

## FORECAST ON NEW TECHNIQUES

A lecture given on  
31 December 1951

### Swift Recovery

Now, I can tell you very bluntly what you are trying to do, and I can give you a forecast on new techniques. The basis of it has to do with this: Did you ever speed up to meet an emergency? Did you ever feel yourself speed up to meet an emergency? That is one variety of speed.

There is a speedup which closely parallels the emotional curve. In an emergency you just speed up, but there is another speedup that approximates the emotional curve, which would be an up-curve. There is the “drop-down” emotional curve but then there is the up-curve.

You are trying to get your preclear up to a higher level of action. You watch that up-curve and you will see that individuals are running faster; they have more time, they have a higher level of enthusiasm, they can handle action much better—they have all of these various things.

Let's take the package like this: Counter-efforts are actually completely in your possession or they are not. What is the difference between your having a counter-effort in your possession and your not having control over that counter-effort? What is the difference between the two? You can say, using a crude word, that it is the speed at which a person is running and that is all.

Actually all a human being is composed of, evidently, are these counterefforts. He is just handling these counter-efforts, and boy, do they modulate human structure! They modify it tremendously.

A person down the tone scale is getting the counter-efforts. He starts to get the counter-efforts and he stops himself in order to stop the counter efforts. He stops himself in time so the counter-efforts can't hit him and then he drops down to a point where everything is counter-effort.

The difference between good self-control up at the top of the scale and bad self-control down low on the scale—no personal control (or environmental control of the individual, which is what you are trying to combat)—is simply the speed of the individual. It is whether or not he is handling his counter-efforts, because when he is all the way down he is not handling his counter-efforts, so that the whole environment becomes a counter-effort to him. That is way down the tone scale.

Up near 1.5 he is just about balanced with his counter-efforts, and he gets arthritis and so forth. He has stopped himself but he is still holding in counter-efforts of various kinds.

Now, the object is not to get rid of counter-efforts; the object is to control counter-efforts. As a person starts controlling counter-efforts, he comes up along the line and the environment stops controlling him. That is all there is to it. That is a simplicity of statement.

The difference between the middle of the tone scale and the bottom of the tone scale is a matter of time, and the difference between middle and top is also a matter of time, so we are still talking about speed.

A person has lots of time mixed up in his theta when he is low on the tone scale. For instance, the forces of destruction (if you want to call them so) that threaten an individual have time in

them. But let's not put a religious connotation on it; we can say anything that threatens an individual has time in it. And the more time there is in it, really, the more volume it has.

There is an equation that demonstrates that a force of destruction has lots of time in it. It is only when the force of destruction can have lots of time put into it on a short impact that it becomes very aberrative. Therefore a blow or something like that has time in it. You get a sudden impact between theta and the MEST universe and time gets wrapped up in it—whatever time is. So, the forces of evil have time in them.

Let's be very practical about this: Your preclear goes home after the session and listens to the husband or Grandpa or somebody about how Dianetics yak-yak-yak-yak and it is no good and she shouldn't do it and she really ought to take better care of herself and control herself and be quiet and be calm and go to bed and not indulge in any more business activities and so on—in other words, "Go kill yourself." That is what this person is telling your preclear.

The only reason anybody can get to your preclear is because you, in the short space of time in which you had him, couldn't pull him far enough up the tone scale so the environment would stop handling him. Therefore a process has to be fast, and the slower your process is, the more likely it will fail. In other words, the more time is stretched across it, the more the forces of destruction leveled at your preclear have a chance to get at him.

Actually you can jump your preclear up above a level of time, theoretically. That is what you are trying to do. You are trying to jump your preclear up above a level where he doesn't have very much time and to where he has instantaneous thought, and therefore he can invest in all the action he wants to invest in because he can control all the counter-efforts. He will be able to do this. This is the theoretical background. What you are fighting is time.

Therefore, a process which worked very swiftly would jump your preclear up to the middle band and it would be well above all the destructive forces that could hit him. It would be swift. Just this one destructive force of going back into a restimulative environment would be licked.

Let's take Dianetics at large: The question right now with these techniques is, can results be produced fast enough so that the whole society out there would be unable to combat Dianetics? If it were unable to combat it, Dianetics would be above a time span—that is to say, its processes would be sufficiently instantaneous to be thought processes in the time span out there.

Now, what do they start telling you every time you say something like "Mamie is well"? They say, "How long has she been well?" (They are saying, "Let's put some time in this.") "Let's see if these results are lasting. Has this been tested very long?" If they can stretch all this out on you enough, you feel rather defeated.

Actually, in ancient religious practice, the force of evil has time in it. Let's go back to an old analogy. I know of many religious works which sort of scout around with this a little bit—the forces of blackness and so forth. Those are time forces.

