

P.A.B. No. 146
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office
37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

15 October 1958

PROCEDURE CCH

(This lecture is a final summing up of the previous CCH PABs [interrupted at PAB No. 138] and should be read after those have been digested. It was given by L. Ron Hubbard to the HGC staff auditors in Washington, D.C. on 23 August 1957.

Thinkingness in general should not be suspected to be under anybody's control. It is probably more under the auditor's control than it is under the preclear's.

When I say or ask "Is the preclear's thinkingness under control?" I want you to understand that it is less under the preclear's control at any time than under the auditor's. The auditor can certainly control the preclear's thinkingness better than the preclear can. But before you can do this you must first get the preclear's body and attention under control.

A condition to running Trio is: Is the person and attention under your control? To assume that the power of choice is also under the preclear's control—much less his thinkingness—is, of course, completely wrong.

This condition then moves Trio way up on the present scale of processes. In order to give the preclear some havingness after CCH 0 to 5 has been flattened, I have developed an undercut to Trio.

Trio is a directive process and should be prefaced by **"Get the idea of having that clock."** **"Get the idea of having that picture (indicated picture on the wall),"** etc. That's highly directive and would keep thinkingness of a rough case under control.

The second version is: **"Get the idea that it is all right to permit that (indicated object) to continue."** It is also just an indicating process.

The third section of this trio is the clincher: **“Get the idea of making that (indicated object) disappear.”** One runs “disappear” instead of “dispense with” or “not-know.”

Small objects are much easier for the preclear to make disappear than large ones. You have not told him to make it disappear but only to “get the idea of making it disappear.” Preclears usually literally interpret you and try like mad to make it disappear—and it usually does for a short time.

I have solved the enigma of exteriorization. Why doesn’t a preclear exteriorize easily and stay exteriorized? We ask the accompanying question: Why does a preclear get sick when one asks him to conceive a static? Obviously we would have to get somebody to conceive a static before he could himself stay comfortably outside his body’s head.

The answer to this problem is contained in the process **“Recall a moment of loss.”** Loss prevents the preclear from conceiving a static. He associates a static with loss. He says, “All right, if there is nothing there I’ve lost it,” or “I’ve lost something there, therefore I’d better not conceive a static.”

Conceiving a static is therefore painful. The truth of the matter is whenever he lost anything, something disappeared. All right. The funny part of it is that he never noticed that he didn’t lose totally every time. He still had other objects. He lost his tie pin, but he still has his tie. He’s still got the floor, the room, this universe, space, etc., but he never realizes this in these instances and that is why we run this process “Recall a moment of loss” to accustom somebody to conceiving a static very directly on loss and to get him to exteriorize.

An individual cannot conceive a static if he associates static with loss—if the loss is painful. So we have to cure him of the painfulness of loss, consideration of, before we can exteriorize him easily.

We do this by going back to automaticity. The universe has been taking things away from him. It has become an automaticity, and we find that the universe has an automaticity known as time and time itself is a consecutive series of losses. So we have to cure the preclear of losses before we can get him to appreciate time, otherwise he would be so afraid of losing it that he’d stick himself on the track and we get the “stuck on the track” phenomenon.

The process “Recall a moment of loss” aimed at this, but the third command of Control Trio (as this series of processes had better be called), **“Get the idea of making that (indicated object) disappear,”** handles it very well. This gets the preclear to take over the automaticity of all of the losses which he has unwillingly experienced.

The universe has been taking the things away from him, and just spotting objects and getting the idea that they are going to disappear or are disappearing takes over the automaticity of losses, and he becomes accustomed to it after a while.

All of the invisible masses that preclears have around them are actually simply symptoms of mass—loss, mass—loss. When an individual has no visio the only thing

that he is looking at is a “stuck” loss. He is looking at the nothingness of something that was there.

So one takes over that automaticity with the third command of Control Trio and one therefore has a very highly directional, workable set of processes.

Each part of that Trio would be run relatively flat and go on to the next part, and I would say that one would run each part certainly not a hundred commands each and the auditor should endeavor to stay in that order of magnitude and just run it round and round.

Take somebody with glasses, for example. His eyesight will do more tricks in less time on this third command of Control Trio than one can imagine. Things will go black. Well, why do things go black? Blackness makes things disappear and one takes over the automaticity of blackness to make things disappear. Night grabs, the way of the universe, once in every 24 hours on earth here. This is the process we have been looking for to turn on visio.

If you want to turn on sonic with this you would have to go down to a noisy part of town and just run Trio on sound, but you wouldn’t dare run Control Trio on sound if the preclear did not already have it flat on objects. Visio turns on before sonic.

There are many things one could do with this process. People who have anaesthetized areas in their body—like they have no chest, etc.—do weird things during this process.

I wanted to tell you particularly about this particular process because it is a specific and will be found to be very useful to you. We had to find out if one version of this would run without killing a preclear and that is “Recall a moment of loss.” Actually “Recall a moment of loss” should act as a havingness process because it as-is all of the lost points on the track and it should be a havingness process all by itself; but we didn’t want to be so bold as to run it with no havingness.

(Until I find out differently, this Control Trio and “Recall a moment of loss” are making a bid for our chief exteriorization processes.)

Now here is a process which is based on our old **“Recall a secret.”** The version is entirely straight wire. The auditor explains to the preclear that he is not looking for hidden data to evaluate it. He is only asking the preclear to look at the data. He then makes a list of valences, paying great attention to those the preclear considers “unimportant” or is very slow to divulge. Then the auditor takes this list and runs repetitive straight wire (1951) as follows: **“Think of something you might withhold from (valence).”**

The auditor repeats this question over and over until no communication lag is present. He *never* says **“something else** you might withhold from valence” because the auditor wants the preclear to think of some of these many times.

