

4. As far as (the item) is concerned, what did you fail to do?

The first two questions handle the motivator side (Flow 1) and the second two questions handle the perpetration side (Flow 2). In each flow, perpetrations of commission (did that wasn't all right) and perpetrations of omission (failed to do) are handled. You are handling perpetrations of commission and omission in both directions. That's the secret to the magic of the Four Magic Questions.

The Pc is allowed to get off the motivators (victim side) first, so that when you get to the perpetration questions (what the Pc did), he or she is more willing and finds it easier to confront his or her own cause in the interaction.

You can put any terminal in as the item. Ask each line until the Pc gets a floating needle or runs out of answers and you will get miraculous results, as long as the Pc isn't too downscale. You can also cycle through over and over, but this is rarely necessary. A more advanced Clearing Practitioner can clean each line on the meter.

VARIATIONS OF THE FOUR MAGIC QUESTIONS

Some people will respond better to the questions if they are worded slightly differently, but you must be sure that the meaning remains the same when you change the wording.

For (1) "What did (the item) do that wasn't all right?" the following may be used:

(a) Did (the item) do something you didn't like?

(b) Did (the item) do something of which you disapproved?

(c) Was something (the item) did unsatisfactory?

(d) What did you get from (the item) that you didn't want?

For (2) "What did (the item) fail to do?" you may use:

(a) Did (the item) omit doing something?

(b) Were you expecting (the item) to do something he didn't do?

(c) Were you disappointed by (the item's) action?

(d)   What did you expect from (the item) you didn't get?

For (3) "As far as (the item) is concerned, what did you do that wasn't all right?" you may use:

(a)   Did you do anything about (the item) that you later regretted/thought was unfair?

(b)   Were you disappointed by your actions toward (the item)?

(c)   How did you justify your action toward (the item)?

(d)   Were you disappointed by some action of yours toward (item)?

For (4) "As far as (the item) is concerned, what did you fail to do?"

(a)   If you hadn't restrained yourself what would you have said or done to (the item)?

(b)   Did you omit saying or doing anything to (the item)?

(c)   Were you disappointed in your lack of action toward (the item)?

(d)   If there would have been no repercussions, what would you have liked to have done or said to (the item)?

(e)   Did you expect to do something to (the item) you didn't do?

Whenever you decide to use a variation, continue to use the exact same wording each time you ask the question; otherwise, you'll cause some degree of confusion.

Since the objective is to discharge emotion, no interruption should take place. If a person becomes angry, permit him to do so. If he shows grief by crying, let him do so. If he turns white from fear it will discharge too. He'll soon get angry, finally bored and when all the emotion is discharged, anxious to get on with processing or life.

You eliminate session grievances by using the same questions but with your and the other person's identities in the questions. These now become:

1.   During the time we've been talking did I do anything that wasn't all right?

2.   During the time we've been talking have I failed to do anything?

3.   During the time we've been talking have you done anything that wasn't all right?

4.   During the time we've been talking have you failed to do anything?

"During the time we've been talking" could be changed to "In this session," "In yourlast session," "On the break," etc.

THE DANGER OF ASKING ASSUMPTIVE QUESTIONS

To ask, "What did you steal?" is assumptive. Perhaps the person never did. The question can sound, depending on the intent of the questioner, accusative. In eliminating grievance never assume anything.

"What did you steal?" requires the person's computer to scan his entire lifetime file on stealing. Perhaps you should ask, "While you have been employed here have you stolen anything?" if this is what you want to know.

The four basic questions are assumptive. They are used only if the person has been "nattery", upset or irritated about someone or something or in handling Past Track items. The questions can be made non-assumptive by a slight change to "Did (the item) do anything that wasn't all right?" and if the person says, "Yes," you may ask, "What was it?"

The non-assumptive basic questions are:

1.   Did (item) do anything that wasn't all right?

2.   Did (item) fail to do anything?

3.   Concerning (item) have you done anything that wasn't all right?

4.   Concerning (item) have you failed to do anything?

Your use of assumptive or non-assumptive questions varies, depending on the item, the person and the amount of emotional charge which it may trigger.

Since each one of us has probably done about the same things as anyone else in our culture, it is easy to assume, from our data, that the aggrieved person may have emotional conflicts from stealing things he couldn't get or buy, sulking, day-dreaming, fighting, masturbating, etc.

CONDITIONS

While it is never a good idea to run a plural terminal or a condition in a process command or question, the Four Magic Questions have proven to be an exception to this rule. Items like "labor unions" (plural) or "nervousness" (a condition) will run with good results in a modified version of the Four Magic Questions.

The form used is:

1.   What's not all right about (item)?

Follow up with:

2A.   What could be the bad consequences of_____?

          or

2B.   What have been the bad consequences of_____?

          or

2C.   Concerning_____have there been any bad consequences?

          or

2D.   Concerning_____could there be any bad consequences?

          and

3A.   Concerning_____have you done anything that wasn't all right?

and

4A.   Concerning_____what have you failed to do?

These can also be used in the assumptive or nonassumptive form.

The Four Magic Questions is the best process ever found for clearing away charge in the Reactive Mind and they do, indeed, work wonders. There are other excellent processes, but the 4MQs will be found to the best foundation for any Clearing rundown.

MULTI-PROCESS TERMINAL RUNDOWN

2 JANUARY 1989

Sometimes when you get a hot terminal through an interview or other question which elicits terminals, the terminal turns out to be so heavily charged that one process is not enough to get the terminal completely flat. We have devised a series of processes to handle such a terminal. The Clearing Practitioner uses these processes with the terminal in the blank space and continues using one process after another until the terminal is flat. The Pc may reach an EP on the terminal before all the processes are run. If this happens, indicate the F/N and end off running that terminal. Rarely, more processes are needed to flatten a terminal and if this is the case, additional processes are given elsewhere.

I. PREPCHECKING

Use the standard Prepcheck buttons with the terminal:

1. Concerning_____has anything been suppressed?

2. Concerning_____has anything been evaluated?

3. Concerning_____has anything been invalidated?

4. Concerning_____is there anything you've been careful of?

5. Concerning_____is there anything you didn't reveal?

6. Concerning_____has anything been not-ised?

7. Concerning_____has anything been suggested?

8. Concerning_____has a mistake been made?

9. Concerning_____has anything been protested?

10. Concerning_____is there anything you've been anxious about?

11. Concerning_____has anything been decided?

12. Concerning_____is anything you have withdrawn from?

13. Concerning_____has anything been reached?

14. Concerning_____has anything been ignored?

15. Concerning_____has anything been stated?

16. Concerning_____has anything been helped?

17. Concerning_____has anything been altered?

18. Concerning_____has anything been revealed?

19. Concerning_____has anything been asserted?

20. Concerning_____has anything been agreed with?

Note: Beginning Clearing Practitioners ask every question in order, repetitively until the Pc runs out of answers or an F/N occurs. For a lighter run through the buttons, ask each question once only. More advanced Clearing Practitioners clean each button on the meter. Ask your C/S which is best for you.

End off the Prepcheck on Cognition, F/N and VGIs.

II. FOUR MAGIC QUESTIONS

1. Has_____done anything that wasn't all right?

2. Has_____failed to do anything?

3. Concerning_____have you done anything that wasn't all right?

4. Concerning_____have you failed to do anything?

Other variations of the 4MQs can be used (See THE FOUR MAGIC QUESTIONS bulletin).

Note: Beginning Clearing Practitioners ask every question in order, repetitively until the Pc runs out of answers or an F/N occurs. For a lighter run, ask each question once only and run as a bracket. More advanced Clearing Practitioners clean each button on the meter. If in doubt, ask your C/S.

End off on Cognition, F/N and VGIs.

III. FAILED HELP

1. How has_____failed to help you?

2. How have you failed to help_____?

3. How has_____failed to help other?

4. How have others failed to help_____?

5. Concerning_____how have you failed to help yourself?

Note: Run as a bracket to EP.

IV. HELP PROCESS

1. Think of_____helping you.

2. Think of you helping_____.

3. Think of_____helping others.

4. Think of others helping_____.

5. Think of_____helping himself/herself.

Note: Run as a bracket to EP.

V. PROBLEMS PROCESS

Flow 1:

      1. Recall a problem you've had with_____.

      2. How did it seem to you then?

      3. How does it seem to you now?

Flow 2:

      1. Recall a problem_____has had with you.

      2. How did it seem to her/him then?

      3. How does it seem to her/him now?

Flow 3:

      1. Recall a problem_____has had with another.

      2. How did it seem to her/him then?

      3. How does it seem to her/him now?

Flow 3A:

      1. Recall a problem another has had with_____.

      2. How did it seem to her/him then?

      3. How does it seem to her/him now?

Flow 0:

      1. Recall a problem you've had with yourself because of_____.

      2. How did it seem to you then?

      3. How does it seem to you now?

Note: Run each flow to EP.

VI. CONFRONT PROCESS

Flow 1:

      1. What problem about_____could you confront?

      2. What problem about_____would rather not confront?

Flow 2:

      1. What problem about you could_____confront?

2. What problem about you would_____rather not confront?

Flow 3:

    1. What problem about another could_____confront?

    2. What problem about another would_____rather not confront?

Flow 3A:

    1. What problem about_____could another confront?

    2. What problem about_____would another rather not confront?

Flow 0:

    1. Concerning_____what problem about yourself could you confront?

    2. Concerning_____what problem about yourself would you rather not confront?

Note: Run each flow to EP.

VII. INVENT PROCESS

Flow 1:

    Invent something worse for you than_____.

Flow 2:

    Invent something worse for_____than you.

Flow 3:

    Invent something worse for others than_____.

    Note: Run each command to EP.

Then run:

    1. Spot where_____is now.

    2. Spot where you are now.

Note: Run alternate repetitive to EP.

VIII. PERPETRATION WITHHOLD PROCESS

    1. Think of something you have done to_____.

    2. Think of something you have withheld from_____.

Note: Run alternate repetitive to EP.

IX. CHANGE PROCESS

1. What do you want changed about_____?

2. What do you want unchanged about_____?

Note: Run alternate repetitive to EP.

       The terminal should be run using these processes until it is flat, which means if the Pc has a big win, VVGIs, wide F/N, end off. Be careful not to overrun.

       The smoothest running is accomplished by checking each command for a read as you clear it. Strictly speaking, if it doesn't read, don't run it.

       If you need more processes, consult your C/S.

THE SIX MAGIC QUESTIONS

2 JANUARY 1989

The Six Magic Questions are designed to handle the area between sessions. These six questions can be used alone or along with the standard rudiments (ARC Breaks, etc.) or Four Magic Questions. The Six Magic Questions get the Pc's ruds in and they are wonderfully easy to use.