For instance, man is at war with time. If he doesn't eat he starves to death, and there are various other things. A destructive force or a supercontrolling force or a force that wants to put a human being into apathy only has to modulate eating to modulate the individual's time. That is all there is to it; it is a very simple equation. If you want to go out and control a whole society, all you have to do is figure out ways to modulate their time.

If you want to find the most aberrative person in a preclear's life, you find the person who modulated his time for him, because the person who modulated his time for him became cause.

You can ask a preclear for this. Now, if you say "Who is 'time cause' in your life?" or "How many time causes are there in your life? How many people are time causes? How many things

are time causes?" he might not be able to understand this. But he would understand this: "Who used to get you up and get you to school?"

Someone will tell you, "Well, that was Mama." Someone will say, "That's just Papa."

"Who used to insist that you ate at six o'clock?" In other words, "Who modulated your time?" Because the person that modulated this individual's time controlled him. And the most aberrative person on the case will be that person—the time modulator.

*Ann: Does delaying work the same way—the fellow who makes you wait and wait and wait?*

Yes. He is just stretching your time. He is throwing your time away for you, and that is a hideous thing.

Now, you can run time on a preclear in any one of its forms—for instance, conflicts with time, combats with time—and that is why the low tone-scale person responds to this single button, "endure." All this person can do is endure. They can't handle time; they just endure the impact.

So, are our techniques at this moment up above this level? At optimum, you or your auditors could walk down the street past the lame, halt and blind and these would immediately become well people. That would be optimum. That is perhaps too high a level of operation. But all these processes and so forth are aiming in toward that as the target.

All you have to do is produce a swift recovery. How swift a recovery do you have to produce?

One case recently failed, on the one hand because the auditor tried to handle the case too fast, but on the other hand because the process was too slow. His wife was able to get in and actually object to a blind man recovering his sight. She suddenly realized that he might, and she realized this before he recovered his sight, and there was the contest right there.

Now, there is a band below 5.0 where time contained in the counter-efforts exerts itself against the individual; the counter-efforts exert against the individual.

You are actually not dealing with anything very concrete when you are dealing with a counter-effort; all you are dealing with is a facsimile. How can it have an effort at all? It is because there is time in it. The individual handles this in various ways: he tries to stop time, he tries to let time go through him and all that sort of thing.

So there is a definite goal toward which we are working. We are trying to jump a preclear up through the band of the somatic, or the counter-effort; we are trying to jump a preclear up through this strata. We are not trying to feed him somatics; that would be an error and has been one. We are not insisting that he get somatics. We want him to jump through the somatic band. If he gets up above that he will start handling his counter-efforts and he will start using his counter-efforts, because evidently his thought strength is actually his counter-efforts reversed to be his efforts.

So, the goal on processing is toward an instantaneous process, and the faster you can make a process work, the more reliable your process is going to be. We have to make a process work swiftly just to jump the individual up through this time strata, because we are dealing with the society and we can't have this preclear 100 percent for two weeks—we can't have him. As a result, he is continually subjected to the external environment. Therefore the process might run for up to two months or it might not arrive at all because the gains are being corroded away faster than you can administer the process.

That is our contest and this is the primary philosophy back of present operation, and has been ever since theta was fairly well identified for what it was—with proof that it does not contain wavelength.

Theta has no wavelength. Fine! It has no mass, it has no weight. We have good, adequate proofs on this. They are the kind of proofs that the physicist wishes he had. So we started working on that basis and right away, of course, in Dianetics we started to produce tricks. It goes swiftly, much more swiftly, now.

But if you keep working with effort continually or if you keep running engrams continually, you are not permitting your preclear to jump above the time band.

Unwittingly or otherwise, in the old days I evidently used to jump people up past this counter-effort band. How? Enthusiasm and fast insight into the computation on the case. To me, every case had a different computation. I never could quite figure out why auditors did not immediately pick up this insight into a case. For instance, some fellow has been worked eighty hours, but you take a look at him and you say, "Well, naturally, he is like he is because his father was a butcher and he worked on a farm and prenatally they slaughtered a lot of pigs. I mean, that's easy. And this guy thinks of himself as a pig, and that's all there is to it." And the case cracks.

I would turn around to the other auditor and I would say, "Well, why didn't you see that?"

Now, actually, it isn't anything very mystical. You just pick it up by the clues of the expression, the voice tones, the postures and so on of the preclear. I used to try to teach people how to recognize these things. It resulted in failure, as far as I was concerned, to teach them so.

I realized then there were common denominators of all these cases. We have the common denominators now. You can make any computation on any case show up without figuring the case.

This is just like the business of reading fortunes: You say what the cards are and the person you are reading the fortune for immediately looks at you and reads into those cards what he is worried about in present time and can't forecast for himself in the future. Then you tell him "It's this way," and he makes a postulate and he makes it that way.

As an auditor you have to be careful not to get your preclear up to a point where he thinks you are a god. You start using these inevitables—common denominators to all cases—and he says, "How did you know that?"

