

THE DIANETIC AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
Volume 2, No. 7 January, 1952

Official Publication of
The Hubbard Dianetic Foundation, Inc.
Wichita, Kansas

An Afternoon with Ron

On the Monday following the December Conference lectures a group of Foundation Affiliates and a few others met at Ron's home for an informal discussion on auditing techniques. Having just attended his five lectures covering the latest theories, everyone was eager to have Mr. Hubbard demonstrate his skill in their practical use.

After about a half-hour of discussion one member of the group asked a question concerning the chronic somatic of wearing glasses, about how quickly physical adjustment is encountered following processing, and to what degree. We pick up the conversation of the group at this point and proceed, presenting everyone's comments verbatim. Mr. Hubbard's remarks are italicized.

"If you have hit the real cause of having to wear glasses dead center, the change is instantaneous. If you are merely unburdening the problems of the preclear, his eyesight will get better gradually, up to a point. At that point any further improvement is dependent upon hitting the central computations on glasses. This obtains by running regret, blame, sympathy, etc."

"I would like to remark on a funny thing that happened to me once. A year ago I wore two pairs of glasses, one for everyday and one for reading. This got to be quite routine, and one day I changed glasses to read something someone handed me. I read the paper through and suddenly realized that I had actually put on the day-glasses to do the reading. I immediately put them back on, tried to read the paper again and couldn't."

"Tell me this: Who's dead?"

"In my family there was only my father who had glasses. He's dead, yes."

"How did you cause his death?"

"I wouldn't say I caused his death—I contributed to his death . . . that is, in a way."

"Well, how didn't you cause his death?"

"I didn't contribute to his death"

"Either way?"

"Maybe I might have contributed in one way"

"How?"

"He didn't like me. When I was crying around the house he used to get disturbed. It's a long story."

"How old were you?"

"They adopted me. My parents were disappointed because I wasn't a girl. And he didn't want me around. I disturbed him and the more disturbance I caused"

"Do you remember thinking this just after his death?"

"Ah . . . I did think so."

"Who said so?"

"I forgot now."

"Did anybody tell you?"

"I wouldn't think so. Because he died when I was away from home."

"Would there have been any possible way for you to have kept him alive?"

"I thought of that."

"How could you have kept him alive?"

[* The Second Annual Conference of Hubbard Dianetic Auditors, held in Wichita Kansas, Thursday through Sunday, December 27-30, 1951.]

Copyright (C)1951 by L. Ron Hubbard. All Rights Reserved.

“Ah . . . by financial support.”
“*You didn’t give it to him?*”
“No.”
“*Do you remember regretting this?*”
“Yes.”
“*You contributed then. . . ?*”
“In a sense. That is a computation.”
“*Do you remember an early period in your life when you wanted to contribute?*”
“I do, but rather vaguely, when I was a boy of six. He made me work to contribute.”
“*Were you forced to contribute?*”
“Yes.”
“*Did you want to contribute?*”
“No.”
“*Did you want to before that?*”
“I’m sorry, I didn’t hear”
“*Did you want to contribute before you were six? Do you remember anything about that?*”
“I don’t understand.”
“*Were you made to do something that earlier you wanted to do ?*”
“Well ...”
“*Do you remember where you were when you regretted the contribution of financial support?*”
“Yes, very distinctly. I was eight-and-a-half years of age, and I earned some money; he took the money away and bought me a pair of shoes, one of the first pairs of shoes I had. I was glad to have the shoes, but I didn’t think it was justified to take my money away.”
“*Do you have a visio on that?*”
“Yes!”
“*The one visio that seems important to you—just get a feeling of regret on it.*”
“I see the shoes. They were nice shoes, and the name on them was Salamander.”
“*Just run a little regret off that now.*”
“I wasn’t emotional about it.”
“*Can you run the feeling of blame concerning the shoes?*”
(Silence)
“*Let’s run a little more regret.*”
“The feeling of regret is a sensation of my own problems. A family problem. Regret I can feel.”
“*What’s another visio you’ve got there, other than the feeling about shoes?*”
“Other than the shoes?”
“Yes.”
“Oh ... I stole something, and father beat me pretty badly”
“*Do you have a feeling of regret on that?*”
“Yes.”
“*Do you have a feeling of blame on it?*”
“Yes, because my mother was punished for it too. He shouldn’t have done that.” (Strong emotion very much in evidence—then forced laughter.) “I don’t want to put on an exhibition here.”
“*But you asked me to audit you.*”
“Oh, I appreciate that, too. All right.”
“*Feel the emotion of regret on that incident.*” (Deep sigh) “*Did you succeed or fail in your effort to help your mother?*”
“Neither. I would say I didn’t succeed, and I didn’t fail.”
“*Do you get the feeling of being thwarted in your effort to help her?*”
“I don’t quite” “*Do you get the feeling of being thwarted in your effort to help?*”

“Sorry, I don’t understand this word.”