They were developed by master Clearing Practitioner Charlie Broaded in 1978 in response to a student's desire to have a set of questions to use at the beginning of session.

The Six Magic Questions are:

1.   Have you wanted anything to happen that didn't (happen)?

2.   Has anything happened that you didn't want to have happen?

3.   Have you done anything that you should not have done?

4.   Is there anything you would like to have done that you didn't (do)?

5.   Is there anything in your life or surroundings that you need to put your attention on?

6.   Is there anything in your life or surroundings that you need to take your attention off of?

These 6 questions are most often prefaced with "Since your last session" or "Between sessions." Feel free to use other prefaces such as "Recently."

The easiest way to run the Six Magic Questions is to ask each question until the Pc runs out of answers. Depending on the Pc, you could also clean each question on the meter and/or run each question to a floating needle. With a heavily out ruds Pc, new Pc or on a Pc with a tight needle, it is best to just ask each question until he or she runs out of answers. Don't run any individual question beyond the point where the charge has blown on that question and don't continue these 6 questions beyond the point where the Pc's rudiments are in.

If you pick up a heavily charged reading terminal on one of these questions, it is all right to bridge off into the Four Magic Questions for that terminal. Don't, however, do this too often. If you do bridge off, be sure to return to the question you were on and flatten it.

If you have a Pc who is up to running ARC Breaks (ARCU-CDEINR) earlier similar style, you could bridge off into handling one particular ARC Break. Again, be sure to return to the question you were on and flatten it.

EXPANDED HELP RUNDOWN

3 JANUARY 1989

Expanded Grade I is done in two parts:

1.   Help to an EP for help.

2.   Problems to an EP for problems.

The processes presented here are powerful. In the late 1950's Clearing Practitioners produced Clears with these processes alone. They were called Help Clears.

The first thing to do in the area of Help Processing is to find out if the Preclear needs Help Processing. This is done by clearing the word help and getting the Preclear to discuss how she feels about being helped and helping others. If help is a reading item when cleared or when talked about by the Preclear, the charge should be released with some help processes before you continue. If the subject of help is clean on the meter and the Preclear feels great about being helped and helping, you, of course, would just indicate the floating needle at the appropriate point and proceed with the next area of processing. Don't do Help Processing unless the Preclear needs it. Most, however, need it desperately.

1.   Clear the word "Help" using a dictionary. False Date Stripping and the Creative Definition Procedure can be use here.

2.   Ask the Preclear:

   A.   How do you feel about receiving help?

   B.   How do you feel about helping others?

   C.   Do you have any other ideas about help?

   D.   Do you have any other thoughts about help?

   E.   Is there any thing else you'd like to say about help?

These questions are cleared and asked to give you an idea of where the Preclear stands on the subject of help. They do not have to be carried to a floating needle. Be sure to let the Preclear talk as much as she want to on these questions with some prompting and half acknowledgements. If a floating needle occurs, be sure to indicate it.

From the above questions, decide whether or not the Preclear needs to be cleared on the subject of help. If so, do the following processes.

Note - Sometimes a Preclear will protest using the word help because it has a bad connotation. If this difficulty stands in the way of processing, clear the words "assist," "empower" and "aid." If the Preclear has a good reality on one of these words and it reads, you can substitute it for the word help in any of the help processes. Be sure to do False Data Stripping and the Creative Definition Procedure on the word "help" before you substitute another word. If "help" cleans up, use it and don't substitute another word.

Note - Help Processing has a tendency to reduce havingness. Havingness and Confront processes should be used as needed in session and at the end of session. This depends on the Pc. Some need it more often than others. Run Havingness and Confront at least after every few Help processes and on the major ones use it after every terminal is

complete or after four flows are run. Use your own judgement on this. You do this by running the Pc's havingness process and then the Pc's confront process followed up by the Pc's havingness process, i.e., Havingness-Confront-Havingness.

3.   Clear and run the following process:

      1.   Think of a way that I could help you.

      2.   Tell me about it.

      3.   Think of a way that you could help me.

      4.   Tell me about it.

      1234, 1234, 1234 . . .

4.   Clear and run the following process:

      1.   Get the idea of helping another.

      2.   Tell me about it.

      3.   Get the idea of not helping another.

      4.   Tell me about it.

      1234, 1234, 1234 . . .

or

5.   Clear and run the following process:

      1.   Define helping.

      2.   Give me an example of that.

      3.   Define not helping.

      4.   Give me an example of that.

      1234, 1234, 1234 . . .

6.   Clear and run the following process:

      1.   Invent a person.

      2.   Tell me that person's idea of help.

      12, 12, 12 . . .

7.   Running Failed Help and Help on Terminals

Failed Help may also be run on a terminal. If the Pc is always having PTPs with a

certain type of terminal (woman, man, etc) then failed help can be run in a specific or general fashion. Follow this up with a bracket of Concept Help on the same terminal.

FAILED HELP

Check each flow for a read before running it.

1.   How could a_____fail to help you?

2.   How could you fail to help a_____?

3.   How could a_____fail to help another?

4.   How could another fail to help a_____?

5.   If you were a_____how could you fail to help yourself?

Run each one of these to EP. If Pc runs out answers switch over to running it in bracket form.

CONCEPT HELP PROCESS

Don't check each flow for a read. Just run as a bracket.

1.   Think of a_____helping you.

2.   Think of you helping a_____.

3.   Think of_____helping another.

4.   Think of another helping a_____.

5.   Concerning a_____think of helping yourself.

Note: Run as a bracket to EP.

8.   A simple and very satisfactory way of making a Pc happy and getting results is to ask the Pc what he thinks is wrong with him/her and run whatever the Pc says - providing it's a terminal - in a general form. If it's not a terminal, get the Pc to convert it to one.

Example:

    Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

    Pc: "My wife."

    Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run 'a wife'."

Example:

    Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

    Pc: "I'm impatient."

    Clearing Practitioner: "Can you think of somebody who was impatient?"

Pc: "My Father."

Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run 'a Father'."

Example:

Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

Pc: "Well, I think I'm hostile."

Clearing Practitioner: "Did you ever know a hostile person?"

Pc: "Yes."

Clearing Practitioner: "Who was it?"

Pc: "George James."

Clearing Practitioner: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one) "What was George James?"

Pc: "A loafer!"

Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run help on 'a loafer,' all right?"

Pc: "Fine."

When "a loafer" is flat, we do the same assessment again and as above get a new general terminal.

Use the FAILED HELP and CONCEPT HELP processes as above on each terminal as found.

9.   Terminals by Profession

There are however some "professional" terminals you can run which do a lot for a case.

Find out what the Pc was professionally in this lifetime and sort out what this profession helped as a terminal and run that.

Always use, of course, the general form of any terminal - not Aunt Agatha, but an Aunt. Not "the works mechanic at Pullman", but a works mechanic or a mechanic. The less adjectives the better.

This does much for a case, and rapidly.

Here are the questions you can use:

What professions have you followed this lifetime?

What has been your main profession this lifetime?

What beingness helps others?

Then:

What did (does) that profession help?

Use the FAILED HELP and CONCEPT HELP PROCESS as above on what the profession helps as a terminal.

10.   Assessment by Goals

A Pc also gets very happy when you run a beingness the Pc is trying to be or hopes to be or even once hoped to be.

For instance, the Pc wants to be a painter or wishes he were a painter or wishes he could be a painter again. Fine, just run help on "a painter."

The Pc wanted to be a singer. Run it as "a singer."

The Pc is trying to be a good housewife or husband. Fine, run "a housewife" or "a husband."

In short, when you explore why the Pc wants to be processed, the Pc often is either trying to correct something wrong (see above) or is trying to be something. Your assessment is done when you establish either item and the Pc will recover, do better and be very happy with you. You can also run help on what the terminal helps.

Here are the questions to use:

What have you wanted to be?

What have you wanted to do?

What have you wanted to have?

What have you wanted to learn?

What have you wanted to know?

What are your goals?

Use the FAILED HELP and CONCEPT HELP PROCESS as above on each terminal found.

11.   Valences and Help

Run the beingness of the Pc in this lifetime as a terminal and you've cleaned up a lot of track.

Find out what she is being and find out what that beingness helps and not helps by using the command, "What would _____ help?" "What would _____ not help?"

Here are some questions to get terminals:

What are you being?

or

What do you think your main beingness is?

Use FAILED HELP and CONCEPT HELP PROCESS on each terminal found.

Then run:

1.   What would_____help?

2.   What would_____not help?

Alternate repetitive to EP.

Then take the maintain terminal this beingness helps and run the FAILED HELP and CONCEPT HELP PROCESS on it.

12.   Attempted Help

Find out something, very general, that a Pc is trying to help or has failed to help and run "What would help _____ ?" "What would not help _____ ? on the discovered terminal. The Pc will get cognitions on what he or she is being and what the Pc is restraining himself or herself from being.

Here are questions used to find the terminal:

What are you trying to help?

What have you failed to help?

When you first got involved in Clearing, what were you trying to achieve? (convert to a terminal that the Pc wanted to help)

Use FAILED HELP and CONCEPT HELP PROCESS on the terminal found.

Then run:

1.   What would help_____?

2.   What would not help_____?

Alternate repetitive

Take the main terminal expressed by the Pc and run it with FAILED HELP and CONCEPT HELP PROCESS.

13.   Lower Dicotomy of Failed Help

F-1

1.   How could another prevent your help?

2.   How could another fail to help you?

F-2

1.   How could you prevent another's help?

2.   How could you fail to help another?

F-3

    1.   How could another prevent another's help?

    2.   How could another fail to help another?

F-0

    1.   How could you prevent yourself from helping yourself?

    2.   How could you fail to help yourself?

14.   Help P/W

F-1

    1.   What help has another given you?

    2.   What help has another not given you?

F-2

    1.   What help have you given another?

    2.   What help have you not given another?

F-3

    1.   What help has another given others?

    2.   What help has another not given others?

F-0

    1.   What help have you given yourself?

    2.   What help have you not given yourself?

15.   Intentions and Help

F-1

    1.   Who has intended not to help you?

    2.   Who has helped you?

F-2

    1.   Who have intended not help?

    2.   Who have you helped?

F-3

    1.   Who has intended not to help others?

2. Who has helped others?

F-0

1. How have intended not to help yourself?

2. How have you helped yourself?

16. Clear and run the following process:

1. How could I help you?

2. How could you help me?

3. How could another person help you?

4. How could you help another person?

5. How could another person help another person?

6. How could another person help herself/himself?

7. How could you help yourself?

1234567, 1234567, 1234567 . . .

17. To finish off the area of help, ask the following questions. Listen and acknowledge and indicate any floating needles.