You look at some fellow and he has a bad leg, and a little conversation demonstrates that he feels very, very tender toward dogs. That is what he feels tenderest toward—dogs. His computation is lying right in front of your face. There it is.

He has a bad leg and he is only really sympathetic toward dogs. He did a dog some dirt when he was a little kid, and then a dog died and he blamed himself for the death. But he couldn't take the blame so he hung up on a maybe on the dog's death, which hung the facsimile up on him, and in trying to examine the thing, he matched it with a somatic that matched up to the dog. You could even say it was the left hind leg of the dog that was run over: "What was it run over by?"

"Oh, it wasn't run over! He got caught in a reaper!"

You are right dead center on the case.

Now, if you can teach your auditors the obviousness of this computation, you can start busting cases with the same facility. It would require merely a series of questions. You just keep asking the individual about what he likes in life and what he feels sympathetic toward and what he thinks is bad in life. And the second you come down to "What's bad in life?" he is liable to tell you something like "Well, it's because of the cruelty of ministers. Ministers are cruel people. They are bad. And religion is bad and all this is bad!"

All you are doing is just getting which dynamic it is that he is really down on.

Here is another way this computation will work out. What computation is it? The person is really down on some dynamic. What is he sympathetic toward? Ask him, “What do you like best?” “What would you hate to see hurt?” “What would you hate to see destroyed?” and so forth.

The fellow will tell you immediately, “Little girls. It’s just terrible what they do to little girls!” You have the man’s service facsimile lying in front of your face immediately. Now, what is the incident?

It is like telling fortunes; there is nothing to it. What dynamic is he mad at and what dynamic is he sympathetic toward? You will immediately have the protagonist and antagonist of a drama which occurred in this person’s life. What you are doing there, really, is just plotting a story.

What happened? He is mad at ministers and very sympathetic toward little girls. What happened in his life? He will tell you how the drama sums up; it isn’t necessary for you to go on and compute if you don’t even want to think that much. You just say, “What are you mad at?”

“I’m not mad at anything, particularly.”

“Well, what are you mad at in the society? As you drive down the street, what makes you angry?”

“Nothing, except churches—these damn churches.”

You say, “All right, run regret on churches.”

And he will tell you about the minister beating up the little girl and about his interference and his subsequent punishment and failure with regard to it. Then he will go back and tell you how he harmed the same little girl earlier, because that is the complete drama. It is like shooting fish in a rain barrel. There is the drama. He will tell you all about it.

I am showing you the mechanics behind this—just the selection of the facsimiles. You are running on an emotional curve. The emotional curve runs like this: The individual felt he could do anything in the society, then all of a sudden he hurt something or somebody—this is the earliest part of the drama—and felt sympathy. Now he will go on feeling sympathy for that and he will try to defend that part of his environment heavily, against all odds. Sooner or later somebody is going to offend against that part of his environment and he is going to try to stop this somebody and he will lose. The second he loses, he gets hung up with a service facsimile. He has a maybe and his life is a bit changed from that point on. He immediately comes down from cause; he realizes he is not the powerful person he was before.

You talk to most cases and you will find out that sometime during their life—if they have any insight on their life at all—they felt that they were powerful, they felt they were strong. You ask them what year did they cease to feel they were strong? They maybe can’t tell you, but quite often they can. You don’t even have to be able to do this; this is just experimental. And you will find out it was at nine or ten years of age. You can even spot the moment of the incident. The person had already gone into sympathy earlier with this particular part of his environment.

It was at that moment the second part of the drama took place. Something offended against what he was trying to protect and he failed in his efforts to straighten it out. At that moment he realized “I am not cause.” He said, “I can’t be responsible anymore. I am effect”—in other words, “I’m way down tone scale”—and everything, really, is piling up on top of a major computation. There may be several of these computations on a case, but most of the cases I

have seen just broke wide open on one computation. The fellow just changes in front of your eyes on one computation.

Now, once upon a time people were doing this in sort of a dull fashion; it would take hours of pegging away at a case to suddenly get some kind of a computation out of it. Therefore I kept looking for a central button on the case, and I didn't know its identity. What could this central button be? Why is it that these cases break suddenly?

Now we have the anatomy, and we have more than the anatomy, because that is the specific anatomy of it: The individual offends against a dynamic (you won't get him to recall that easily); then he feels sympathy toward this entity; then he tries to defend it against a hostile force toward it and fails in his defense. There is the case computation. You should be able to teach your auditors that because it is just too confoundedly simple.

And if they don't get it, there is a simpler technique. You just say, "Have you got a visio on anything?"

"Oh, no. No. I'm occluded."

"Well, just one little visio."

"No.... Well, one! Once in a while I see myself standing and looking out of a window and there is snow outside; I am just a little boy." "Well, is there anything bad about that?"