Before selecting another valence the auditor runs a little Locational or Trio. He then takes the next valence the same way. The list is covered once and then the same list is covered again. The object is speed. Cover many people. Given time the auditor can do the same thing on all dynamics.

There is a variation. Instead of a valence, body parts may be used. **“Think of something you might withhold from that (body part).”** Leave sexual parts or obvious psychosomatic difficulties until *last*. Don’t begin on a withered arm, for example.

It is amusing to realize that this process overlords all early psychotherapies, but they, using this effort to locate secrets, thought that divulgence and confession were the therapeutic agents. These have no bearing on workability. Further, early efforts naively thought there was one secret per case. Actually there are billions. It is easy to get into past lives on this. A basic secret is that one lived before.

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

You will often find that it is more advantageous to run Locational Processing than Problems of Comparable or Incomparable Magnitude at times. A Problem of Comparable Magnitude is all right, but it is a thinkingness process and on a case that is having an awful lot of trouble with it, 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 is an excellent process. Two-Way Communication is great and does not as-is havingness. You have to keep the reality of two-way comm very high, though, and be willing to interrupt obsessive outflows and silences of the preclear. It is establishing a high level of reality. It consists of the auditor feeding experimental data to the preclear to have him look it over and decide about it one way or the other. You don’t let the preclear in Two-Way Comm as-is everything he knows, thinks, or wants to do.

The latest addition to the Rudiments is “Clearing the Auditor.” Actually the crudest way known of clearing the auditor is **“Who do I remind you of?” “Tell me something you like about me.”** The best way of clearing the auditor we know of is in Training 15, 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?”** etc. You beat it to pieces on a big long bracket.

This goes so far that it becomes a fantastic process in itself. You take father and mother valences and they are usually quite hot. You can run this on “Help.” This is usually quite necessary on a case that is going to hang up because the only reason he is sitting there is to waste help.

One has to understand that this case is trying to waste help, and it isn’t a matter of “Find the Auditor” in the Rudiments today, but “Clear the Auditor” and the only point on which he is cleared is “Help” — “Can I help you? Can you help me?”

We use *Handbook for Preclears* to give the preclear some homework at the Hubbard Guidance Centers and it has been helping out just to the degree that it does some clarification on goals and gets the preclear stirred up. It simply stirs up the case so that it will run out.

I was running over a phrenological questionnaire, and it said people are never permitted to do anything they want to do and this is the best goal of discipline. I got

this tangled out in one way or the other. I got thinking about it from the standpoint—this was about 20 years ago—of “I wonder if there is anybody around that could articulate with great conciseness what he would like to do?” And I have found on all hands a failure to articulate was the main difficulty. A person had the feeling that he wanted to do something and that it would be wonderful, but it was all in a sensory capacity. If he could have been made to articulate this it would really have been something. And I experimented on it a little bit and we see that today in the *Handbook for Preclears*.

If you can get a person to articulate in a session anything about the future you have won 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 the clearance of goals. Goals would not be likely to run on a high generality. In other words, they are specific, personal and intimate. It is **“What do you think? What do you want? What is aligned to your life?”**

Let’s look at Goals as a process. One could run Goals for 25 hours with the greatest of ease. One could run the Present Time Problem for 25 hours, 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 as though the Rudiments could be the session.

We discover a preclear in the terrible condition of not wanting any auditing, not going any place and all of his goals being somebody else’s goals. Two things can be done immediately: Clear the auditor and then run Goals.

Goals could be run with two-way comm in this manner. You ask the preclear what he is absolutely sure would happen in the next couple of minutes, the next hour, a day from now, a week from now, one month from now and one year from now. We want something that the preclear is absolutely sure would happen.

We are running right there the reverse process of atomic bombs which say “no future—no future—no future.” That is basically what is wrong with a person. Why does he get jammed on the track? It is because of “no future.” He had been denied to a point where his loss was so great that he dared not own.

I had a case, by the way, which was one of the roughest cases I have ever run into. He put on the total appearance of being sane—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.” It was fascinating. He would make odd remarks like this from time to time.

One day he made a remark on goals: “Well, it’s really best to tell people that things cannot happen to them because otherwise they might hope they could and then they would be disappointed.”

This person was stark, staring mad and had no future of any kind. Five hours just this one 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?" was run on him and his confident answer, with great certainty was, "No. No. No."

Finally we broke through it 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. That busted the case. It read from total no-future up.

This case was an isolated one as we have had occasionally. Now and then an inspirational sort of process cracked them 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. 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.

The best way that I know of to clear up a goal is as follows (with two-way comm): **"Is there anything that is going to happen in the next couple of minutes?"** We get this thrashed out until he has got some great big certainty that there will be something a couple of minutes from now. Then we gradiently move it up and we get certainties at each one of these stages and levels—regardless of on what.

The person knows there is going to be a future there. Now let's have him put something in this future he has now created. He has created a future and has certainty on it. 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, tomorrow, next week, etc?" We will get weird things which have no desire in them; they will all be get-rid-of's, and if you finally plowed him 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 over my fear of darkness, I would like to get over feeling bad every time my mother screams at me," these aren't desires. These are run-aways, flinches. These are "Let's not confront it," "Let's get out of the universe; let's scram," 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."

So that process doesn't even vaguely get flat unless there is a real goal like "I'd like to have a stick of candy." *That is* a goal, a real goal.

Preclears will modify their goals in some way or another: "Of course, I can't because I have to work and I don't have any money," and "yak, yak, yak." They are modified goals, and as long as they modify them they don't have a goal because they are making a postulate and the MEST universe is kicking the postulate in on them. So we do this on a gradient scale of time so that goals become real to them.

L. RON HUBBARD