A. How do you feel about the subject of help now?

B. Have you gotten any new ideas about help?

C. Is there anything else you'd like to say or ask about the area of help?

The Preclear will either be clear on help with a floating needle on the subject of help or need further Help Processing. If the Preclear is clear and floating on help, indicate the floating needle and do the standard end of session procedure per model session. If it is evident that the Preclear needs further processing on the subject of help, end off the session, write up your report with all the details and turn the folder into the C/S.

THE PRIOR CONFUSION

2 JANUARY 1989

ALL PROBLEMS ARE PRECEDED BY A PRIOR CONFUSION.

To confuse means to throw into disorder, to perplex, to disconcert or to cause to lose self-possession, according to Webster's Unabridged Dictionary. Confuse also means to confound which comes from the Latin confundere (con, together and fundere, to pour) pour together. A confusion is then a period of mixed up disorder where the Preclear lost the ability to distinguish one thing from another. One thing equaled another or A=A=A; consequently, reactive material was formed in the subconscious mind.

All problems are preceded by a period of time when the Preclear was confused about something and was unable to clearly see what was going on. The result of this confused state of mind is a problem.

For example, if a person is suddenly overloaded with too many things to handle connected with her job and is fired because she is making too many mistakes, she may have a problem connected with the condition of being unemployed. Further, she may be forced into marrying someone with whom she is not truly happy to solve her financial problems, resulting in a problem connected with the condition called an unhappy marriage. In all cases these problems can always be traced back to the earlier or prior confusion connected with her job or some other earlier confusion.

If the Clearing Practitioner locates and clears this period of confusion prior to the problem, the problem will as-is and clear because the confusion is earlier and more basic than the problem itself. Get the prior confusion and you blow the problem.

On this course you will study a technique, The Problems Intensive, which will allow you to process and clear the prior confusion for any Preclear. The Problems Intensive is a very powerful technique for undercutting and clearing problems and involves the more advanced Clearing Style of Level II.

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE

12 JANUARY 1989

The process that achieves enormously effective results, is the Modern Problems Intensive.

It does the following:

> Eradicates feelings of illness
> Adds years to life
> Subtracts years from appearance
> Increases IQ

It is very easy to run as it can be done with errors and, so long as the range arm moves, will achieve marvelous results.

It is the ideal process for Clearing Practitioners as it gives them countless wins.

It is a natural for the field Clearing Practitioner who knows his Model Session and the rundown.

The Clearing Practitioner makes a list of changes that the Pc decided to make in this lifetime (self determined changes). The Clearing Practitioner then works with the Pc to help the Pc find the confusion prior to the change which might have cause the Pc to decide to make the change. This Prior Confusion is an incident of greater or lesser duration. The Prior Confusion is located and dated. The Clearing Practitioner then arbitrarily predates the Prior Confusion by one month, and prepchecks "Since(the date one month prior to the confusion)". If the self determined change occurred August 24, 1963 and the Pc finds that the Prior Confusion which led to the change was May 5, 1963, the Clearing Practitioner Prepchecks with the preface "Since April 5, 1963 (one month before the Prior Confusion). For example, for the first button it would be "Since April 5, 1963 has anything been suppressed?" Each button is cleaned until all charge is blown and an EP is attained. The Clearing Practitioner may not need to do all twenty buttons to get an EP. The next longest reading self determined change is then selected and the process is repeated to another EP. All other reading self determined changes are run this way.

See the bulletin PROBLEM INTENSIVE PROCEDURE for a complete rundown on procedure.

It can be interrupted by an end of intensive without consequences to the Pc if something was left unflat.

The public may scream to get clear, but most of it could be cleared on a Problems Intensive anyway.

All the gains envisioned in Book I can be achieved with enough Problems Intensives, even a 1st Dynamic clear in many cases.

Get good, solid gains with the Modern Problems Intensive. Only if you fail to find and pull his or her Missed Withholds in the course of sessions could you estrange a Pc. The way is "don't miss withholds in the first place".

You may have to clear the buttons for the Pc who doesn't understand the words, but otherthan that it's all plain sailing.

People are suddenly losing all manner of things they thought were illnesses and were

calling arthritis and ulcers and what not. They weren't sick. They were just suppressed.

Please realize what you've got here in a Modern Problems Intensive.

Problems Intensives

"Supposing that dianetics and scientology did everything they were supposed to do. What would your problem have been before you came into it -- your own personal problem?" That is the approach you should use on a PE course. Give all the "firsts" of scientology and dianetics; give a very broad, complete description. Then ask, "What is the problem that would make you come into scientology?" This is assuming that everything that was said about scientology was true. You restimulate their PTP of long duration, then ask, "What is your problem?" The problem is now staring them in the face and in some percentage, they will, for the first time, recognize the source of some discomfort. Then give them some data about processing and get them into the HGC. That should be the first lecture on a P.E. course, because it gives a stable datum, a conditional but desirable stable datum. On a certain number, you will produce a startling change.

There's a new addition to a PC Assessment Sheet. It gets you a list of things. You take the best-reading and run a list of processes on it. Reassess the list of thinks and repeat the process. It gets the prior confusion and handles it with ruds, problems processes, and sec check on the personnel in the prior confusion. The first list asks for times the PC's life changed. Ask when the changes occurred. Each of them will be handled with the problem that existed just prior, as well as the prior confusion. The change was a solution. Get the changes of life-style also. The "when" doesn't have to be very precise. Now get the best-reading change and ask, "What problem did you have immediately before that change?" Get him to state the problem, not just a fact. It should have a a question, a mystery about it, a how, why, or what. Then just run the problems rud process, until flat e.g. when the somatic that got going quiets down. It gets at the PTP of long duration, which gives hidden standards. Run it by the TA. After it is flat, ask, "What was the confusion in your life just before that?" Then assess the people in that confusion. The idea of listing and asking for another person in the confusion will put the PC back in the confusion and stop him from skidding forward, and you'll wind up with a list of personnel. You sec check the list. This requires some acumen to mock up the sec check. It's really a glorified O/W, and you could just run O/W except that it has some danger, since it's running against a terminal which hasn't been assessed. So it's better to sec check. If a terminal is not on a goals line, running it can beef up a case unless run on a sec check. The sec check needn't be awfully extensive, though doing it very thoroughly will give a better result.

You continue the process with the next best-reading change, etc. When all is done, we could say that the person was a release and has no hidden standards and would do auditing commands. This fully supplants Routine 1A as a way to handle problems.

The reason you are handling hidden standards is not because the individual has his attention stuck someplace, nor because the PC vias your auditing commands through it, though these things are true. You are running it because to the PC it's an oracle. He's not really analytically checking his eyesight every session to see if auditing is making it better. His eyesight somatic knows, and that's the only data there is. Observation and experience have no bearing on his knowingness. It's more than a PTP of long duration of a specialized sort. It's a pretty vicious proposition. The PC does it every command or every session. If he does it every command, it knows and he doesn't. So he has to consult it to find out. He does it in life all the time, too, unbeknownst to you. He judges goodness and badness, truth and falsity by whether he gets a somatic which comes from some circuit or other.

A criminal knows right from wrong because a circuit is restimulated or not. Therefore the cops are crazy, because the little green light in his skull lit up when he was about to commit his "crime". He's baffled when he's arrested. He "knows" nobody can tell right from wrong, or he knows by the way he feels whether he's doing right or wrong.

The way people get that way is thus:

1. They are a thetan, as themselves.

2. They get so invalidated or invalidate others so much that they get overwhelmed with their own inval and they pick up a valence.

3. Somatic overwhelm. While being the valence, he got a hell of a somatic.

An impact is easily substituted for knowingness. It can also seem to be punishment for some unknown crime, so he's got a terrible problem: What has he done to be punished for it? He doesn't know; he just feels guilty. Anyway, impact seems like knowingness. One's own knowingness as a valence is in validated so he's got an impact knowingness which he keeps around, which is part of an engram on his goals-terminal chain. The engram presents a problem because it is not reachable, because it's in the middle of the goals-terminal chain. Since the PC's own knowingness has been invalidated, he can only go on being validated in his knowingness as a circuit. But he has to be careful because it knows more than he does! Superstitious peoples, who have very little and have been knocked around badly, have catalogs of superstitions, which are sort of third dynamic circuits. This moves out into a secondary state: the circuit is now audible; it dictates to him, gives him orders aloud. This is the final result of a valence which has been overwhelmed by a somatic, which has been overwhelmed by another thinkingness, etc. [See Fig. 4]. It is not an endless number of valences, but there can be a nearly endless number of hidden standards.

A real hidden standard is something the PC consults with each command or each session. "Consults" is the clue. The hidden standards key in because of problems of magnitude or because of prior confusion. The usual course of human events is: The individual went through a lot of trouble and a lot of confusion. He couldn't quite figure any part of it out, and it left him hung with a problem, which he up and solved by changing his life in some way. He may get the idea when there's a change, there must have been a problem before. There isn't always a problem. Other-determined changes don't necessarily have problems before them, but they won't assess on the meter. He solves the problem with a hidden standard.

Where does a circuit come from? They're different from valences. A valence answers the question of who to be or how to be right with a beingness. A circuit answers the question, "Without changing a beingness, how do you know when you're right?" A circuit furnishes information; a valence furnishes beingness.

A circuit can step up from furnishing information to furnishing orders, and then it can step up to furnishing orders below the level of consciousness, always expressed faintly at least in somatics. Most people live in haunted houses. They think there are other thetans in their bodies because of the commands of circuits.

A circuit can be set up easily and isn't a bad thing unless it's out of his control, forgotten as to authorship, etc., controlling the fellow, with him taking no responsibility for it. A thetan can do anything a circuit can do, and more. The basic of circuit trouble is setting something up and taking no responsibility and leaving it on automatic. If he's done this, he has some God-Awful problem just before he did it. Just before he has the problem, he was in fantastic confusion, and before the confusion, he had fantastic numbers of withholds from the people in the confusion. Those conditions must all be present to get circuit trouble, and you have to pay attention to all of them to unravel the circuits.

To get into that state, he'd have to have been pretty active, and to have started withholding everything from everybody, he was in contact with, about everything, or about something special. He's not free to communicate. Things start going wrong, since his comm is messed up. Life got very confused, eventually became an awful problem. Then he solved the problem. If he had enough overts and withholds, he'd blow, which brought about a change. The change is now the tag you can use to get back to all the stuff behind it.