"No."

"Run regret off of it."

"How do you mean, 'run regret'?"

"Well, just feel the emotion of regret and look at that picture. And just sweep over it a few times, feeling the emotion of regret and looking at the picture."

He will put his whole case in your hands right there, because an individual on blame keeps a visio—a specific visio, either moving slightly or still—as a memento of blame. This is quite interesting. It is a little phenomenon that was just lying there waiting to really be triggered and picked up.

Now, sometimes you get a case that is "wide open" that is nothing but dub-in from one end to the other. You start running that: "Well, what about some picture?"

"Well, how many pictures do you want?"

Don't be licked. Just run regret on their whole life, and they'll spill tears all over the place. That case is so ready to bleed that the amount of charge that must come off it is tremendous. It is just enormous; it is almost inconceivable.

But if you don't know quite how to trigger it, the case will be very hard and sometimes very aloof, quite inaccessible and so on. So you say, "Now, do you remember a time when you were sixteen?"

"Oh, yes, I remember times when I was sixteen; we used to go on such nice sleigh rides" and yakety-yakety-yakety-yak.

"Well, wait a minute. Do you get a specific visio on any time you were sixteen? Do you get one right now?"

"Oh, yes."

“Can you run a feeling of regret on it? A little feeling of regret on it?”

“Why should I run a feeling of regret on it?”

“Well, just for an experiment, just for kicks, just for a laugh, you know? Just run a little feeling of regret.”

And all of a sudden, bang!—”I used to be so happy and cheerful and I was a dear sweet little girl, and then all of a sudden my whole life changed. And it was all because of Reginald!”

And you say, “Yes, tell us more. Do you have a visio of Reginald?”

“Oh, I hate to look at Reginald. Yes, I do have. One particular one.”

“Well, run a little regret off of that.”

“Oh, I wouldn’t dare!”

“Well, can you run the desire for approval from Reginald?”

“Oh, no! No, I wouldn’t want any approval from Reginald.”

“Well, can you run a moment there when Reginald wanted approval from you—something like that? Can you run it a little bit?”

“Oh, yes, yes. There is one of those.”

Then all of a sudden she gets a visio on Reginald, so you say, “Can you run some regret on this now?” Bang! You run right into a parentally enforced abortion, and there is Reginald and all the rest of it. She didn’t even know about it; she had forgotten it. It had just been all put away completely.

But life fixed it up so there were some tabs left and you can just trigger these tabs. You just run regret and blame, blame and regret, approval— giving approval, receiving approval—regret and blame and so on, on any of these visios or such manifestations. You don’t have to put a person on the time track, you don’t have to put them down on a couch, you don’t have to do anything to them but that. And they will hand you computations so fast that you can’t catch up with them. Those are the computations of the case. There is nothing more esoteric to it than that.

*Ellen: What if the case won’t run any regret? Suppose the case has nothing to regret? I’ve run one like that.*

Oh, he has nothing to regret at all?

*Ellen: Yes.*

How crazy was he?

*Ellen: He’s my husband.*

Yeah? Got nothing to regret?

*Ellen: Yeah.*

He has nothing to regret at all?

*Ellen: No. Well, that's what he said.*

That's what he says. Well, that is very interesting. You have not made him pick up a visio of anything, have you?

*Ellen: I've got the visio. He ran it for me once, and a few tears crawled out, but he can't cry. I mean, he's that way.*

All right. There are many other things that you can run on this case, and I was going to get into those. But if you had run some regret at that moment . . .

*Ellen: I can't ask him for regret.*

But if you had asked him at that moment for it he would have had it. If you don't get the regret, get the blame.

*Ellen: Oh, he'll run it for mankind—what other people have done to mankind.*

Sure. Here is blame. Blame is part of the sequence: regret, blame, searching for approval and so on.

There are other ways to get a very occluded or very hard-faced case to roll. At one time we didn't have these at all. These are new. The way to get one of these cases to roll is to coax them into some counter-emotion. They sometimes are unable to feel any, but if you coax them into a little counter emotion, all of a sudden on somebody or something they will pick something up. Usually it will be somebody they love; it may even be near present time or something of the sort. It stretches their visios out into a three-dimensional level; it gives them some sensitivity that they have hit something that they do not ordinarily hit in their thinking. You get them to run the counter emotion or the counter-thought on various people and they will pick up a visio then, and they will be softened up to a point where you can start running approval, blame, regret and so on.

Now, if this cold, hard, calculating case still insists on doing something else, if you don't want to use the chart of buttons (because that will dissolve any case anyhow), and if this case still won't give you anything, you make him start computing on yes, no and maybe.

