Remimeo
C/Ses
Auditors

OBJECTIVES NOT BITING

Ref. Tape 5511C08   SIX LEVELS OF PROCESSING, Issue 5, Level 2
      HCOB 19 Mar 78   QUICKIE OBJECTIVES

This HCOB contains data on objectives, based on current folder study, which is VITAL to C/Ses.

A major reason for the quickying of objectives is running too-steep-a-gradient objectives on cases that need lower gradient objectives first. (Running too steep a gradient can also lead to grinding on with no change.)

During a study of folders of pcs currently being run on objectives during purif and pcs being run on objectives after Purif, there were cases who were said to be „flattening" processes such as S-C-S and Op Pro by Dup in very short amounts of time (like 20 mins, 40 mins). These cases were not getting any real EP – more an assertion that they were done or a very minor win, often just a statement from the auditor that the process was „flat" – sometimes the process was ended on pc protest.

Those same cases, when put on *very* low gradient objectives, started running the process and winning like mad!

By low gradient objectives, I mean: Mimicry; PT Differentiation (getting the pc to tell the difference between objects by actual touch); Dangerous Environment Process („Look around the environment and find something that isn't being a threat to you."); „Notice that …"; „Feel my arm. Feel your arm.", the Animal process and other objective processes for invalids and children (such as those given in the Introductory and Demonstration Processes and Assists pack).

On those cases, these low gradient objectives bit, turned somatics on and off and the pc ended up with a real cognition and very good exam report.

One of the pcs went through the treason and enemy conditions in session on the objective process, PT Body Orientation (Have the pc locate a part of his body and recognize it as such). He had thought that he was „brown hair" (his hair color is brown) and went up through various recognitions that he wasn't body parts and that he wasn't his past and arrived at the cognition that he really is a thetan – which was quite a win!

The folders reviewed and handled as above were not all heavy druggies, nor were they what would be called especially rough cases; some were what would be called „average" cases on a Class IV org's or mission's lines, these days. These were ordinary people who hold jobs, etc.

This is further confirmation of the necessity to undercut due to the deterioration of society. Indeed, the world – thanks to psychologists, drugs and TV – is going down the tubes.

Today a high percentage of cases starting out in auditing have a very short attention span and can only respond to very light processes.

C/Ses and auditors who have been used to handling the cases of persons who have had Scientology processing and training could easily overlook just how low one has to go to undercut the cases of beginning pcs today. One very experienced C/S, who has mainly C/Sed for Scientologists and upper level cases in recent years, was somewhat shocked to find that processes ordinarily reserved for the more difficult cases a decade ago, were necessary for the majority of beginning pcs today. Sometimes we as Scientologists tend to overlook how far we have progressed and how rapidly society is going down.

Undercutting cases has been necessary since the early '50s and will go on being continuously necessary in the future. So auditors and C/Ses are again alerted to this. Success with beginning pcs and lower level cases is dependent on correctly choosing a process that the pc can do and make gains on. It is also necessary to be able to detect when a pc is not running a process successfully because it is too high.

WHEN TO UNDERCUT

In 1955, London, I gave a dissertation on objectives not biting in the second lecture of the Hubbard Professional Course (Tape 5511C08). The main points were as follows:

A.   When a pc is being run on too high a process, the auditor is running the process on a machine; no matter how brightly the pc may answer, the process is being run on a machine.

B.   If you are running the pc too high, there are two things missing: communication lag and cognition; the pc will trot like a well-trained horse through the whole process, without any communication lag, without any cognitions.

Thus we have the rule:

AN OBJECTIVE PROCESS THAT PRODUCES A COMMUNICATION LAG, WILL PRODUCE A COGNITION; A PROCESS THAT DOES NOT DEVELOP A COMMUNICATION LAG, WILL NOT PRODUCE A COGNITION.

The only thing that has changed since 1955 is how far one must undercut today, to get a process that is within the ability of the PC to do and which will produce change.

CAUTIONS

Not every case needs to be undercut as far as those described above; on the other hand, some cases will have to be undercut lower than those described.

C/Ses and auditors can also err in the other extreme and try to re-run all of a pc's objectives over again (as has already happened in some areas). Doing so is out tech and results in the pc grinding on and on or becoming protesty – sometimes surprisingly so.

There is a vast difference between flattening a process that is producing change and forcing on over pc protest or other bad indicators (or a lack of good indicators).

Objective processes (or any other processes for that matter) that have been run to EP, must not be run again; it violates the auditor's code to do so.

SUMMARY

C/Ses and auditors should look over cases being run on objective processes and if these are not running very well and going to a full EP, then there are either auditor errors or the case is being run on too high a gradient or the same process or processes are being run again after they have already been flattened.

This data, hot off my research line, is being issued to you now (pending a full publication regarding objective processes) so that faster and better results can be obtained on pcs being run on objective processes and in objective co-audits, right away.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Assisted by
Senior C/S International

LRH:DM:bk