DWINDLING SPIRAL OF CIRCUIT FORMATION 1. The thetan being as himself. 2. He gets invalidated/overwhelmed as himself. 3. He picks up a valence. 4. The valence gets

overwhelmed by a somatic. 5. The valence's knowingness is invalidated. 6. The PC, as the valence, sets up a circuit to use the "impact knowingness"   of the somatic as a senior source of knowledge, so he can go on being   validated in his knowingness. The circuit now does the observing and   knowing. 7. The circuit becomes audible. 8. The circuit gives orders. 9. The circuit gives orders below the level of consciousness, always expressed at least faintly in somatics.

The point of change is a withdrawal; so is the original O/W. Both key in circuits. [Cf. page 47, where LRH points out that circuits are a substitute for confront and gives more data about what circuits are used for.] The whole story is repetitive out-of-communication, with a periscope that looks for him and tells him. That's the hidden standard, seen as a circuit. Experience must not approach this person, and since auditing is an experience, he never allows it to approach. You are trying to audit the person, not the via. Thus case gain is slow at best.

The Problems Intensive hits all this and knocks the circuits out of the road. It can be done with imprecise auditing, and it starts with a PC assessment which is less accusative to the new PC than a sec check assessment. He gets familiar with sec checks on a gradient, dealing with specific people, interesting areas to him. It makes practically any level of case processable and can be done by the most self-conscious auditor.

Problems Intensive Assessment

The PC assessment form is of vast use to the auditor to know what is going on is the PC's life. If you have a new PC -- new to scientology, do one. Even if the PC is just new to you, do one. It gives the PC some confidence to know that his auditor knows something about him. It should be done by the auditor who is going to audit that PC. This will relieve the PC's sneaking suspicion that the auditor knows nothing about him. If the PC knows about something, it isn't aberrative, so this is a negative assessment, since whatever is known there isn't aberrative.

Number of times divorced is an important one, especially if it doesn't correlate with number of times married, since you've then got big withholds to get off. Educational level is another area for withholds. Pcs can be ashamed of how little or how much they've had. Jobs, accidents, illnesses: this starts to get into an interesting zone: engrams he never mentions. Watch out for restimulation in these areas, if you ask any details about them, This can throw the PC right into engrams,

The auditor gets data while doing this form that tempts him to take things up with the PC, but don't do it! Acknowledge and go on without creating an ARC break. Don't let the PC talk his havingness down, in the accidents and illnesses area. If the PC is very chatty, give him an R-factor beforehand that you only want to know briefly about each thing. The some applies to the present physical condition. We're very interested in whether there are any withheld physical conditions or worries about health they haven't told anyone or diseases they'd hate to have anyone know about. Pump the PC; get all the withholds off, because this is a serious withhold on the case. On mental treatment, be equally sure to get off any withholds. It would be not OK to be getting other treatment, physical or mental, at the same time as auditing.

The usual cause of high tone arms on pcs who leave with low TA and come back with high TA is some withhold about their physical condition or concurrent mental treatment or some bug on the subject of the mind. Get the withholds off on the subject or you won't be his auditor, because he won't be willing to talk to you. If you do get them off, you'll be his auditor because you know things about him no one else knows.

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE PROCEDURE

2 JANUARY 1989

All sticks on the Time Track stick because of a Prior Confusion. The most stuck point on the track is a problem.

A Problem is caused by a balanced postulate-counter-postulate. Neither postulate has dominance. The problem, therefore, hangs in time and floats in time. Force vs. force, endeavor vs. endeavour; all these are the anatomy of a problem.

One cannot have a problem without perpetrations and withholds against the people involved in it, for one cannot be so individuated as to not influence others unless one has P/Ws on those others.

All somatics, aberrations, circuits and problems are postulate-counter- postulate situations.

All these items occur only where one has P/Ws on others.

Here is an important definition:

HIDDEN STANDARD 1. An undisclosed opinion, decision or consideration which an individual formed sometime in the past of how things should be. This decision has never been acknowledged or accepted by others. The individual uses the decision or consideration automatically to judge and measure her/his own progress as well as the propriety of the actions and behaviors of others.

By finding and clearing the area of Prior Confusion to any problem, somatic, circuit or hidden standard, one can alleviate or blow that problem or condition.

THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

1.   Complete Change List

The Clearing Practitioner asks the Pc for all the self-determined changes the Pc has made this lifetime. For example, "What self-determined changes have you made in this lifetime?" These are written with date first, followed by two or three descriptive words. This list is done on a separate sheet of paper and not on the session worksheets.

It is important that no other-determined changes in his or her life are recorded as these are occurrences of engram content as in operations.

The Pc must have made up his or her mind to change, to move, to diet, to seek adventure, to take up sewing, to go to Church, etc, etc.

When the CB Meter no longer reacts to the question "Was there another time you decided to change your life?," when no needle action remains, consider the list complete.

The following areas can be made into questions to prompt the Pc to give more answers:

When did Pc start a new life?

When did Pc stop going to parties?

When did Pc leave a job?

When did Pc subscribe to a fad?

When did Pc newly join any religious group?

When did Pc decide to start being educated in some new line?

Whom did the Pc decide to leave and when?

When did the Pc decide to go away?

If the Clearing Practitioner thinks of other prompting questions, these can be used also (just so they are self-determined and not other-determined).

2.   Assess Change List

We find the most important, most reacting change in the Pc's life by the largest read.

Assess this list to see which change got the biggest read when the Pc gave it. You will wind up with a charged, self-determined change. Write it down on your worksheet.

3.   Obtain Problem

Ask the Pc for the problem that preceded this change.

If you have the right change, the Problem will leap into view. If you have the wrong change, the Pc will appear to be in present time trying to figure out what problem there might have been.

This last indicates he is not stuck in the problem; therefore, it isn't it. If the Pc obviously can't find any problem in the area, even when coaxed, do a better assessment.

When you have the problem, write it down.

4.   Date The Problem

Find the date in this lifetime when this problem arose. This gets the Pc into a time perspective with regard to the problem.

If the Pc insists on going back track, play along with it. Do the following steps anyway on back track. But do not encourage it. A Problems Intensive concerns this lifetime.

5.   Find the Prior Confusion

Discuss the problem with the Pc. Find out what people or type of person it concerns.

We then locate the prior confusion to that problem. In no case will it be earlier than two weeks from the incident. These confusions, so often missed by the Clearing Practitioner, take place from two weeks to five minutes before the actual decision to change.

Locate the Confusion which occurred minutes, days, weeks before this problem. This should read on the meter when the Pc gets it.

Find out the names of the people concerned in this confusion.

Write down these names with the meter reads.

Now ask searchingly with the meter for any missing persons.

When satisfied you have the persons (and sometimes things) involved, end your list.

6.   Clearing Terminals (OPTIONAL STEP)

Take the largest reading person (terminal) found above and use the Four Magic Questions to clear that terminal.

1.   What did_____do that was all right?

2.   What did_____fail to do?

3.   Concerning_____what did you do that wasn't all right?

4.   Concerning_____what did you fail to do?

For the complete procedure on this see the bulletin THE FOUR MAGIC QUESTIONS. You may also have to use additional processes to get the terminal flat. Refer to the bulletin called MULTI-PROCESS TERMINAL RUNDOWN.

When the first terminal is flat, pick the next longest reading terminal and flatten it, until all reading terminals are flat.

If the Pc has a specific terminal, a boyfriend named Jake, which is part of a life-long problem with men or boyfriends, you might want to generalize the terminal. In the case of a boyfriend named Jake, the generalized terminal could turn out to be "a man" or "a boyfriend" or whatever the Pc says it is. Refer to the bulletin called SOME HELP TERMINALS for information on how to turn a specific terminal into a general one.

After all the reading terminals in the prior confusion are flat, check to see if the Pc now remembers any other people involved in that confusion and run those that are reading. Repeat until you've really cleaned up and flattened this entire area of the Pc's life.

7.   Prepchecking

At this point, when asked, the Pc will probably be able to give you a very accurate date for the prior confusion. Use the meter if needed to get the date right down to year, month and day (for example May 20, 1955).

Having located the time of the prior confusion, we then go one month earlier in date.

This gives us an exact date for our questions. Let us say the self-determined change was June 1, 1955. The prior confusion was May 20, 1955, and the arbitrary month earlier was April 20, 1955. We get the Pc to spot this arbitrary date more or less to her ownsatisfaction.

We now form a question as follows: "Since (date) is there anything you have...."

The question is completely cleaned by Repetitive Prepchecking. One asks it off the meter until the Pc says there is no more. Then one checks it on the meter and steers the Pc with any read, and then continues the question off the meter to an F/N or until the Pc can really find no more answers.

In turn, we clean each one of the buttons above. It is vital not to clean anything that's clean or to miss cleaning a read that reacts.

When we have in turn cleaned each of the buttons above, we take the next longest reading item off the change list and get a new time just as before and handle that just as before.

When the second area is clean, we assess for a third, until all reading self-determined changes are run.

Once in a while, particularly if the needle gets dirty, we ask for missed withholds.

If the Pc has a wide persistent F/N with VVGIs and a dramatic life change with a valence shift, end off the entire Problems Intensive, even if you still have unrun change items on the original list.

A Problems Intensive can key out present time problems of long duration, chronic somatics, circuits and hidden standards.

It is one of the skills of a Class II Clearing Practitioner (Guiding Style Clearing).

Excellent graph changes (Personality Profile) have been obtained by giving a Problems Intensive.

A SUMMARY OF THE BEST LEVEL II PROCESSES

29 SEPTEMBER 1988

I.   THE PRECLEAR'S CONFRONT PROCESS

The Confront Process for the Preclear is located by Range Arm. If eight or ten commands of a Confront Process moves the Range Arm, that is the Confront Process for the Preclear to be used after other processes and before the Havingness process is run. If the needle floats while testing a Confront Process, indicate the F/N and end off the process. That is the Preclear's Confront Process. If a Confront Process fails to move the Range Arm or F/N in 8 to 10 commands during testing, stop using it immediately and test the next one.

These are the Confront Processes in order of test:

(Where there are two commands, run them alternate repetitive)

C1. Tell me something I am not doing to you.

C2. What beingness could you confront?
      What beingness would you rather not confront?

C3. What beingness could others not confront?

C4. What unkind thought have you withheld?

C5. Tell me something you might not be confronting.

C6. What would deter another?
      Where would you put it?

C7. What unconfrontable thing could you present?

C8. What is a bad object?

C9. Point out a place where you are not being confronted.

C10. Recall somebody who was real to you.
      Recall somebody you really liked.
      Recall somebody you could really communicate with.

C11. What intention failed?

C12. What would be betrayal?

C13. What would you rather not duplicate?

C14. What is understandable?
      What is understanding?

C15. What have you done?
      What have you withheld?

C16. What past beingness would best suit you?
      What past thing would best suit you?

C17. What could you confront?

What would you rather not confront?