Right in the front of Handbook for Preclears it talks about past goals, past fears, present fears, present goals and so forth. You can make up lists of these or you can simply ask him for a time when he was undecided about whether he was right or wrong. He will come up with some time when he didn't want to go down to a store or someplace else—something mild. Get an earlier one and an earlier one and an earlier one. You will find him in the middle of an automobile accident or something of the sort. He is stuck on the track right at that point, where he gave the driver directions. Did he cause the wreck? The directions were wrong. Did he cause the wreck? Maybe there was somebody killed by him.

If he still fails to hand you out a computation after you have done all this and you practically have the corpse lying there, you have many other points of entrance into this case. You can go on with life continuum; you can go on with any one of these things.

Straightwire is just a little slow, but on a psychotic case that is all you can use. You would enter the psychotic case just the same way. You would get some Straightwire on present time, because they are remembering from the past into the future, and the future is the present. The psychotic is usually so far back down the track and so thoroughly there that he has to forecast or predict to take a look at a present-day facsimile.

Here is a wonderful way to bring an individual up to present time, by the way: "Can you feel the counter-emotion? Can you feel an atmosphere around you right now?" And then make him evaluate every part of the atmosphere. Sometimes you will have a preclear in a bad fear charge

or something like that and you can't immediately turn it off, so you ask him, "Can you get the feeling of the present atmosphere?" Quite often it will go off in a snap; sometimes it will take two or three minutes, but it will go off, unless he is just in a screaming state of terror, which would be right in the middle of the engram—and you would be running it at that time.

Now, this doesn't alter the fact that if a secondary presents itself to be run and you think it would be beneficial, you go on and run it. But don't demand the secondary into existence; that is a mistake. You don't charge people into secondaries and you don't charge them into engrams. Don't charge them into incidents. Let the preclear feel like he sort of got there by his own treacherousness, then run them when they are unavoidable, because they will run then. Too many cases in Dianetics have been hung up in that.

Can you see the whole basic computation on which you are working here? There are about eight more methods of getting into cases more or less delineated in Hand book for Preclears. But your central point is you want to get this individual free in time. You want to get him able to handle time in facsimiles and get the time out of the facsimiles. That is what you are trying to do.

The reason a person has a visio on something he is regretting is he is suspended there, and he is suspended on a maybe. And maybe not only says "Was I right or was I wrong?" it says "Am I or am I not?" A maybe automatically asks that question: "Am I or am I not?"

He can't decide whether he is, so how can he even have any facsimiles? But he won't be able to control these facsimiles if he isn't, quite.

This is very simple. But to get the plot of an existence, you want to watch for that first computation I gave you because that will be the overall plot of a lifetime.

I gave you that first one as a simplicity, and as I talked on from that first one, I was merely demonstrating to you there are more and more and more techniques, any one of which will blow the case up. And you have a list of those techniques in Hand book for Preclears.

Now, let's take an emotional curve: You can handle an emotional curve any way you want to. It is the handiest little gimmick in the world, and it will run him into the front of this computation too. These things all do the same thing. They just run the individual in to where he is stuck or where he is blaming himself or where his thought processes are hung up in maybe and so forth. And then any one of these techniques will practically resolve the same thing.

So, you say he can't feel regret. All right, he can't feel regret. Take technique two: Can he feel blame? No, he can't feel blame. All right, what is he sympathetic toward? Then get him to tell you all about what he is sympathetic toward. You are going to break the case open.

You have a tool kit. If one of your auditors working in an outer office doesn't appreciate this and you find him trying to go into a case with snap! snap! "What's this phrase? What's that phrase?" pick up the fire extinguisher and hit him over the head! Do something, anything desperate, because that is a waste of time! It is not whether or not it produces results. Do you see why that would be? Sure, that will produce results; sure, you can run engrams; sure, you can run secondaries just as secondaries. And a case will get better and chronic somatics will go away and all sorts of things will happen. But it is a waste of time!

Why go out and try to fill a granary with one grain of wheat at a time from the field—taking this one grain of wheat which you pick off the stalk in the field and taking it in and putting it in the granary (maybe there is an ant in that darn granary that keeps taking away one and one half grains for every one that you put in it)—when you have a complete combine-thresher-binder with high-pressure air blowers to fill that granary? That is the mystery which you face in an auditor who insists on running a slow technique, because that auditor is unwittingly playing around with the environmental factor. His technique is too slow to overcome the force of the

environment in many cases. And where you have had consistent failures in cases, it has just been on that factor: your technique was not fast enough to catch up with the environment.

When you have a psychotic sitting in front of you and you are trying to process that psychotic, the environment is catching up faster with the psychotic right there than you can process him. It has caught up with him! You get off one speck of something and the environment is laying it back on again. What in the environment is laying it on? The light switch or something! This is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the environmental factor.

Let's say this preclear has been getting better—his chronic somatics have been disappearing, everything has been going along just beautifully and splendidly with him—and one night when he leaves he is feeling beautiful and everything is swell but he comes back the next day apparently in much worse shape than he was in before you started processing him.