“What’s the effort to hold you in place when you try to get up to help her?”

“The effort is hate; in other words, the inability of the position I’m in. He puts his knees on me, hits me and he pushes my face in the dirt.”

“How do your eyes feel at that moment?”

“They feel closed and red, and I scream. I am crying, and they hurt.”

“Do you get your effort to repel those blows?”

“Yes, I do.”

“All right. Feel the effort again; your effort to get out of the dust. “

“I rise up but he holds me down too tight. I scream and then my mother comes, and with her help I am able to push myself up and get away.”

“What emotion are you feeling at that moment?”

“Emotion of relief in a sense, like escaping an enclosure.”

“Can you scan straight through this incident from the first moment that he challenges you, right straight on to the end of it?”

“Yes.”

“All right. Do so. “

“Shall I vocalize it?”

“No, just scan it through. “ (Deep sigh, muscular movements of shoulders, shudders.)

“I’m through it.”

“All right. Let’s pick it up from the first moment he touches you there and get your feelings of repulsion and disgust and effort to help, etc. “

(Long silence)

“Can you get a vision there of your mother in the house?”

“Yes.”

“Fine. Any regret on that? Run the emotion of regret as you watch. “

“I have had a lot of emotion on it. A lot of grief.”

“Have you run the grief out already?”

“Yes.”

“All right. Can you get the feeling of trying to stop mother’s feeling of grief?”

“Stop her crying?”

“Yes. “

“I did tell her not to cry. I went over to her and said, ‘Mamma, don’t cry,’ and I cried too.”

“Do you get a feeling of not really being able to help her there?” “Yes, a feeling of helplessness.”

“All right. Can you run that on the incident?”

“Yes. It’s a mutual helplessness.” (Speaks very softly, throat constricted, tears flowing freely.)

“Who are you blaming in that incident?”

“Myself.”

“How did you cause this?”

“I stole, she got punished. He beat us.”

“Now can you find just before that your effort to stop him, to push him away?”

“No.”

“What effort did you make to get up and stop him?”

“I tried with my hands, of course.” (Long interval of silence, pc’s shoulders heaving, deep emotion in evidence.) “I felt much stronger. I push myself loose and I get away and he calls curses after me.”

“Get your effort along that line. “

(Sigh) “All right.” (Voice apathetic, although not deep apathy.) “Now how far are you carrying it through?”

“Through to the point where he left.”

“Let’s pick it up at the first moment you are apprehended about the theft, and scan the emotion on it straight on through to the end. “

(Silence for a few moments, then sighs) “I feel a tenseness on my spine . . . tenseness”

“Scan the emotion.”

(Deep sigh, immediately) “I’m through now.”

“Through to the end of it?”

“Uh huh.”

“Okay. Let’s pick it up at the beginning again, and scan the emotion straight on through, with all its variations.”

“I remember now that I was out of valence—I saw myself.” (Long silence, then deep sigh) “All right.”

“Let’s contact the beginning now. I think you’ll find a little more variation of emotion in there this time than you’ve been running. All right, again.”

(Immediate deep sigh, silence, voluble crying for a few moments, short stretch of coughing, many tears) “All right.”

“Let’s contact it at the beginning again. There’s probably even a little more variation in the emotion, in there, through the incident. Let’s scan it again.”

(Grief less in evidence, blows nose, sighs deeply, finally speaks with throat choked with grief.) “Most emotion is on my mother. I have my mother’s strong emotion.” (Deep sobs, changing to sighs) “That’s the end now.”

“All right. Let’s scan through from the beginning to the end of it again. There’s still a little more emotion there. Let’s contact it. Straight through to the end. This time contact your thought stream.”

“Another incident comes up with a similar situation”

“Just roll this one.”