II.   REVELATION PROCESS XI CONFRONT PROCESS

Run as a bracket:

1. What could you confront?

2. What would you permit another to reveal?

3. What might another confront?

4. What might another permit you to reveal?

5. What would you rather not confront?

6. What would you rather not reveal?

7. What might another hate to confront?

8. What might another object to your revealing?

9. What should be confronted?

10. What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?

III.   REVELATION PROCESS X2

Run as a bracket:

1. What wouldn't you want another to present?

2. What wouldn't another want you to present?

3. What have you presented?

4. What has another presented?

IV.   LIGHT GRADIENT PERPETRATION WITHHOLD PROCESSES

Run each to EP:

1. Tell me some things you think you should not have done.

2. Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble.

3. What wouldn't you do over again?

4. What are some things a person shouldn't say?

5. What gets a person into trouble?

6. What have you done that you regret?

7. What have you said you wish you hadn't?

8. What have you advised others to do?

V.   SELECTED PERSONS PERPETRATION RECALL PROCESS

A. Select a person (terminal) that is real to the Preclear.

B. Run (whichever reads best on the meter on clearing first command):

1. Recall something you have done to_____.

2. Recall something you have withheld from_____.

OR

1. Recall a time when you did something to_____.

2. Recall a time when you withheld something from_____.

OR

1. Recall something_____has done that wasn't all right.

2. Recall something_____has failed to do.

3. Regarding_____recall something you've done that wasn't all right.

4. Regarding_____recall something you've failed to do?

Here is how we find the selected person:

1. Is there anyone in your life who is to blame for the condition you're in?

2. Is there any person who really had it in for you?

3. Is there anyone you know that you'd really hate to be?

4. Did you know anyone in the past who you'd really hate to be?

5. Is there anyone you'd like to get even with?

6. Is there anyone in your life who has harmed you?

7. Is there anyone who causes you to get angry when you think about them?

8. Do you have any enemies?

9. Do you have any regrets about a past relationship?

It is better to find and run generalized terminals, except in the case of a present time problem where running specific terminals is acceptable.

Select a new person each time the Pc EPs the one you're running. You'll find some amazingvalence shifts.

VI.   GENERAL PERPETRATION PROCESS

The commands to be used to clean up perpetrations are three in number. They are run one at a time (as a bracket) to a floating needle on the process (not F/N on each leg).

1. What has been done to you?

2. What have you done?

3. What has another done to another?

4. What have you done to yourself?

VII.   THE PRECLEAR'S HAVINGNESS PROCESS

Help processing lowers havingness. After doing some help processing we run a havingness process to restore havingness. Perpetration/withhold processing actually raises havingness. A perpetration and the subsequent withhold cause the person to restrain his actions and communication and these restraints are in themselves a reduced havingness; therefore, the running and releasing of perpetrations and withholds removes these restraints, thereby, restoring or raising havingness. Nevertheless, we do run havingness after P/W processing or after the Pc has gotten off perpetrations on any other process such as prepchecking. This allows the Pc to see that his reach has been restored by the P/W process or processes. It is merely an invitation to utilize his newly restored power to reach.

See the bulletins HAVINGNESS and LIST OF HAVINGNESS PROCESSES for more information.

EXPANDED CONFRONT RUNDOWN

3 JANUARY 1989

Expanded Grade II is done in two parts:

1.   Confront to an EP for confront.

2.   Perpetration/Withhold to an EP for Grade II.

As soon as the Preclear is flat on confront, go on to the EXPANDED PERPETRATION/WITHHOLD RUNDOWN. You may not need to run all the confront processes.

I.   THE PRECLEAR'S CONFRONT PROCESS

The Confront Process for the Preclear is located by Range Arm. If eight or ten commands of a Confront Process moves the Range Arm, that is the Confront Process for the Preclear to be used after other processes and before The Havingness process is run. If the needle floats while testing a Confront Process, indicate the F/N and end off the process. That is the Preclears Confront Process. If a Confront Process fails to move the Range Arm or F/N in 8 to 10 commands during testing, stop using it immediately and test the next one.

In this step the Clearing Practitioner finds the Preclear's confront process and then runs it to full EP.

These are the Confront Processes in order of test:

(Where there are two commands, run them alternate repetitive)

C1. "Tell me something I am not doing to you."

C2. "What beingness could you confront?"
       "What beingness would you rather not confront?"

C3. "What beingness could others not confront?"

C4. "What unkind thought have you withheld?"

C5. "Tell me something you might not be confronting."

C6. "What would deter another?"
       "Where would you put it?"

C7. "What unconfrontable thing could you present?"

C8. "What is a bad object?"

C9. "Point out a place where you are not being confronted."

C10. "Recall somebody who was real to you."
       "Recall somebody you really liked."
       "Recall somebody you could really communicate with."

C11. "What intention failed?"

C12. "What would be betrayal?"

C13. "What would you rather not duplicate?"

C14. "What is understandable?"
"What is understanding?"

C15. "What have you done?"
"What have you withheld?"

C16. "What past beingness would best suit you?"
"What past thing would best suit you?"

C17. "What could you confront?"
"What would you rather not confront?"

II.   VIEWPOINT PROCESSING

F-1

1. Give me some things which it would be comfortable for you to look at.

2. Give me some emotions it would be all right for you to look at.

3. Give me some efforts it would be all right for you to look at.

F-2

1. Give me some things which it would be comfortable for another to look at.

2. Give me some emotions it would be all right for another to look at.

3. Give me some efforts it would be all right for another to look at.

F-3

1. Give me some things which it would be comfortable for others to look at.

2. Give me some emotions it would be all right for others to look at.

3. Give me some efforts it would be all right for others to look at.

F-0

1. Give me some things about yourself which it would be comfortable to look at.

2. Give me some emotions of yours it would be all right for you to look at.

3. Give me some efforts of yours it would be all right for you to look at.

III.   VIEWPOINT ARC PROCESS

F-1

1. Who would it be all right to have like you?

2. Who would it be all right to have agree with you?

3. Who would it be all right to have communicate with you?

F-2

1. Who would it be all right for you to like?

2. Who would it be all right for you to agree with?

3. Who would it be all right for you to communicate with?

F-3

1. Who would it be all right for others to have like them?

2. Who would it be all right for others to have agree with them?

3. Who would it be all right for others to have communicate with them?

F-0

1. What would it be all right for you to like about yourself?

2. What would it be all right for you to agree with about yourself?

3. What would it be all right for to communicate about yourself?

IV.   FRIENDLY PROCESS

F-1

1. Get the idea of people making you friendly.

2. Get the idea of people making you unfriendly.

F-2

1. Get the idea of making people friendly.

2. Get the idea of making people unfriendly.

F-3

1. Get the idea of people making other people friendly.

2. Get the idea of people making other people unfriendly.

F-0

1. Get the idea of making yourself friendly.

2. Get the idea of making yourself unfriendly.

V.   MELBOURNE 3

Do a Dynamic Assessment and run the terminals found in the following processes. General terminals are better than specific.

F-1

1. What about a_____could another confront?

2. What about a_____would another rather not confront?

F-2

1. What about a_____could you confront?

2. What about a_____would you rather not confront?

F-3

1. What about a_____could others confront?

2. What about a_____would others rather not confront?

F-0

1. If you were a_____what about yourself could you confront?

2. If you were a_____what about yourself would you rather not confront?

VI.   REVELATION PROCESS XI CONFRONT PROCESS

Run as a bracket:

1. What could you confront?

2. What would you permit another to reveal?

3. What might another confront?

4. What might another permit you to reveal?

5. What would you rather not confront?

6. What would you rather not reveal?

7. What might another hate to confront?

8. What might another object to your revealing?

9. What should be confronted?

10. What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?

VII.   CONTINUOUS CONFRONT

F-1

1. What could another continue to confront about you?

2. What would another rather not continue to confront about you?

F-2

1. What could you continue to confront about another?

2. What would you rather not continue to confront about another?

F-3

1. What could others continue to confront about others?

2. What would others rather not continue to confront about others?

F-0

1. What could you continue to confront about yourself?

2. What would you rather not continue to confront about yourself?

VIII.   REVELATION PROCESS X2

F-1

1. What wouldn't you want another to present to you?

2. What has another presented to you?

F-2

1. What wouldn't another want you to present?

2. What have you presented to another?

F-3

1. What wouldn't another want another to present?

2. What has another presented to another?

F-0

1. What wouldn't you want to present to yourself?

2. What have you presented to yourself?

IX.   THE PRECLEAR'S HAVINGNESS PROCESS

When you run Confront on a Preclear be sure to run Havingness between processes if needed and always at the end of session if needed.

See the bulletins HAVINGNESS and LIST OF HAVINGNESS PROCESSES for more information.

EXPANDED PERPETRATION WITHHOLD RUNDOWN

4 JANUARY 1989

Expanded Grade II is done in two parts:

1.   Confront to an EP for confront.

2.   Perpetration Withhold to an EP for Grade II.

The EP for Grade II is:

RELIEF FROM THE HOSTILITIES AND SUFFERINGS OF LIFE

You may not need all the processes in this rundown to achieve that result.

HAVINGNESS

When a Pc gets off perpetrations and withholds in a session her ability to expand and reach into the environment is greatly enhanced. To assist the Pc in experiencing this new found ability, havingness is always run at the end of a P/W session. Actually running P/W increases havingness so we are not running havingness to "restore" havingness as with Help Processing. Havingness after P/W is a way of showing the Pc that she can now reach and is no longer as inhibited from reaching into the environment.

Do havingness first and then do the forgiveness step.

FORGIVENESS

The Clearing Practitioner who runs P/W processing must inform the person that he is forgiven for the sins he just confessed, and that he is cleared of these sins and free of them.

The statement that is used is:

"By the power invested in me as a Clearing Practitioner, any perpetrations and withholds you have fully and truthfully told me are forgiven."

I.   LIGHT GRADIENT PERPETRATION WITHHOLD PROCESSES

PROCESS ONE:

F-1

1. Tell me some things you think another should not have done to you.

F-2

1. Tell me some things you think you should not have done.

F-3

1. Tell me some things others think they should not have done to others.

F-0

      1. Tell me some things you think you should not have done to yourself.

PROCESS TWO:

F-1

      1. Tell me what another has done that got him/her into trouble.

        and/or

      1. What gets a person into trouble?

F-2

      1. Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble.