What happened to him? Somebody revoked a license to survive on him, and you didn't have him up to a point where he didn't need a license to survive. The wife or somebody said, "Well, I've heard that before. I've heard how well you feel. It's probably euphoria or something of the sort. You know how the doctor warned you against it," and then walked out and slammed the door. This combination of action is sufficient to key in the computation which you have not gotten yet.

If you get these computations on sympathy, regret and blame, a large number of marital situations will resolve fast enough in few enough sessions so that they can't be restimulated into a bad state. That is advantageous, isn't it?

So that is what you're working against: you are working against the environment. And you want to bring the individual up into a full control of his counter-efforts.

Now, an auditor in a town I was in a short time ago said to me that he had been having a little trouble with his preclear but he was getting along all right. Since Effort Processing had come along they were getting along much better.

Of course, Effort Processing is still a much faster technique simply because it takes off the major counter-effort that a person will have. If you are processing the incident, it will take off that major counter-effort and snap the preclear sufficiently up the tone scale.

*Ellen: Would you say that what it does is separate the preclear from his environment in that incident?*

Yes, that's correct. That is what it does, forcefully!

There isn't much reason to do that, though, if the preclear can get up to a point where he can handle it.

Anyway, I said, "Let me talk to your preclear," and I asked the preclear, "How are you feeling?"

And he said, "I'm . . . oh, I feel pretty good."

"Oh, are you very active about existence? What's your main trouble?"

"Well, I'm not doing very much work."

"Well, what do you do?"

"I suppose I spend most of my time trying to be broke, from what I've learned in processing."

I said, "Well, do you have any visio—any particular visio?"

“No. Oh, yeah. One. One.”

It was the one which I just gave you a moment ago, of the little boy standing at the window. So we scanned regret out of it just a few times, and he fell right into it. This preclear was obviously in a case of measles. His face demonstrated it, his eyes demonstrated it—he was obviously in a case of measles. That told me immediately that on this case was a maybe about measles. This is direct reasoning—very direct. There he was, forty years old, and he had measles: there was a maybe on the subject of measles which had hung up the facsimile at that point.

So we ran a little regret on this. It was his little brother’s funeral procession winding around the corner in the bleak, slushy snow. This preclear started to fly to pieces a little bit and then he got hold of himself quickly.

“Well, what happened?”

He said, “My mother blamed me. My mother said I brought home the measles and therefore my little brother died.”

Here we went off into a life continuum because they weren’t his measles. I asked, “What were the goals of your little brother?” What would the goals of a baby be? He was a very young baby; he was about eight months old. He would be in a state of inaction; everybody would have to take care of him, so he would have to demonstrate that he was helpless. There it was.

Now, this preclear was in a second incident. That was the computation for this life, but it was hung up on an earlier computation somewhere else in the bank which had a fear charge on it.

What was this fear charge? He started to shiver and shake. I did not care to go into it any further.

But what was the fear charge on it? The way you would have found that was very simple. You just would have found any little visio that he might get in dreams or in thinking of himself as something or other. He might have seen himself as a fish or anything you could think of along this line. He would have another facsimile on it. And so you would run some regret on that one and you would blow him into the fear charge. (And then I would have had to have run the fear charge and it would have taken me an hour or so.)

His auditor said, “You know, I’ve been working with this case for months and months and months and there was no certainty on any computation like that. But you’ve dug up here in just a few minutes, for sure, what it has taken me many months to get into light the hard way!”

So that is how fast a computation can blow into view. There is an outline of a demonstration.

You are going to find cases in a condition, very often, where a secondary has to be run as such. If so, try to run it emotionally. If you can get away with running the emotion off a secondary you are going to save time. Even though there are somatics on it, if you can get the emotion off that area, the dickens with the rest of it, because the postulates fall out of the emotion. The only time you get postulates coming out of effort is when the emotion is starting to show up.

*Susan: Ron, in several grief charges I have run, during the time of shock the preclears have been told to “take a little drink, it will make you feel better,” and they have been drinking since then. When they found these phrases and became aware of the suggestion that had been made to them, they didn’t feel they had to anymore. So is it still necessary to find this sort of material?*

You can find all the material you want, but there is an earlier one on every one of those. And none of those was the computation of the case. Just running a grief charge

*Susan: If you just ran the emotion off the grief charge without finding that . . .*

You see, you are not running central computations on these cases; you are running grief charges off. The vital thing in those grief charges was blame.

Whether they were eight months of age or two years of age or forty years of age, how did they occasion this loss? How did they make it come about? That is what is vital on the thing. Although the suggestion is there, the impulse is also there. The impulse is “Well, it’s too tough to face! How do we unface it? Alcohol.” There is the overall computation.

Now, doing it this other way, you would get the phrase off and it would lighten it up to a point where the individual doesn’t feel the compulsion as strongly, but that individual can fall from grace. There is still a possibility of him falling from grace if he is an alcoholic unless you have gotten the real reason he was drinking.

