

RUNNING CCHs

A lecture given on
22 June 1961

All right. I'd better cover the running of the CCHs just for fun just for fun, just as an amusing activity that, of course, has no relationship to anybody that's ever going to make a mistake—particularly here.

And the way the CCHs are run is CCH 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 2, 3, 4; just like a waltz step. You just continue them over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over. And it is a breach of the Auditor's Code, Clause 13, to run a process longer than it is producing change; and it is a breach of the Auditor's Code, Clause 13, to cease to run a process that is producing change. And nothing we are doing these days has exceeded the Auditor's Code in any way, shape or form.

The odd part of it is, the more we seem to change our minds, the more they remain the same, as far as what we're doing is concerned. People who accuse us, you see, of always changing our minds miss the point that we haven't changed very many fundamentals. But we've sure been looking for an opening in other people's minds, and CCH is one of them.

And the CCHs were basically pioneered, I see, back in about 1956. And that is the first way they were run, and that is the way they produce the maximum change. And after that, I didn't pay too much attention to them, and they slopped into very careless ways. And people started adding additives to them; that is the usual thing that happens. And people started to endure while running them, and it hadn't anything to do with the CCHs.

Hence I'm calling this back to your attention. Commands have been added to them, like "Put your hands back in your lap." Now, what that has to do with the CCHs, I'm sure I don't know, because I never heard of it until I picked it up on a sheet of paper not too long ago.

Somebody refined it and I okayed it carelessly and then forgot about it, and so forth. Truth of the matter is, the words in a CCH process have practically nothing to do with the process.

Now, I had a question on an auditor's report here the other day, as to whether or not you were really supposed to put the person's hand—or touch the person's wrist with your other hand. At least that's the way I interpreted the question. Well, how are you going to get the man's hand? It's a matter of seizure, as far as you're concerned; it doesn't matter whether he's hanging from the chandelier or anything else. You take his wrist delicately between your thumb and forefinger and put his paw in your paw, and you execute the auditing command for him. And you continue to do that. It's always the same repetitive motion; you always do it the same way.

And there are exact motions that you go through. I won't try to describe these verbally; I'd rather show you. They're very simple. For instance, when you're doing CCH 1, your knees are interlocked with the PC's knees. Try to get out of a chair when somebody has got your knees clamped. You see, you don't sit back across the room and so on. You do so much formal auditing that you've forgotten that there was an awful heavy routine regimen laid down here on these CCHs. They were quite precise.

Anyway, you're moved in practically into the PC's chest, and you've got at least one of his knees between your knees, and he starts anyplace, why, there he is. He isn't going to get up—not if you close your knees. And furthermore, you should be between him and the door. Always. Your back's to the door; his face is toward it.

Now, he's got a wide perimeter to leap through to get to the door, but you're covering all of it. If you're suspicious of him, back him to the far corner of the room on a CCH 1; so therefore he

has to walk through you to get to the door. And you don't lose PCs. I mean, they sit there and run CCH 1, that's all.

You do a certain routine with your hands, and you present the hand into your hand, and you don't shake it and wish him happy days and all that sort of . . . He has given you his hand, and at that moment you put his hand back. See, you don't tell him "Now, put your hands back in your lap."

What was this—telepathic CCHs? Well, the CCHs are run with meat. They are very meaty processes, you see? They're not verbal "Let's all get along . . ."

We had a student one time on one of the ACCs that was running CCH 2, and the PC was giving the auditor a very bad time, you see? But it was just a coaching session because they were doing Upper Indoc. And this PC was acting as the PC, of course, was slumping and doing unexpected twists and turns. And this dear person who was running this TR, all of a sudden just abandoned the whole thing and turned around to her instructor and said, "PCs never act that way; I'm simply not going to run that TR anymore."

Well, time went by, and she ran into one who did act that way, who acted much worse in an actual session. So all of your Upper Indoc was simply basic training by which you could then do the CCHs. But unless you'd done Upper Indoc, you see, and got your confrontingness up on this amount of motion, then it was difficult to do the CCHs.