“He hits me . . . I’d like to kill him. I want to bite him, kick him; I did scratch him.” (Few moments of deep sighing, heavy breathing.) “I felt his hate.”

“Tell me when you reach the end of it.”

“Yes, I’m at the end.”

“All right. Let’s contact the first moment of it and get your thoughts, or statements. You don’t need to verbalize these as you swing through, still running the emotion.”

“Pain down in here” (Indicates stomach, solar plexus. Emotion not so deep as formerly. Light sighing.) “There’s a lot of fear here.”

“See if you can contact it.”

“My arm in this position presses into me.” (Indicates arm folded beneath his body. Very deep, shuddering sigh.) “All right.”

“Okay. Did you get any of your thoughts?”

“Yes”

“Contact the beginning of it and scan through it, and pay particular attention to your thoughts. What are the fears there?”

“Fear he might kill me.”

“Yes, continue.” (Deep sigh, says “All right,” as breath expires.)

“Let’s contact the first moment of it again. You’ll probably find earlier thoughts than you”

“Yes, I have many thoughts on it.”

“All right, contact those and go right on through the incident again. There may be a little more emotion that you can contact again.”

(Sighs, quiet, little display of grief.) “Uh huh.”

“All right. Let’s scan it again.” (Blows nose. Emotion light, little display, sighs.) “All right.”

“Okay. Let’s contact it once more through the line.” (Few silent moments, short sigh.) “All right.”

“Let’s contact it once more.” (Few-moment silence, again short sigh.) “All right.”

“Once again.” (Very short time, few seconds, indicates finished with incident.) “All right, once more.”

“I don’t have any more emotion on it.”

“What particular thought in there is related to your eyes?”

“A burning sensation.”

“Yes, but what is your thought related to that burning sensation ? ”

“It hurts.”

“Did you comment to yourself in the incident?”

“Uh huh. Because the tears bum.”

“Let’s sweep past that thought. ”

“I had to be taken to a doctor. He used to give me eye drops. My mother took me to him.”

“Was he sympathetic?”

“Yes.”

“All right, once more. Let’s run past that postulate you made about your eyes in the incident. ”

“The ground is dirt, loose dirt—there was no floor—and he pushes my head down and the dirt gets in my eyes.” (Short silence follows.)

“All right. ”

“Then I rub it—it hurts.”

“Do you get your emotion there as that’s occurring? ”

“Yes.”

“Let’s run your emotion on through. ”

(Short period of silence, deep sigh.) “I’m through it.”

“Let’s run it again. ”

(Sobs again, blows nose. Indicates by gesture at end of incident.)

“Let’s run it again. ”

(Pc laughs heartily.) “Do you want to know why I laugh?”

“Why ? ”

“From what you said about eyes I started to think right away of my eyes and it brought me up to this point, present time, to when we started. I’m laughing about how I didn’t ask for it.” (Laughs again, then quiets down, silence, speaks again.) “It’s light now.”

“Let’s run through that part about eyes again. ”

(Coughs, shows some emotion.) “What I said about eyes comes through again. A half-dozen incidents about eyes come through—when I went to a doctor, and he said I was short-sighted and must wear glasses, and I didn’t want to wear glasses. I bought glasses and then didn’t wear them. And then later a friend said, ‘You’re crazy! You ought to wear glasses—you’ll ruin your eyes!’ He somewhat persuaded me against my better judgment, and from then on I have had to wear glasses. He told me to wear them all the time, and I wear them all the time. All of this came up.”

“Let’s scan through the emotion on that whole incident again. ”

“You mean the first incident?”

“On that incident we have been running. Scan the emotion straight through. ”

(Sigh of boredom.)

“All right, let’s run it again and see if there is a little more emotion there somewhere that we have not yet contacted. ”

“There is a heaviness. (Short silence) I’m very much in present time. As long as it’s purely a demonstration, how would it be if you would finish the session?”

“How about scanning it one more time? ”

“I have a feeling of resisting.”

“Who are you resisting? ”

“I am resisting myself, of course. And for a reason.”

“Who are you blaming in that incident? ”

“A... that’s....”

“Let’s talk about that incident. Run the emotion of blame straight through that incident. ”

(Sighs) “Of course, I blame my father for everything.”

“Let’s run the emotion of blame again, straight through that incident. ”

(Shifts uncomfortably.)

“Something more show up?”

“It shifted, from the pressure in my spinal cord to—in here, on this side.”
(Indicates shoulder.)