On each one of these grief charges there was a blame and a big restimulation of the original computation or a new computation of some sort.

Now, we are just talking about case entrance on this. If you can get to the computation of a case it should come up the line fast—and then you will find it less and less necessary to work this other stuff and it will blow easier and easier. But have you ever seen a case suddenly come up the line to where it couldn’t run grief? I do mean come up till he couldn’t run grief—just wouldn’t run grief. He is simply running too fast. Grief is way down on a lower band someplace, and so what? You can talk to this case all you want to.

If the area about the grief is still occluded, the reason it is occluded is because it is in a maybe and there is blame on it; there is blame and regret.

What is regret? That is taking something out of the time stream. A person only regrets, really, what he blames himself for or blames another for. These occluded deaths which you have tried so hard to work resolve on running an emotional curve until the blame shows up. You just run a curve; just ask, “How would you feel before something was said to you, and afterwards?” and you run it a few times. The blame on a death will show up or the blame on an accident will show up, or something of the sort. Run the regret off the thing and you will desensitize it rapidly, because that is what you are looking for.

*Jim: Ron, yesterday the subject of breaking the book down into its separate acts as pamphlets was brought up. I know there is much thinking behind that and I recognize what a good idea it is.*

Now, you have been describing an interrogation period or a questioning period and have described it, leading up to the computation on the case, as fortune-telling cards. Now, actually in your self-help book you’ve put together a series of “fortune-telling cards,” and you put them together in a series in which you think the average person should take their cards: one, two, three and four. In making a computation with questions (if we are to have the self-help book used more than the auditor), if the auditor in just a little bit of questioning can make a decision on the computation, would it be wrong or is there any value in him selecting the card that he thinks is a fortune-telling card for the preclear and saying “You do this one first” instead of giving it to him just one, two, three, four?

Yes. That is why the book should be gone through the second time. Somewhere in this book the computation will trigger. It doesn’t matter where. I had to put the book together for a blanket use with no judgment in that fashion. Somewhere the computation on the case will trigger. Regardless of how sloppily the individual is going through it, he is going to run into

something head-on with a crash. He is either going to send for you or it is going to be right there to handle.

It would be a very good thing if we had such packages to hand out and say this one is what the individual should work. That would really make it an auditor's tool.

*Bill: Jim has brought up a point that's exactly in line with what you've been doing; I mean, it is teaching these people how to process dianetically.*

But what I meant to say is, wouldn't it be a valid agreement that we could reach—for these people who are in the clinics, particularly (we have a closer association with them than we do with the general HDA)—to take these books out and put the books into the hands of the preclears and find out, more or less, if there is a consistency where this thing occurs or if they can develop a skill in predicting where a preclear is going to pick up his computation on the case? Then after we've got that data back, we could do a little revision in the text and put each one of those acts out as a self-cover booklet and send those out to the clinics as a package rather than as one book.

The next arrangement of this book, by the way, is different than its present arrangement. This is built already on accumulated experience.

*Jim: We discussed that, Ron. But this was something new.*

It happened at home; I was running somebody through on it, one, two, three, four, and she was saying, "Nothing is happening to me"—bang! Now, if the auditor doing an interview said "Hmm, this looks like number five," and instead of giving one, two, three and four, even with the book as it is now, said "You start here," he might have a phone call within a relatively short period of time.

Sure. For instance, there is the case of the homosexual. A homosexual is in a very, very fine spin. They are in the most beautiful spins of anybody you would care to run into, and yet there is a technique which cracks such a case relatively easily. You do nothing but run the desire to be an effect on the second dynamic; just start scanning it. What you will get! He will hand out computations faster than you can pick them up; he will start handing out computations wildly—untrue ones. He will start handing stuff out just too fast to roll—my experience has been on it—until all of a sudden he sort of breaks down in his desperation and hands you the computation.

Sometimes you have to go into the second stage of life continuum in order to get the computation on a homosexual. Whose life is he continuing? It is generally that the opposite sex has failed.

To get the computation on a case is very easy right now. We are talking about the solution of the case. You have the button chart and you can look across any one of those columns, if you have this individual more or less spotted on the tone scale, and you can start handling him.

Somebody was putting some caution on the handling of the "serious" button. They said that one shouldn't handle this button very soon or very rapidly in a case; one ought to kind of lay off it a little bit. Why? Why lay off any of these buttons? The "serious" button is the most depressive of all of the buttons. If you want to get the "serious" button worked on the case, just start scanning "all the times when you decided something was serious," then "all the times when you had insisted something was serious and failed."

All of a sudden the individual will say, "Oh, my God!" Or "Gee! Yeah, well, that was . . . (sigh) Yes, that was my eighth wife," or something.