Now, two of the CCHs are as rough as bear rassling. Now, the other two CCHs are not. Nevertheless, they, too, are done by compulsion if necessary.

You can run one-handedly CCH 3 and CCH 4, and you run it one handedly. That's an interesting aspect of it. You take the PC's hand and you make the PC's hand touch yours and follow the motion. That's all. And then you release his hand. I mean, that's as simple as that. It becomes a kind of a CCH 1 all over again, but it was with motion in a different pattern each time, don't you see? So if the PC is running fine, you run it two-handed and if the PC is not running fine, you run it one-handed. And that's all there is to it.

And book mimicry: He says he's not going to do book mimicry because when he was very young he got hit by a book. And you say, "That's fine," and you take the book and you put it through a motion, and then you put the book in his hands and you put it through the same motion. And then you take the book and put it through a motion, then put it in his hands and go through the same motion. You understand?

This PC never has an opportunity not to execute the auditing command, and that's all there is to it. And that's CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. The PC never has an opportunity not to execute the auditing command.

And the auditor who will let the PC get away with a non-execution of a CCH oh, my. It just isn't done—not at all, not even in Chelsea. Not done. The PC always executes the auditing command, no matter if you have to sit on her chest and get it done! And you could fully expect the PC to turn up to high C, high G. soprano, contralto, or just get into a roaring funk or anything else. Who cares! It has nothing to do with your Tone 40ing through the CCHs. It is just that way. It is not nice; it is effective.

Now, the consequences of letting a PC get out of a CCH are very grave, and you only have to do it once and you will wish to God you never did it again.

I saw a PC let out of CCH 2 one day, and that PC went crazy. How do you like that? It was an institutional PC to begin with. And the PC was getting better under CCH 2 and all of a sudden made a break for the door, and the auditor did not stop her. And she rushed out into the street. And the auditor walked along behind her trying to persuade her to do the process. And she walked all over the town and was eventually picked up by the cops and thrown into the local

spin bin, where she had come from originally. I'm not trying to tell you that CCH 2 drove this person crazy. But do you know that PC didn't get all right for years? Now, the consequences of it are pretty fabulous.

That auditor just stood there and let the PC blow. You got the idea? He heard about it for years, too. Whenever he was getting out of line, why, we'd mention it to him, see? We'd say, "Well, at least you didn't let the PC blow out on the street," you know? And he'd cringe.

No, it's a serious thing. Nov., all he had to have done was just to have blocked the PC's leaving. Yes, it was an institutional PC; yes, the girl had been in spin bins till you couldn't count; yes, she'd been electric-shocked and all the rest of it. So what? All he had to have done, all he needed to have done, was simply to have stopped her going out the door and put her back through CCH 2—through the next command. And that psychosis was blowing and would have blown. We know by experience that this is quite common and quite ordinary.

The CCHs run out electric shocks; they run out surgery; they run out almost anything you can think of, if they are run right.

The darnedest physical manifestations turn on. And, of course, the CCH is not flat at its points of hugest volume of reaction. Your PC doesn't, oddly enough, sustain tremendously high volume reaction, and you almost never see a PC screaming for twenty minutes so that you have to say that it's flat, don't you see, and go on to the next CCH. Almost never happens.

Neither do you necessarily wait till he stops screaming and then say it's flat. Has he stopped screaming for twenty minutes, you see? That would be the test.

But, of course, by rule now, what do we mean by flat? We mean the same aspect of the PC for twenty minutes, which by ne plus ultra; reductio ad absurdum, would be, if the PC were screaming at exactly C-sharp minor exactly, for twenty minutes, that is a no-change. So you'd go on to the next process. You got it?

If the PC is lying on the floor in a funk for twenty minutes, that process is flat. Have you got it? You're executing the auditing command, and the PC remains on the floor for twenty minutes, there's no aspect change of the PC, so that process, as far as you're concerned, is flat. Now, you got that?