“Let’s run the emotion of blame straight through that incident again.” “(Short silence, deep sigh.)

“Okay.”

“Let’s try it once more, this time get the postulates—your thoughts of blame, as you go through it.”

“There’s a whole chain of it (expresses exasperation) in relation to the question; fear, regret and all other sorts of associations.”

“Let’s get the blame off just that one incident now, just that one. Roll it straight through.”

“All right.” (Long period of silence.) “In all fairness, I’m resisting, and I feel that I am resisting.”

“Now; just let me ask you this question: Who are you blaming there?”

“I’m blaming my father.”

“All right. Has any of this blame slopped over into present time?”

“Yes.”

“Are you blaming your auditor a little bit because he is keeping you going on this?”

“No.”

“Who are you blaming in present time on this same emotion?”

“I wouldn’t call it blame. I’d rather call it an awareness of having my analytical awareness in the incident here; I somehow keep on a given level and not let go completely, because if I let go completely I will cry a lot.”

“Get your postulate in that incident that you’re ‘sure not going to show him.’”

“I never wanted to show him I would cry.” (Hearty laughter.) “I didn’t want to show him that he wins.” (More laughter.) “That’s right.”

“What do you want to do with this incident now?”

“I would like to have it run again. I’m an auditor myself.”

“Do you think there is very much grief left on it?”

“No, but still I feel it a little bit.”

“Sweep past the portion of it where you feel it in there.” (Laughter, deep sigh.)

“Find it?”

“Uh huh.”

“What postulate is it?”

“It’s actually, in a sense, a visio of a channel of grief related to similar incidents.”

“Another incident there?”

“Yes, a whole”

“Is there a tie-in in that incident when you think that this is going to keep on going, or it’s always this way, or a feeling of despair about it?” “No.” *“Is there a feeling there that this is like many other times?”*

“Yes.”

“All right. Let’s run that feeling in this incident.” (Silence, deep sigh.)

“I’m through it.”

“Got it?”

“Yes.”

“Let’s sweep through that a couple more times.”

“As much as I try on this particular incident, they pop up. I try not to, but”

“What’s the atmosphere of present time?”

“Awareness.”

“Awareness of what? What is the counter-emotion of present time?”

“To resist.”

“The counter-emotion of present time.”

“The people in the room are having a counter-emotion.”

“Do you feel that?”

“Yes.”
“All right. Let’s feel it in your shoulders.”
“It has a little pressure, an effected pressure.”
“Let’s feel it in your back.”
“Yes”
“Let’s feel it in your knees.”
“They’re getting cold.” (Laughter.)
“Let’s feel it in your chest.”
(No response.)
“Is this atmosphere here friendly; unfriendly? How would you classify it?”
“A little too friendly.”
“Can you feel that?”
“Yes, I feel sympathy, sort of.” (Laughter.)
“How does it feel?”
“I don’t like it.”
“How does it feel to your eyes?”
“My eyes are a little watery.”
“How does this atmosphere feel to your eyes?”
“I wouldn’t say I have a specific feeling.”
“How does it feel to your nose?”
“My nose feels clear; I had a cold.”
“How does the chair feel under you?”
“Okay.”
“Feel the chair under you ? ”
“Uh huh.”
“All right. What’s the atmosphere of the room, now? How does it feel to your eyes, or to your eyelids as they are closed ? ”
“A feeling that everybody’s eyes are directed towards me.”
“How does it feel to your shoulders?”
“Not bad.”
“Your elbows?”
“There’s a little—I don’t know what to attribute it to—a little tenseness, a little rigidity, I would say.”
“Is that tenseness in the room here?”
“No.”
“How does the room here feel to you?”
“I feel a little ... a little ... embarrassed” (Laughter.)
“All right. Let’s call that the end of the demonstration.”
“Thank you very much.” (Opens eyes, sits up, reaches for glasses, puts them on, takes them off and wipes them, puts them on again.)
“Do you mind if I discuss with the group what we were doing and the reasons for it?”
“Not at all! In fact, if any questions are in the mind of anyone present, I’d be very happy to answer them”
(Hubbard now speaks to entire group. No indication will be made as to the identity of the individual asking any particular question. Hubbard’s remarks continue to be italicized.)
“You notice that the computation came up immediately when we scanned a little regret and blame. Did you see how it works?”
“Next step was to try to find out something about a life-continuum in operation. This indicates the presence of personnel. Then we sought for a little regret on the individual concerned, worked with that for a moment, and suddenly the preclear dropped right into an incident, obviously the ‘stuck incident. Instead of running the effort out of this incident we began by running the emotions therein, one right after another. After working like this for a short time—for demonstration purposes not as long as I would have run it in a regular session—one knew immediately the postulates were beginning to fall out of the emotion. The postulates having begun to show up, we began to