F-3

      1. Tell me what others have done to others that got them into trouble.

F-0

      1. Tell me what you've done to yourself that got you into trouble.

PROCESS THREE:

F-1

      1. What wouldn't another do over again?

F-2

      1. What wouldn't you do over again?

F-3

      1. What wouldn't others do over again?

F-0

      1. What wouldn't you do over again to yourself?

PROCESS FOUR:

F-1

      1. What are some things a person shouldn't say to you?

F-2

1. What are some things you shouldn't say to others?

F-3

1. What are some things people shouldn't say to each other?

F-0

1. What are some things you shouldn't say to yourself?

PROCESS FIVE:

F-1

1. What has another done to you that he/she regrets?

F-2

1. What have you done that you regret?

F-3

1. What have others done to others that they regret?

F-0

1. What have you done to yourself that you regret?

PROCESS SIX:

F-1

1. What has another said to you that he wishes he hadn't?

F-2

1. What have you said you wish you hadn't?

F-3

1. What have others said to others they wish they hadn't

F-0

1. What have you said about yourself you wish you hadn't?

PROCESS SEVEN:

F-1

1. What has another advised you to do?

F-2

    1. What have you advised others to do?

F-3

    1. What have others advised others to do?

F-0

    1. What have you advised yourself to do?

II.   CLEARING BASIC TERMS

1. Clear the word perpetration. Have the Pc use it in sentences.

2. Run the word perpetration through the Creative Definition Procedure.

3. Clear the word transgression.

4. Run the word transgression through the Creative Definition Procedure.

5. Clear the word withhold. Be sure to use the definition that defines a withhold as a "transgression against a moral code."

6. Run the word withhold through the Creative Definition Procedure.

III.   SELECTED PERSONS PERPETRATION RECALL PROCESS

A. Select a person (terminal) that is real to the Preclear.

Use the following questions to find terminals:

1. Is there anyone in your life who is to blame for the condition you're in?

2. Is there any person who really had it in for you?

3. Is there anyone you know that you'd really hate to be?

4. Did you know anyone in the past who you'd really hate to be?

5. Is there anyone you'd like to get even with?

6. Is there anyone in your life who has harmed you?

7. Is there anyone who causes you to get angry when you think about them?

8. Do you have any enemies?

9. Do you have any regrets about a past relationship?

10. Have you known people who were really weak?

B.   Run terminals using one of the following P/W processes (whichever reads best on the meter on clearing first command).

P/W Process One:

F-1

    1. Recall something_____has done to you.

    2. Recall something_____has withheld from you.

F-2

    1. Recall something you have done to_____.

    2. Recall something you have withheld from_____.

F-3

    1. Recall something_____has done to others.

    2. Recall something_____has withheld from others.

F-3A

    1. Recall something others have done to_____.

    2. Recall something others have withheld from_____.

F-0

    1. Recall something you have done to yourself because of_____.

    2. Recall something you have withheld from yourself because of_____.

OR

P/W PROCESS TWO:

F-1

1.   Recall a time when_____did something to you.

2.   Recall a time when_____withheld something from you.

F-2

1.   Recall a time when you did something to_____.

2.   Recall a time when you withheld something from_____.

F-3

1.   Recall a time when_____did something to another.

2.   Recall a time when_____withheld something from another.

F-3A

1.   Recall a time when another did something to_____.

2.   Recall a time when another withheld something from_____.

F-0

     1. Recall a time when you did something to yourself because of_____.

     2. Recall a time when you withheld something from yourself because of_____.

OR

P/W PROCESS THREE:

F-1

     1. Think of something that_____has done to you.

     2. Think of something_____has withheld from you.

F-2

     1. Think of something you have done to_____.

     2. Think of something you have withheld from_____.

F-3

     1. Think of something_____has done to another or others.

     2. Think of something_____has withheld from another or others.

F-3A

     1. Think of something another has done to_____.

     2. Think of something another has withheld form_____.

F-0

     1. Think of something you have done to yourself because of_____.

     2. Think of something you have withheld from yourself because of_____.

OR

P/W PROCESS FOUR:

F-1

     1. What has_____done to you?

2. What has_____withheld from you?

F-2

1. What have you done to_____?

2. What have you withheld from_____?

F-3

1. What has_____done to another or others?

2. What has_____withheld from another or others?

F-3A

1. What has another done to_____?

2. What has another withheld from_____?

F-0

1. What have you done to yourself because of_____?

2. What have you withheld from yourself because of_____?

OR

P/W PROCESS FIVE:

1.   Recall something_____has done that wasn't all right.
2.   Recall something_____has failed to do.
3.   Regarding_____recall something you've done that wasn't all right.
4.   Regarding_____recall something you've failed to do?

P/W PROCESS FIVE is run as a bracket. You can use any other variation of the Four Magic Questions.

OR

P/W PROCESS SIX:

F-1

1. Get the idea of_____doing something to you.

2. Get the idea of_____withholding something from you.

F-2

1. Get the idea of doing something to_____.

2. Get the idea of withholding something from_____.

F-3

1. Get the idea of_____doing something to another or others.

2.Get the idea of_____withholding something from another or others.

F-3A

1. Get the idea of another doing something to_____.

2. Get the idea of another withholding something from_____.

F-0

1. Get the idea of doing something to yourself because of_____.

2. Get the idea of withholding something from yourself because of_____.

Use the process that reads best with the Pc and is most real to the Pc and then stick with that form for the rest of Grade II.

It is better to find and run generalized terminals, except in the case of a present time problem where running specific terminals is acceptable.

Select a new person each time Pc EPs the one you're running. You'll find some amazing valence shifts.

After P/W is flat on any terminal you can run responsibility with the following process:

1.   What responsibility have you taken for a_____?

This process is not run for every terminal, but only on those where responsibility has been low.

IV.   GENERAL PERPETRATION PROCESS

The commands to be used to clean up perpetrations are three in number. They are run one at a time (as a bracket) to a floating needle on the process (not F/N on each leg).

1. What has been done to you?

2. What have you done?

3. What has another done to another?

V.   NOT-IS RECALL PROCESS

1. Recall a time you implied something was unimportant.
2. Recall a time when somebody else thought something was important.

VI.   WANTS HANDLED PROCESSES

A simple and very satisfactory way of making a Pc happy and getting results is to ask the Pc what he thinks is wrong with him/her and run whatever the Pc says - providing it's a terminal - in a general form. If it's not a terminal, get the Pc to convert it to one.

The terminal is then run in the P/W process found in SELECTED PERSONS PERPETRATION RECALL above.

Example:

Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

PC: "My wife."

Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run a wife."

Example:

Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

PC: "I'm impatient."

Clearing Practitioner: "Can you think of somebody who was impatient?"

PC: "My Father."

Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run a Father."

Example:

Clearing Practitioner: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

PC: "Well, I think I'm hostile."

Clearing Practitioner: "Did you ever know a hostile person?"

PC: "Yes."

Clearing Practitioner: "Who was it?"

PC: "George James."

Clearing Practitioner: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one) "What was George James?":

PC: "A Loafer!"

Clearing Practitioner: "OK, we'll run help on 'a loafer,' all right?"

PC: "Fine."

When "a loafer" is flat, we do the same assessment again and as above get a new general terminal.

VII.   RECALL A SECRET

1. Recall a secret.

VIII.   PERPETRATION JUSTIFICATION PROCESS

F-1

1. In this lifetime what perpetration has another committed against you?
2. How has he/she justified it?

Run these processes 12222..., 12222..., 12222..., etc.

F-2

1. In this lifetime what perpetration have you committed against someone?

2. How have you justified it?

F-3

1. In this lifetime what perpetration has another committed against another or others?

2.How have she/he justified it?

F-0

1. In this lifetime what perpetration have you committed against yourself?

2. How have you justified it?

IX. KNOW TO MYSTERY P/W PROCESS

The Know to Mystery Scale:

KNOW
NOT KNOW
KNOW ABOUT
LOOKING
EMOTION
EFFORT
THINKING
SYMBOLS
EATING
SEX
MYSTERY
WAITING
UNCONSCIOUSNESS

1. Ask the Pc what terminal (person or object) would represent each of the above starting from the bottom of the scale.

2. Select the terminal (object or person) which gives the largest read.

3. Run the terminal in the P/W process found in SELECTED PERSONS PERPETRATION RECALL as above.

4. Repeat in order of descending read on other terminals found.

X. P/W PROCESS ON PROBLEM PEOPLE

1. Ask, "What types of people do you have problems with?" and make a list.

2.   Run reading items in the P/W process found in SELECTED PERSONS PERPETRATION RECALL above.

XI.   THE BEST RESPONSIBILITY PROCESS

Two way comm the following questions:

1. Is there something you've been trying to do?

2. Is there something you've been unable to accomplish?

3. Is there any area of your life where you've wanted to do something and you find you can't do it?

4. Are you having trouble taking responsibility in some area of your life?

5. Is there area where you feel you cannot take responsibility?
Find terminals that represent these areas. This can be done by asking:

1. Did you know anyone who had that difficulty?

OR

2. Did you ever know anyone like that?

or

3. What type of person would_____?

or

4. What type of terminals would_____?

or any other questions that find charged terminals that represent the area.

Take the terminals you find and run them by largest read first in the P/W process found in SELECTED PERSONS PERPETRATION RECALL above.

XII.   PERPETRATIONS BY DYNAMICS

At this point use the PERPETRATIONS BY DYNAMICS list of perpetrations and withholds. Handle by standard Integrity Processing procedure to a full EP. Other perpetration lists can also be done at this point. Additionally, a specialized Integrity Process List can be "custom made" to fit a particular area or profession.

XIII. WITHHOLD PROCESS

F-1

        1. What could you withhold from another?

F-2

        1. What could another withhold from you?

F-3

     1. What could another withhold from others?

F-0

     1. What could you withhold from yourself?

XIV.   WITHHOLD PROCESS FOR ALLIES

Two Way Comm the following questions to get terminals (general or specific) which are allies:

1. If you were having a difficult time in life where would you seek help?

2. When you were not well as a child who took care of you?

3. Who are your main support people?

4. Who were some of your main support people in the past?

   You can make up other similar questions to find allies.

   Run the terminals found in the following process:

F-1

     1. What could you withhold from_____?

F-2

     1. What could_____withhold from you?

F-3

     1. What could_____withhold from others?

F-0

     1. What could_____withhold from himself/herself?

XV.   COMMISSION AND OMISSION PROCESS

F-1

     1. What has another done?

     2. What has another not done?

F-2

     1. What have you done?

     2. What have you not done?

F-3

    1. What have others done?

    2. What have others not done?

XVI.   HAPPINESS RUNDOWN

At this point the HAPPINESS RUNDOWN can be done using any number of moral or social codes, e.g. The Code of Integrity, The Clearing Practitioner Code, The Ten Commandments, The Way to Happiness, etc.

XVII. MOTIVATOR CLEARING PROCEDURE

See bulletin called MOTIVATOR CLEARING PROCEDURE.

