

P.A.B. No. 121

PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office

35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

1 October 1957

RUDIMENTS AND GOALS

All you need to clear up if somebody is having too much trouble trying to locate or isolate a problem is to clear up the semantics of a problem—what does he mean by a problem? I got this rich one off a preclear one day doing this quite fascinating thing.

What was a problem, I finally asked, and he told me a problem was something that could never be solved.

Whenever you run “withhold” on a valence you finish up with “can’t have” on the valence and that flattens it off better.

You will find it is quite often more advantageous to run Locational Processing than it is to run Problems of Comparable Magnitude. A Problem of Comparable Magnitude is all right, but it’s a thinkingness process, and on a case that is having an awful lot of trouble, it gives them hell to run Locational Processing, but nevertheless it does run out the present time problem, which is most fascinating.

Any one of the Rudiments are excellent processes—any one of them. Two-way communication is something that has never been stressed much on this side of the water—it has been taught very thoroughly on the other side. I took up a lot of the 4th London A.C.C. on the subject of two-way comm, how you handle two-way comm.

You have to keep the reality of it very high and you have to be willing to interrupt obsessive outflows of the preclear, etc., and obsessive silences. Two-way comm is a very interesting way of going about things, and it isn’t just talking. It is establishing a high level of reality. It consists of the auditor feeding experimental data to the preclear, in order to have the preclear look it over and decide about it one way or the other. In two-way comm, you don’t let a preclear as-is everything he knows, thinks or wants to do.

All right. Now we look over this and we discover that the Rudiments consist, in part, of a present time problem. Now we already know that a present time problem can be run in this wise—Locational. It can also be run as a Problem of Comparable Magnitude. So we have a lot of processes connected with a present time problem.

Now let’s take another one of the Rudiments. Clearing the Auditor. Actually, the crudest way known of clearing the auditor is **“Who do I remind you of?” “Tell me something you don’t like about me”**—these are real crude ways of clearing the auditor. The best way of clearing the auditor we know of is in Training 13, which is

"Could I help you—how?" "Could you help me—how?" "Could I help anybody else—how?" "Could you help anybody else—how?" "Do other people ever help other people?" "Do women ever help women?" "Do men ever help men?" "Do men ever help women?" "Do women ever help men?" And you just beat it to pieces on a big long bracket. Now this goes so far that it becomes a fantastic process in itself. You take father and mother valences—they are usually quite hot. You can run this on Help. This is usually quite necessary on a case that's going to hang up, because the only reason the case is sitting there is to waste help. And you can run a case on any process, no matter how excellent, on a basis of wasting help until the case simply can't find enough ways to waste it and he goes down tone scale. You have to understand the case is trying to waste help. It isn't Find the Auditor in the Rudiments today, it is Clear the Auditor. The only point on which he's cleared is Help—"Can I help you?" "Can you help me?"

All right. Now let's take another facet of this. Goals. Actually, *Handbook for Preclears* has been helping us out just to the degree that it does do a little clarification on goals and gets the guy stirred up. The real reason the *Handbook for Preclears* is used at the HGC is quite an interesting one. It's simply to stir the case up so it'll run out.

All right, this guy's sitting there in a sleep and he's just gonna run Locational, you know, and he's in a disoriented state anyhow: He isn't here and he isn't home and he isn't anywhere—well, let's get him worried, let's get him chewed up a little bit, let's get him restimulated somewhat, let's get him interested in this. All right, these problems, then, do tend to swim to the top; you run some relatively non-directional process, and does it bite on? Now if you're going to run non-directional processes—that is to say, "**Give me that hand**" and so on—you're going to have to have something to run them against, and something like the *Handbook for Preclears* gives you something. The guy thinks while he's going over this sort of thing, he thinks "Oh my, blah blah, the trouble with me is I have nothing to do and I don't want to do anything and I never will have anything to do."

But I got to thinking about goals from the usual standpoint of their high generality with most people—"I wonder if there is anybody around who could articulate with great conciseness what he would like to do"—and I found on all sides that a failure to articulate was the main difficulty. The person had a feeling he wanted to do something and this would be wonderful, and it was all in a sensory capacity. Now if he could be made to articulate this, why, we would really have something. And I experimented on ;t a little bit and we see that today in the *Handbook for Preclears*.

Now if you can get him to articulate in a session anything about the future, you have won on the subject of goals. But it must be in the alignment of this person's frame of reference—it must be aligned with his life, not aligned with something we think he ought to live. So let's take a look at clearance of goals. Goals would not be likely to run on a high generality. In other words they are specific, personal and intimate. It's "**What do you think?**" "**What do you want?**" "**What is aligned with your life?**"—and we can't beat around the bush with this one if we're going to get any place with it.

All right, let's take Goals as a process. You could run goals for 25 hours with the greatest of ease, and we just had a report of a terrific win here on a preclear who was run on Locational for 25 hours, so it looks like the Rudiments could be the

session. So if somebody says, "Well, now, I ran the Rudiments and then we got into some processing"-fascinating, you see. Rudiments are dignified today with CCH 0 as an appellation. All right.

We discover this preclear in this terrible condition of not wanting any auditing, not going any place, all of his goals being somebody else's goals. Two things we can do at once are Clear the Auditor and then run Goals. Now how would you really run Goals with two-way comm? Goals could be run with two-way comm in this way: **You ask the preclear what he is absolutely sure would happen in the next two minutes-in the next day—three days from now—one week from now— one month from now-and one year from now. And we want something he'd be absolutely sure would happen.**

Now we're running right there the reverse process of atomic bombs, which say "no future"—"no future"—"no future." Well, basically, what's wrong with anybody—why does he jam on the track? It's because of "no future." He has been denied to a point where his loss is so great that he dare not own.