run them. Running the postulates brought the preclear into a little closer contact with the incident, and suddenly some more emotion showed up. So we ran emotion and more postulates appeared. Suddenly we are confronted with all sorts of material, indicating with certainty that there must be an 'endure' in action. 'Endure' gives the feeling that an incident will go on for a long, long time. The continued unwillingness to express emotion definitely demonstrated a postulate suppressing that emotion.

"Remember old-time Repeater Technique! In those days when the preclear said, 'Well, I feel too hot,' the auditor fired back, 'Well, run "too hot." You've all worked Repeater that way. We have a Repeater Technique in Postulate Processing which is not a harmful technique. There is a postulate present in every incident describing what the individual believes is wrong. If he says, 'I can't show emotion,' there's a postulate that suppresses emotion. If he says he feels too tall, there's a postulate there that makes him feel too tall. This, however, can be overdone when used as a method of processing. Don't wish off on your preclear a flock of postulates that he doesn't know are there.

"Running the incident will eventually cause that postulate to come up, and it's much better just to let it come up than to force it. But if your preclear is having a rough time of it and you decide that you'd like to remove a particularly bothersome postulate, just ask if there is such a postulate there. He will either observe that he is to some degree dramatizing and will look for it hurriedly, or he will not recognize that he is dramatizing. If you find that it is necessary to feed postulates on a suggestive basis, it is because the incident is soggy with emotion. This, then, is your monitor: How much emotion is present?

"Any of the central computation incidents will furnish almost unbearable pressure, as you will readily agree. It would be difficult not to emote on such an incident. There were two choices of procedure if that incident had hung up in any way—recall that he constantly mentioned alternate incidents—we could have run those variations or we could have picked up all the sympathy from the doctor. Sympathy affords a slight value to the continued wearing of glasses; and from this deduction we might have gone out on this track wherein the sympathy given by various doctors would be run.

"It would have been possible to complete the running of the entire incident without any discussion whatsoever of life-continuum, by running the emotional curve. When a preclear is asked to run the emotional curve, he will almost invariably present several incidents of various kinds, and eventually hand you the central computation. The running of the emotional curve will take the preclear quickly to the central computation.

"This particular incident, the beating, was preceded by the overt act, which, failing, became sympathy. The overt act in which he tried to protect his mother was picked up, but there is a more precise and central incident available in which he will be found to be protecting his mother, or trying to protect her and failing. Against whom was the earliest overt incident directed?"

"Mamma!"

"That's right. The preclear did something against mamma at a very early age, and now has to defend mamma. He weakened a portion of the interdependency of life by the overt act against mamma, and therefore takes it upon himself to assume the responsibility to defend that portion from then on. The grief and sympathy is a product of the earliest overt act against mamma. Doctors, sympathizing with the preclear's eyes, restimulated his feeling toward his mother. Each time they gave him sympathy they turned on the original overt act and depressed him down the tone scale. Sympathy re-echoes the original overt act against some portion of the dynamics.

"The effort the preclear made to defend mamma tipped us off immediately that mamma had been offended against, overtly and with full self-determinism. He didn't necessarily crave the sympathy from the doctors, but he accepted it, keeping the overt incident keyed in.

"This, then, is the viciousness of sympathy: because one 'sins against one of the dynamics, ever afterward, through the key-in of sympathy, one is forced to defend that dynamic against all enemies, real or fancied.' "

"What kind of an act could one commit which would be against all mankind?"

"I don't know, off hand. What kind of an act do you think it would be?"

"I suppose, to separate oneself from mankind."

"Yes, how would one do this?"

"Since I'm not computing out of my own case, I can't answer."

"All right. The preclear will tell you. You as the auditor don't even have to know. You have only to start running regret, blame and sympathy and the preclear will hand you the central computation. If he's so sympathetic he has to protect all mankind, he's offended against every one of the dynamics."