XVIII. 3 S & Ds

If the Pc has not attested Grade II by this point, do the standard 3 S & Ds. Run the full PTS Rundown steps on each item found. See the bulletin called S & Ds.

XIX. SUPPRESSED PERSON HANDLING

Any remaining troublesome terminals would be run on the Suppressed Person Rundown steps at this point.

XX.   LOCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

1. Look around here and find something you could be responsible for.

2. Look around here and find something you don't have to be responsible for.

3. Look around here and find something you would permit somebody else to be responsible for.

XXI. GENERAL P/W PROCESS

F-1

    1. What has another done to you?

    2. What has another withheld from you?

F-2

    1. What have you done to another?

    2. What have you withheld from another?

F-3

1. What has another done to another or others?

2. What has another withheld from another for others?

F-0

1. What have done to yourself?

2. What have you withheld from yourself?

XXII. INTEGRITY PROCESSES FOR GRADE II

INT 1:

1.   In this lifetime, what have you said you would do or decided to do then did not do?

2.   In this lifetime, what did you say you wouldn't do or decided you wouldn't do and then did it anyway?

INT 2:

1.   In this lifetime have you ever changed your mind without letting another or others know?

2.   How did you justify it?

XXIII. THE PRECLEAR'S HAVINGNESS PROCESS

When you run Confront or Perpetration Withhold Processes on a Preclear be sure to run Havingness between processes if needed and always at the end of session.

ANALYSIS OF CASES

29 SEPTEMBER 1988

A primary skill required of an accomplished Clearing Practitioner would be analysis of a case. The basic error is overestimating the case's ability. All failures stem from a failure to undercut the reality of a case. If that reality level is reached, the case will improve. If not, the case remains stagnant.

THE DEFINITION OF RESULTS: The Preclear achieves a reality on change of case, somatic behavior or appearance, for the better.

THE DEFINITION OF BETTER: Negative gain. Things disappear that have been annoying or unwanted.

THE DEFINITION OF ABILITY GAINED: Pc's recognition that Pc can now do things she could not do before.

THE DEFINITION OF INTELLIGENCE GAIN: Loss of reactivation of stupidity by reason of attempts to confront or experience the problems of life. Intelligence appears when stupidity is keyed out or erased. Intelligence is a confronting ability.

FAMILIARITY: Familiarization permits intelligence to manifest. Reaching and withdrawing are more possible when stupidity is keyed out or erased. Increasing ability to reach and withdraw increases intelligence.

It can be seen that when attention is fixed, the ability to reach and withdraw decreases; therefore, intelligence decreases, therefore the ability to change decreases, therefore no "case gain."

Unfixing attention is done in various ways. As hypnotism is done by fixing attention, a parallel observation is that a person wakes up, receives less fixed effect, when attention becomes unfixed.

Unfixing attention must be done by increasing ability to reach and withdraw from the specific thing or person on which attention is fixed in the bank. The bank merely expresses a recording of past attention fixations.

Shocks of various kinds can unfix attention but always lead to a decrease in ability over a period. Unfixing attention by violence throws a case downscale. As the case goes upscale the attention refixes on things violence unfixed it from.

Clearing is a gradient process of finding places where attention is fixed and restoring the ability of the Pc to place and remove attention under his own determinism.

Case Analysis consists then of the determination of where Pc's attention (at current state of case) is fixed on the track and restoring Pc's determinism over those places.

This is done by:

1. Present Time Problem running.

2. Preclear Interview and remedy of fixed points by processing those areas found.

3. Selected items and persons survey and unfixing other-determined attention at those points by processing.

There are many ways of doing a survey to determine what the Pc's attention is fixed upon now. The CB Meter and interviewing of the Pc are the main methods of finding the fixed attention. The PTS interview is also a good way to locate fixed attention. The PTS interview, however, is always done after a full PTS C/S-1.

"What has your attention been fixed on lately (or 'in this Life')?" would elicit a reply that could then be used in further questioning.

"Recall a time when you did something to (items or person so located)." "Recall a time when you withheld something from (item or person so selected)."

If you find the exact item or person on which attention is fixed, you achieve immediate case gain, which is to say reality, which is to say interest, in-sessionness and success.

If any Pc you are running has not manifested case gain, reality, interest and in-sessionness, then one of two things is true:

1. Your haven't found the item or person on which Pc's attention is other-determinedly fixed and haven't run it yet, or

2. Pc is too low on the Scale of Emotions.

This may be of some small assistance in learning how to analyze a case.

SEARCH AND DISCOVERY

2 JANUARY 1989

One must know what a suppressive person is, what a potential trouble source is and the mechanism of how and why a person rollercoasters and what it is. Ethics counseling technology handles the whole phenomena of case worsening (rollercoaster) after Clearing and without this technology, a Clearing Practitioner easily becomes baffled and tends to go on hoping or give up. The only reason a person rollercoasters after good standard Clearing is the Potential Trouble Source (PTS) phenomena and a Suppressive Person (SP) is present.

THREE TYPES

There are three types of Potential Trouble Source:

Type One is the easy one. The suppressive is right in present time, actively suppressing the person.

Type Two is harder, for the apparent suppressive person in present time is only a reactivator for the actual suppressive.

Type Three is beyond the facilities of the individual Clearing Practitioner, as these are entirely psychotic.

HANDLING TYPE ONE PTS

The Type One is normally handled by a Clearing Practitioner or Ethics Counselor in the course of an interview.

The person is asked if anyone is invalidating him or his gains or his Clearing and if the person answers with a name and is then told to disconnect from that person, a bright smile appears promptly and the person is quite satisfied.

If, however, there is no success in finding the SP or if the person starts naming unlikely persons as SP, the Clearing Practitioner must realize that she is handling a Type Two PTS. The real SP is in the past.

It is easy to tell a Type One PTS from a Type Two. The Type One brightens up at once and ceases to rollercoaster the moment the present time SP is spotted. The person ceases to rollercoaster, he does not "go back on it" and begin to beg off, he does not begin to worry about the consequences of disconnecting. If the person does any of these things, then he is a Type Two.

It can be seen that the Clearing Practitioner handles the majority of the PTSes in a fast manner. There is no trouble about it. All goes smoothly.

Therefore, when you find the Type One approach does not work quickly, you must do a Search and Discovery to find the real SP in the past (Search and Discovery is a technique which locates the real Suppressive Person in the person's past).

TYPE TWO

The person who isn't sure, who won't disconnect, who doesn't brighten up, can't name any SP at all, is a Type Two.

Only Search and Discovery will help.

HANDLING TYPE THREE

The Type Three PTS is mostly in institutions or would be.

In this case, the Type Two's apparent SP is spread all over the world and is often more than all the people there are -- for the person sometimes has ghosts about him or demons and they are just more apparent SPs but imaginary as Beings as well.

All institutional cases are PTSes. The whole of insanity is wrapped up in this one fact.

The insane person is not just a bad off Being. The insane person is a Being who has been overwhelmed by an actual SP until too many persons are apparent SPs. This makes the person rollercoaster continually in life. The rollercoaster is even cyclic (repetitive as a cycle).

Putting the person in a current institution puts him in a bedlam. And when also "treated," it may finish him, for he will rollercoaster from any treatment given until made into a Type Two and given a Search and Discovery.

The task with a Type Three is not treatment as such. It is to provide a relatively safe environment and quiet and rest and no treatment of a mental nature at all until made into a Type Two and given a Search and Discovery.

Treatment with drugs, shock, operation is just more suppression. The person will not really get well, will relapse, etc.

Standard Clearing on such a person is subject to the rollercoaster phenomena. They get worse after getting better. "Successes" are sporadic, enough to lead one on, and usually they worsen again since these people are PTS.

But removed from apparent SPs, kept in a quiet surrounding, not pestered or threatened or put in fear, the person comes up to Type Two and a Search and Discovery should end the matter. But there will always be some failures as the insane sometimes withdraw into rigid unawareness as a final defense, sometimes can't be kept alive and sometimes are too hectic and distraught to ever become quiet. The extremes of too quiet and never quiet have a number of psychiatric names such as "catatonia" (withdrawn totally) and "manic" (too hectic).

Classification is interesting but non-productive since they are all PTS, all will rollercoaster and none can be trained or processed with any idea of lasting result no matter the temporary miracle.

Remove a Type Three PTS from the environment, give him rest and quiet, get a Search and Discovery done when rest and quiet have made the person Type Two.

The modern mental hospital is not the way to give a psychotic quiet and rest. Before anything can be done in this field, a proper institution would have to be provided, offering onlyrest, quiet and medical assistance for intravenous feedings and mild soporifics (sleeping medicines) where necessary (but not as "treatment") and where no treatment is attempted until the person looks recovered and only then a Search and Discovery as above under Type Two.

PTS INTERVIEWS

28 DECEMBER 1988

Interviews to discover a PTS condition are done on a meter.

The interviewer asks about:

1. Persons who are hostile or antagonistic to the Preclear.

2. Groups that are against mental or spiritual practices.

3. People who have harmed the Preclear.

4. Things that the Preclear thinks are suppressive to the Preclear.

5. Locations that are suppressive to the Preclear.

6. Past life things and Beings suppressive to the Preclear.

The above is a guideline for questioning, and questions are made up from the above 6 categories. The PTS interview is not rote. Also other questions can be made up that inquire about suppression in the life of the Preclear, for example, "Do you have a continuing upset with anyone?" See the bulletin called THE SUPPRESSED PERSON (PTS) INTERVIEW for other examples. You can make them up by the dozen.

In performing the interview, the interviewer must realize that a sick person is PTS. There are no sick people who are not PTS to someone or a group or something somewhere.

A somewhat suppressive Preclear will find the good people suppressive. This does not relieve his condition. He is PTS to SP people, groups, things or locations, no matter how SP he is.

Some PTS people will make trouble for good people because that is what PTS means (Potential Trouble Source). So do not believe that all the people he claims are suppressive people really are.

Further, when you do get the person or group or thing or location, the PTS person will begin to get well.

The PTS condition is actually a problem and a mystery and a withdrawal, so it is sometimes hard to find and has to be specially processed to locate it.

Usually it is quite visible.

Don't have a sick, rollercoaster Preclear appear for an interview and then say "not PTS." It's a false report. It only means the interviewer did not find it by asking enough of the right questions.

Those reading terminals found can be run and flattened with the MULTI-PROCESS TERMINAL RUNDOWN or THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN as given on the Level II course.

THE SUPPRESSED PERSON (PTS) INTERVIEW

28 DECEMBER 1988

Ask the following as an interview. Listen to the Pc carefully and write down what he or she says on worksheets. Write it up as a session and hand it in to your Case Supervisor (C/S) as you would any other session.