Those buttons all act more or less the same way. You get over there on “obey”: “What are the times you’ve tried to make somebody or something obey and they wouldn’t?” You can see that the person ceases to obey himself when he fails on that.

Now, the trick that we are working with and the effort we are working with—we are right back to the beginning of it—is to jump the individual up the tone scale to a point where he handles his counter-efforts. And contained in this mass of common denominators—because each one is a common denominator—is the button for the case. With any one of these buttons, if you work practically nothing but that button, the individual’s tone will start up. He will go through what we will call the critical band on these counterefforts.

This is why you shouldn’t go on with Effort Processing forever and ever: it is a waste of time. We are looking for a more instantaneous technique. You can sit for twenty hours on one engram if you are really going to knock this thing for a loop.

Of course, there is this about an effort: a person may be so thoroughly embedded in the effort of an incident that nothing is freeing up or coming to mind. You will walk into that particular case. This person appears to be very occluded and so on. Right at the beginning of the case, you are unfortunately confronted with this; he won’t run any regret, he can’t think of anything he ever blamed himself for, he has no visios but he has some obvious somatics. This case is relatively inaccessible, but he is inaccessible to himself. And his somatics will be such that it will definitely indicate—ordinarily, if you really think it out—something a little bit out of the ordinary.

And you start running effort, but not “the effort not to” or “the effort to.” The dickens with that. Just run “If your head was being moved, which direction would it be going?”

“Up. Yeah, up.”

“Well, what would be keeping it from going up?”

“Nothing.”

“Well, then, what would keep your body from going down?”

“Yelp! My neck! “

You are running a hanging, so you go on and you run the hanging— efforts, counter-efforts and so on. “What’s the effort to feel that?”

Then he gets down into apathy, and here you have to remember, in running Effort Processing, that if you process out all of his own effort in a serious, bad incident, he will go into apathy. He will be nice and tame and well regulated and tractable—and a psychiatrist’s dream! But you have put him at the complete bottom of the tone scale if you have run out all of his own effort in one incident. He is still in the incident. As a matter of fact, you have put him exactly in its lowest point, and there he has hung up, because the residual effort in the body at that point was possibly no more than the efforts of atoms and molecules to stay together. It would be down that low—below living-organism level. He will snap into that somewhere along the line, way down.

What do you do? You have to go back all the way through the incident and run the counter-efforts—run nothing but counter-efforts—and you can work and work and work. Then all of a sudden the thing is not giving up and you are having trouble; he will now run efforts.

But if you run Effort Processing on a person for ten minutes without getting marked results, then you are running into a life continuum. Let’s say you are processing an individual who is wearing glasses. You have said, “Get the effort, now. Is there any effort associated with your eyes?”

“Yes.”

“What’s the effort?”

“Well . . .” (It is coming in on him, sort of.)

“Well, can you get the effort to push that back out?”

“Yes.”

“All right.”

You work it this way: work the counter-effort for a while, then work the effort for a while, then work the counter-effort for a while and work the effort for a while. But actually, after two or three minutes, if the world hasn’t just gone bing! to him and everything has not become much more deeply colored and brighter, you are not going to get it out, because he is holding on to it for somebody else.

So you start in on the line: “All right, who wore glasses?” “Nobody. Nobody in my family. I’m the only one that wore glasses.”

Or he might say, “Everybody in my family wore glasses. Everybody, everybody.”

“Well, who’s dead?”

“They’re all dead.”

“Let’s see, can you get a visio on anybody in your family wearing glasses?”

“Sure. Sure.”

“Well, scan regret on it.”

“All right.”

“Now scan blame. Let’s just....”

“Why scan blame?”

“Well, scan a little more regret.”

“There is my father! He hit Grandma in the eye with a snowball!” or something ridiculous. This isn’t the computation that is going to come up. This person is actually blaming himself for the death of everybody in his family that wore glasses, in some fashion or other.

Now, if you just charge him at the incident, that is kind of bad, because he has to pick up his own blame and regret. So go over the area with regret, with sympathy, with approval, with pleasant incidents with the person—any time like this to creep up on it—and all of a sudden you will find out why the preclear was certain that he caused that death. It will be some darn-fool reason: “Well, I didn’t mail the letter.”

“What letter?”

“I didn’t mail the letter to the induction board on Tuesday. If I’d mailed it on Tuesday, then the induction board might have taken George in by Thursday, when he died. He wouldn’t have been on the highway on Thursday; he’d have been downtown. So therefore I’m guilty.”

The fellow has got it all worked out. It is completely specious logic, but it is a maybe. There is enough on it to make it a maybe.

Now, don't think that just his recognition of this will necessarily blow it. You want to get "If you failed to blame yourself, what would happen? If you blamed yourself, what would happen?" Just get him to think about it for a moment and you will get the maybe unbalanced. If you get the maybe unbalanced, he will blow the incident.