"How would one offend against all dynamics?"

"One of the ways would be to offend against one's own form and shape. An individual who may make himself weak or ridiculous somehow or other computes that he caused a man harm and therefore has made all men appear weak or ridiculous. Each person is a representative, an ambassador of a race, and when one makes a confounded fool out of oneself, he, to some degree, offends against the entire race."

"It could go from dynamic one to eight to four, couldn't it?"

"Any number of combinations. Everyone has his own idea of what this combination is. The auditor has the 'fortune telling cards,' which invariably furnish him with the correct computation."

"Let's run over the steps again: There is basically an overt act against one dynamic, followed by a later effort which fails and is, of course, followed by sympathy. Then there is a later effort to defend that dynamic against any offender, which is essentially defending the world against oneself. Look for a time when failure occurred on that defense. Therein will be the computation. There will be several of these on each case."

"This might be a very profitable cycle to run just by itself."

"It is."

"With this method of computation in mind, what makes an atheist?"

"For an atheist God does not exist, or he unreasonably hates God."

"Why should one hate God?"

"You have the formula. First there is an overt act. There is offense against something and sympathy for it thereafter; that's the first step. Later the atheist is simply defending against other offenders this entity which he once offended. Ask, 'Who is this person sympathetic toward? What is this person sympathetic toward? How did God offend against this entity?' Go early enough and you will discover that the preclear thought God offended this person. Processing with these steps solidly in mind, incidents can be disconnected, and you get the computation on the case."

"I have a question. When you locate the original incident in which the preclear commits the overt act, how do you work with it?"

"With the emotional curve. Run the offense as another incident. At first the person will not care too greatly about it; then suddenly he will put forth an effort to force something through. His tone will degenerate into anger, then go on down the tone scale, because the person fails the moment the other dynamic fails. In the incident his anger only hurt the other dynamic. What he had wanted to accomplish by his overt act was action, and what he succeeded in accomplishing was inaction. So he has a failure on his hands and goes into sympathy."

"You just use the scanning technique, then, to get off the grief. Is that correct?"

"Yes, that's correct. Don't bother to verbalize—it takes too much time. Notice how fast our preclear was rolling through the stuff today. How long would that take under the old standard line of running? True, he still has grief on that particular line, but not necessarily on the one incident. We could unburden it now by continuing to run similar incidents, picking up sympathy and regret, or by trying to find the overt act against mamma. It wouldn't take long to blow it."

"Somebody recently said to me, 'I can spend hours just running one grief charge. ' If you spend hours running a grief charge, this grief is not prepared to blow. There's just too much of it. You can scan through it for thought; thought is relatively instantaneous."

"Ron, for the benefit of the group, while I was being run, I had a concept of a tube, a round tube. Grief seemed to be coming from a whole line of incidents through

that one tube, or incident. I felt I could cry for all the incidents just in this one alone.”

“That’s correct; there is only one emotional curve. “

“It tends to drain off where you tap it then.”

“That’s right. Let’s work out some computations using this auditing technique. A fellow is very protective of his little brother; he hates his grandmother. All right, what happened ?”

“Grandmother made him come in for meals at a certain hour.”

“What’s the whole picture, the whole curve?”

“Well, he hated little brother at first, then he sympathized with him.”

“He hated him and then what did he do?”

“He hurt him.”

“And then what did he feel?”

“Regret, sympathy, remorse, shame.”

“Go ahead. “

“Somebody tried to hurt little brother and he tried to protect little brother. This effort failed.”

“Who was the person who tried to hurt little brother?”

“Grandmother.”

“That’s right. Who’s the villain of the piece?”

“He is.”

“Who has he elected to be the villain?”

“Grandmother.”

“All right. Now try this one: A girl feels very sympathetic toward animals and hates men. “

“It has something to do with men in her life.”

“Men in her life?”

“She has harmed an animal, then identified that animal with all animals.”

“Forget what she has identified; what has she done?”

“She felt sympathetic for the animal.”

“She doesn’t identify it: she’ll only feel sympathetic toward one kind of animal in each incident.”

“She is trying to protect the animal from some man.”

“The girl loves animals; she hates men. She thinks animals are too darling, and people are cruel to them. All right, what’s happened?”

“Well, first she has harmed an animal, then felt sympathy and tried to protect the animal, failed, then she”

“Right! You see, it’s a specific drama that is played over and over. “

“Mr. Hubbard, I would like to know how hate comes off a case. By pounding, beating the cot, etc.?”