1. Are there any people who are hostile or antagonistic to you?

2. Does anyone disagree with what you are doing?

3. Does anyone not like your lifestyle?

4. Does anyone not like you the way you are?

5. Is anyone trying to make you change or be different?

6. Is there anyone who you have continual upsets with?

7. Is there anyone or anything that is suppressing you?

8. Are you unable to express yourself around certain people?

9. Are there any locations that are suppressive to you?

10. Is there anyone who has harmed you?

11. Did you think of someone and then decide not mention him or her?

12. Did any other person come to mind during this interview?

THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN

A MAGICAL NEW RUNDOWN

2 JANUARY 1989

At times the results of "ordinary" Alethiology tech are extremely impressive, even to an old timer. We are by this time, quite accustomed to miracles as usual, but magic is not quite so commonplace an occurrence, even these days, and is worthy of special note.

Many times the suppressive person to whom the Pc is PTS exists in present time and is still capable of causing trouble or upset for the Pc. It is to this situation that the Suppressed Person Rundown is addressed.

This new rundown, the Suppressed Person Rundown, produces the wondrous result of changing the disposition of an antagonistic person at a distance, by clearing the PTS Preclear. Where this person was antagonistic, invalidative, hostile or downright suppressive, he will suddenly have a change of heart and seek to make peace with the PTS Pc.

This Rundown is not considered complete until the magic occurs; that is, on this Rundown, we take a PTS Pc and we clear this Pc and clear him and clear him on Problems Processes until a major change occurs in the antagonistic person's universe, which prompts him to make a friendly overture to or concerning the Pc.

This friendly and unprompted origination or attempt at origination from the antagonistic person to or concerning the Pc will occur in all cases if Problems Processes are run and are fully flattened. This happens no matter how out of comm the two persons have been or what length of time has intervened between their last communication.

The rundown is continued until the EP occurs. Each problem process is run to its own EP.

This is how it works. The Pc, due to some act or acts previously committed, has gone the effect of the antagonistic person. The person then attempts to suppress the Pc. The Pc, already the effect of the person, becomes the effect of the suppression. So the Pc's own postulate to improve himself and his conditions

is countered by the suppressive person's counter-postulate which the PC has taken as his own, and he is thus given a present time problem of sufficient magnitude to prevent case gain, as only a present time problem will halt the progress of a case. To the present time problem are added ARC breaks with the antagonistic person, and as only ARC breaks will worsen a case, the result is no gain or deterioration of a case by reason of the suppressive connection in the environment.

A possible simple explanation for what occurs is: the Pc, on running Problems Processes, comes up to cause on his problems with the person and when he is continued on problems, he will break through and actually run out the antagonistic person's problems which he has given to him.

When this occurs, the formerly antagonistic person will get into communication with the Pc or by communicating in a friendly way to others about the Pc. He will write a letter to make peace, or he will make a phone call to say "All is well" or he will tell Aunt Betty he feelsmuch better about the Pc and has decided to let bygones be bygones. It sometimes occurs that the antagonistic person does not know where the Pc is but he will still try to communicate.

This friendly origination by the antagonistic person is the EP of the Rundown. If the person hasn't yet originated, you haven't run enough Problems Processes. THE ONLY TIME

THIS DOESN'T WORK IS WHEN YOU HAVEN'T RUN ALL POSSIBLE PROBLEMS PROCESSES OR HAVE RUN THEM WITH OUT-TECH SUCH AS A BROKEN METER.

The EP of the Rundown has been reached when the antagonistic person originates in a friendly way to the Preclear or seeks to communicate to the Pc in a friendly manner. It's not just a cessation of hostilities; it's more than that. Even if the antagonistic person doesn't know the Pc's address he will find out, or he will put word out and the Pc will hear from or about the antagonistic person. And it will be a friendly message. Even if the antagonistic person doesn't know the Pc's address, news will reach the Pc that the antagonistic person wishes bygones to be bygones. That is the EP you are aiming for, and you continue to Clear Problems Processes with the Pc on the antagonistic person until that occurs.

It is very important not to underrun the Rundown. Some Clearing Practitioners will be tempted to end off the Rundown because the Pc has had a major win or ability regained or some such. When the Pc has had a major win, you would of course let him have his win and would leave him off Clearing until the persistent F/N dies down, but you do not accept as the EP of the Rundown anything other than the formerly antagonistic person originating, with no coaxing, in a friendly way to or about the Pc. You keep running problems until the EP is attained. You do want to see the magic, don't you? And the only way this Rundown can fail is by not continuing to run Problems Processes until this EP is attained.

One of the many advantages of the Suppressed Person Rundown is its simplicity. There are very few places where it can go off the rails. This Rundown does, however, require expert metering and very standard handling, and the C/S should be alert to the following:

1)   The Clearing Practitioner must realize that the target of this Rundown is not just the Pc; the target is the antagonistic person the Pc is connected to. And the EP is not just a change in the Pc, but a change in the antagonistic person of a positive, friendly communication to the Pc. The Clearing Practitioner and C/S must realize that the above is the target and EP for this rundown.

2)   ALL Problems Processes must be run on the antagonistic person, and failure to run enough Problems Processes is the only thing that will prevent this Rundown from working.

3)   The Clearing Practitioner who does this Rundown must be skilled at metering so he doesn't miss reads and fail to run reading flows or attempt to run unreading flows. Imprecise metering can undermine the results of the Rundown as the running of all charged flows on problems is vital. The Clearing Practitioner must be able to read a meter and must take instant reads which occur instantly on clearing or calling the command. (Reference: INSTANT READS)

4)   Each reading flow of each Problems Process must be taken to its full EP which is cog, F/N and VGIs. The C/S should ensure that the processes are indeed taken to EP, that one or more Problems Processes have not been left underrun, unflat or unrun.

Some Clearing Practitioners may say they've done the Rundown and the Pc's in beautiful shape and he's had tremendous gains and now the Suppressed Person Rundown is complete.

Your answer to this is: "Finish the Rundown. Continue until the person gets in touch with the Pc to make peace." And sure enough, a day or two or three later the Pc, in utter amazement, will report that her sister, who hasn't spoken to her for 10 years has just sent her an affectionate letter or that his father, who disowned him when he got into a spiritual or mental practice, has just called to say "Hello" and that they had a great chat, just like old times.

It always happens when Problems Processes are fully run.

So there you have it, the Suppressed Person Rundown, quite an amazing magical feat, and very easily achieved with good standard Clearing. Use it well and fully and you'll get smashing one-for-one successes on PTS Pcs.

PROCESSES FOR THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN

2 JANUARY 1989

Sometimes when you get a hot PTS terminal through an interview or other question which elicits terminals, the terminal turns out to be so heavily charged that one problems process is not enough to get the terminal completely flat. We have devised a series of processes to handle such a terminal. The Clearing Practitioner uses these problems processes with the terminal in the blank space and continues using one process after another until the terminal is flat and/or the special EP for the Suppressed Person Rundown is achieved (Ref: THE SUPPRESSED PERSON RUNDOWN). The Pc may reach an EP on the terminal before all the processes are run. If this happens, indicate the F/N and end off running that terminal. Rarely, more processes are needed to flatten a terminal and if this is the case, additional processes are given elsewhere.

I.   THEN AND NOW PROBLEMS PROCESS

   Flow 1:

      1. Recall a problem you've had with_____.

      2. How did it seem to you then?

      3. How does it seem to you now?

   Flow 2:

      1. Recall a problem_____has had with you.

      2. How did it seem to her/him then?

      3. How does it seem to her/him now?

   Flow 3:

      1. Recall a problem_____has had with another.

      2. How did it seem to her/him then?

      3. How does it seem to her/him now?

   Flow 3A:

      1. Recall a problem another has had with_____.

      2. How did it seem to her/him then?

      3. How does it seem to her/him now?

   Flow 0:

      1. Recall a problem you've had with yourself because of_____.

      2. How did it seem to you then?

      3. How does it seem to you now?

Note: Run each flow to EP.

II.   CONFRONT PROCESS I

Flow 1:

    1. Tell me a problem you have with_____.

    2. What part of that problem could you confront?

Flow 2:

    1. Tell me a problem_____has with you?

    2. What part of that problem could s/he confront?

Flow 3:

    1. Tell me a problem another has with_____.

    2. What part of that problem could s/he confront?

Flow 3A:

    1. Tell me a problem_____has with another.

    2. What part of that problem could s/he confront?

Flow 0:

    1. Tell me a problem you have with yourself because of_____.

    2. What part of that problem could you confront?

III.   CONFRONT PROCESS II

Flow 1:

    1. What problem about_____could you confront?

    2. What problem about_____would rather not confront?

Flow 2:

    1. What problem about you could_____confront?

    2. What problem about you would_____rather not confront?

Flow 3:

    1. What problem about another could_____confront?

    2. What problem about another would_____rather not confront?

Flow 3A:

1. What problem about_____could another confront?

2. What problem about_____would another rather not confront?

Flow 0:

1. Concerning_____what problem about yourself could you confront?

2. Concerning_____what problem about yourself would you rather not confront?

Note: Run each flow to EP.

IV.   INVENT PROCESS

Flow 1:

Invent something worse for you than_____.

Flow 2:

Invent something worse for_____than you.

Flow 3:

Invent something worse for others than_____.

Note: Run each command to EP.

Then run:

1. Spot where_____is now.

2. Spot where you are now.

Note: Run alternate repetitive to EP.

V.   CREATIVE PROCESS

Flow 1:

1. Get the idea of solving a problem with_____.

2. Get the idea of not solving a problem with_____.

Flow 2:

1. Get the idea of_____solving a problem with you.

2. Get the idea of_____not solving a problem with you.

Flow 3:

1. Get the idea of_____solving a problem with another.

2. Get the idea of_____not solving a problem with another.

Flow 3A:

1. Get the idea of another solving a problem with_____.

2. Get the idea of another not solving a problem with_____.

VI.   PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

Flow 1:

1. What problem have you had with_____?

2. What solutions have you had for that problem?

Flow 2:

1. What problem has_____had with you?

2. What solutions has s/he had for that problem?

Flow 3:

1. What problem has another had with_____?

2. What solutions has s/he had for that problem?

Flow 3A:

1. What problem has_____had with another or others?

2. What solutions has s/he had for that problem?

Flow 0:

1. What problem have you had with yourself because of_____?

2. What solutions have you had for that problem?

The terminal should be run using these processes until it is flat, which means if the Pc has a big win, VVGIs, wide F/N, end off. Be careful not to overrun.

The smoothest running is accomplished by checking each command for a read as you clear it. Strictly speaking, if it doesn't read, don't run it.

If you need more processes, use the processes on the MULTI-PROCESS TERMINAL RUNDOWN or consult your C/S.