I knew a person at one time, a case that was, by the way, a psychology major— one of the roughest cases I have ever run into. The case put on the total appearance of being sane—it was a dramatized sanity, and yet the case would make odd remarks like "I really think people are crazy." "Well, why do you think people are crazy?" I would say. "Well, because people say they can tell right from wrong, and you know there's no difference." Fascinating! The case would make odd remarks like this from time to time. One day the case made a remark on goals, like this: "Well, it's really best to tell people that things can't happen to them, because otherwise they might hope that they could, and then they'd be disappointed." Now you disentangle that. This was all taught to this person, by the way, at the University of California at Berkeley. The person was also taught that the best way to preserve anybody's status quo, etc., was to drug them and so on, I mean it was a gentle course. All right. This person was stark, staring mad and had no future of any kind, no slightest future, brought out by this. Five hours on just this one type of question, **"Is there anything going to happen in the remainder of this afternoon?" "Will anything happen the rest of today?"**

"Is there anything going to occur any place in the world the rest of today?" And the confident answer, with great certainty, was "No." "No." Five hours.

And finally we broke through it—"Well, you will probably sit there for the rest of the day wrangling with me and screaming at me the way you have been doing"—and it busted and I finally got the person to admit that there was some slight possibility that there would be a room here for the rest of the day. And it busted this case. It read from total no-future up. Well, this case was an isolated case, as we've occasionally had now and then, and this was an inspirational sort of process that cracked through.

Well now, we see this process of Goals on the basis of futures, and a person without futures cannot have a fancy future called a goal, and all a goal is is a fancy future determined by the person. And if he has no future at all determined by anybody, then he isn't going to go anywhere from that point, and any goal he has is totally unreal.

So the best way I know of to clear up a goal is as follows: Two-way comm “Is **there anything that's going to happen in the next couple of minutes?**” We finally get this totally thrashed out till he's got some great big certainty that there will be something a couple of minutes from now. And then we move it up a day, and then we move it up a week—three days—and move it up a week; and move it up a month; and move it up a year. And we get certainties at each one of these stages and levels, regardless of on what. Now the person knows that that is going to occur. He knows there is going to be a future there.

Now let's have him put something in this future that he now has had created.

He's created a future, he's got certainty on it, it's up there. All right. Now let's put some desire in the future and we get a goal. “**Now what would you like to have happen in the next couple of minutes?**” or “**What would you like to do in the next couple of minutes?**” — “**What would you like to do in two hours?**” — “**What would you like to do tomorrow?**” — “**What would you like to do in three days?**” — “**What would you like to do in a week?**” — “**What would you like to do in a month?**” — “**What would you like to do in a year?**” And we will get these weird things which have no desire in them; they are all get-rid-ofs, and if you really plowed such a person down on it he would get down to the bottom of the ladder, which is “Knock this body off right now.” And when he says “I would like to get rid of my fear of darkness, I would like to get over feeling bad every time my mother screams at me”—well now, these aren't desires. These are runaways, these are flinches—these are “let's not confront it,” “let's get out of the universe,” “let's scream.” And the final result is the basic postulate “If I could just get rid of this body right this instant I would be all right.”

All right. So that thing doesn't even vaguely get flat unless there is a real goal like “I'd like to have a stick of candy”—now that's a goal, see, that's a goal. “Tomorrow, I'd like to walk down the street and find a couple of bags of gold lying on the corner.”

You see, it has to have desire in it. “Next week, why I'd like to go camping. I'd just love to go camping.” Then they'll always modify these things in some way or other, “because of course I can't because I have to work and I don't have any money and”

yak, yak, yak—you got the idea? They'll modify these goals. As long as they're modifying them they don't have a goal, because they're making a postulate and the MEST universe is kicking the postulate in on them.

So how do you solve this? If it's this arduous how do you solve it? Well, run “**Build a future— two minutes** (these times are only approximate), **tomorrow, three days, a week, a month, a year** just build the fact that there will be something there, that time is going to advance in those areas. Then we build a desire into it: “**Well, what would you like to have happen?**”—“**What would you like to do in two minutes?**”, a day, three days, a week, a month, a year?

All right. Well, he didn't give you anything he really wanted to have happen; he said, “I'd like to—if I were brave enough I'd tell you I'd like to get rid of you and me and everything, but I'm not brave enough so all I will say is I would like to get rid of the darkness, that would be fine.”

All right. Two-way comm consists in the main of keeping a pre-clear talking, busting

through their silences, knocking them into line and manhandling them with pomp. You keep 'em talking; and therefore it is a skill—a very high skill. But after you've built a future you build into it something they would like to have happen in that future. All right.

So here is a modus operandi now that makes this a process: Build a future on that span, then build something they'd like to have happen in that future. Now build a new future, go all over the same first process again on prediction, next couple of minutes, what he's sure is going to happen, what he could be certain about. **"What could you be certain about a year from now?"** All right, we've built a future—then you'll find out that's a little stronger, and then we build something in that future that he'd like to have happen. And then we build a new future—same first process again—and then the second process of adding the desire to it, and we finally will come out into the clear.

Now there is a way to run Goals for twenty-five hours—slug, slug, slug. Now you can run Help for twenty-five hours, too, on just who helps who, when, where.

"Has there ever been anybody in the whole universe who ever helped anybody in the whole universe?" is the most general form of question. But here we have these Rudiments, then, moved out into processes, and it's possible to just handle intensives with Rudiments.

Now we find somebody wasting help—well, he's hard to put into session. And if you are going to help him anyway, it isn't goals that's in trouble, it's help, and if you try to help him too much and he's wasting help, he will eventually waste help by blowing. So it's help that has to be cleared if goals won't. Got this? All right!

L. RON HUBBARD