“Not necessarily. Sometimes it does become rather violent. It isn’t necessary to get the preclear to articulate every phrase; the phrases aren’t important. “

“Ron, you emphasized here that phrases are not important. I have found in many cases that a phrase leads into grief.”

“You’re forcing a person into a secondary. There is no doubt that this phenomenon exists. But do you recall when I said that you want to get this preclear up the tone scale past the counter-effort band? The fastest way to speed him to the top is the best way. Validating language as aberrative will slow his time en route.

“There seems to be some relation between emotion, the ability of the person to handle counter-efforts and the type of phenomena evidenced. Hanging onto ‘maybes’ slows progress also, and should be watched. Theoretically, you should be able to make a preclear a fortified man between the time he leaves home in the morning and returns at night. Environmental restimulation in home or work is relatively ineffective now.

“But shall we cover these factors once more? The auditor finds the individual is sympathetic towards some portion of the dynamics and is antagonistic toward another portion. There is a sympathy line and an antagonistic line. Some persons pick out an antagonist for a sympathy line; thus sympathy and antagonism can come to be intermingled. The auditor knows immediately that the individual has sometime offended

the thing towards which he is sympathetic. This sympathy could have wavered; it could have gone back to further antagonism and back again to sympathy. In other words, the preclear swings on this curve. The feeling could be, 'I hate you, poor thing,' alternating between hating and sympathizing. The individual continues to dramatize the original curve on this subject.

"If the preclear says, 'I love my brother, but I hate him,' the auditor asks, 'What did you do to him?' 'I took his car....' You run down the original incident to where he hit his brother over the head with a flatiron. His brother felt very cold afterwards, and suddenly he realized he had offended against life. Then he felt sympathy for his brother. Four hours later the brother revived, discovered the head injury, got a baseball bat and banged his torturer over the head. The preclear could wear the somatic of being hit over the head with a bat as the cause and reason for the hatred of the brother. He wears it as a badge that he has been offended against.

"At the bottom of a case is overt sympathy. Later the individual defends this entity against an antagonist. He either has to defend against the new antagonist or be the antagonist. So one has to hate, and the reason one hates is an effort to reject being something one does not care to be.

(Turns attention to the preclear.) "How do your eyes feel? Did they change any?"

"I have been paying attention to you, not my eyes."

"How about your eyes right now?"

"I feel my glasses need cleaning. I seem to see every speck of dust on the glass where it made no difference before."

"Here is an item which all of you might want to tuck into your notebooks: The absence of visio is the assignment of a tremendous amount of CA USE to another individual. A dub-in is a picture of somebody telling a story, and that somebody is occluded. A dub-in case has been surrounded by persons who constantly evaluated situations FOR the individual. His next step after occlusion is pictures."

"I would like to ask about a preclear who has been psychoanalyzed. He runs symbolic garbage for hours on the second dynamic with very little fact."

"He is paying a penalty, as many of these cases are—self-punishment. Scan the analysis and run sympathy on doctors."

"This rather explains the work of a chiropractor, doesn't it? He keys out the nerve block and interrupts the action of the facsimile. When the individual becomes restimulated because of the original overt act, it keys in again. So he goes back to the doctor for another unblocking."

"Check. A chiropractor brings a person up to present time but doesn't necessarily help him there. The use of tactile communication sometimes produces very marked results. The danger is that tactile can readily place the preclear in a hypnotic trance."

"But tactile is touch. How does tactile cause trance?"

"Communication is defined as the use of those sense channels with which the individual contacts the physical universe. Any enforced communication will cause hypnosis. That is what hypnotism is: an enforced communication channel."

"But touching a catatonic will sometimes cause his first moves toward"

"Certainly, because he goes into communication with you. But constant, monotonous stroking fixates attention units to that sense channel. Your desire is to accomplish an unfixed present-time attention, so should you use tactile, use it with randomness and not with a static stroke. Rather than stroking a man's back over and over, reach up every so often and hit him on the side of the head."

(Nearing the end of the discussion, the group again directs interest to the preclear of the day.)

"Will you be audited when you get home?"

"Yes"

"And will you have a copy of this tape?"

"Yes."

"Make certain your auditor listens to it before running you. You are only three or four hours from taking your glasses off for keeps."