Now, how slight a change is a change? A somatic enters and leaves in that twenty minutes. Well, that's not flat. You've got to run it for twenty minutes without the return of that somatic. You got it?

Now, most CCHs run rather calmly. Most of your CCHing is not done with this tremendous duress. About the only time that tremendous duress sets in is usually when the PC is going through something he considers quite painful.

Now, the CCHs turned it on and the CCHs will turn it off, and that is one of the oldest rules of auditing: That which turns it on turns it off. What do you think is going to happen? You've got a horrible, strong, beefy process of this character, and you've turned something on with it. Well, when is he going to get the CCHs run again? See, you didn't run it on through and turn it off. Well, that's a serious thing, you see? That's a blunder of magnitude.

But it's twenty minutes, and it's by the clock. It's not about twenty minutes; it's twenty minutes, by Greenwich meridian, navigational chronometer, sidereal time. Twenty minutes. And if there's no change of aspect in the PC for twenty minutes, then it's flat.

Well, what if the PC, during the whole of the run—nothing happens? PC just offers his hand and he offers his hand and offers his hand and offers his hand. Nobody said anything to—you ran it till you got a reaction!

Now, let me point out something: An E-Meter very often, on a level (and this will fool you sometime if you don't know about it, so know about it pretty well)—the E-Meter, assessed on a level, sometimes for the first three to five hours of run will be giving you the answer to a flat tone arm. A flat tone arm. It's giving you less than a quarter of a division of motion for the first three to five hours, in an extreme case. Less than a quarter of a division for twenty minutes is the signal to change to another process, isn't it? How can you call it flat when it hasn't yet begun to bite?

But there is some motion in the tone arm; there is some motion in the tone arm. Therefore, it is not flat at the beginning of an assessed level run in Routine 2. In Routine 2 it's moving an eighth of a division. It moves an eighth of a division, it almost reaches a quarter of a division, it moves a sixteenth a division, it moves an eighth a division, it moves almost a quarter of a division. You get the idea?

Well, those all say—according to the test—"process flat," because it's moving less than a quarter of a division. Look, how can a process be flat when it hasn't begun to run? It can't be. And you will find—and you needed some subjective reality on this; you'll run into it soon enough, because it happens to people early in processing, particularly on a Routine 2. But it sometimes happens when you've assessed the goal and you're running on a Routine 3, too. All right.

Here's this little creak, creak, creak, you know? And you say, "Well, by all the rules, it's moving less than a quarter-division in twenty minutes; therefore, I'll come off of it." And then you say, "Well, the PC was ungratefully spun." And the process has not yet begun to run.

Three to five hours, sometime in that period, all of a sudden it suddenly picks up and moves a quarter of a division. Now suddenly it moves a half a division. Now all of a sudden it moves a division. And then it gets down and you say, "Well, thank goodness, it's coming on down now, and this level is flattening." And it's only moving about a third of a division, and pretty soon it'll move a quarter-division, and then it goes from 1.0 to 6.0 to 7.0 to 5.0 to 3.0 to 4.0 to 2.0, because when they do this, sooner or later they get hot, hot, hot!

Now, the only danger in overrunning a process, of course, is sticking the tone arm. And the only danger there is that you stick it for a couple of sessions, and you can't reassess. But you could stick it for a half an hour and still reassess. So if you're in doubt, while you're feeling your way over this, go ahead and stick it!

It's like I told Barry Fairburn up at HGC London. He kept telling me, on this one PC, he said, "Well, it's just . . . I just . . . when will it ever get flat?" You know, it had picked up and had gone very slow, and he'd come off it and he'd reassessed another level in the same afternoon. And of course there I was, looking right down the telex wire at him.

And I said, "Ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah!" I said, "With a tone arm doing that little, the tone arm has not yet begun to move on that level. That tone arm will begin to move on that level. So let's get on the ball here." And he promptly and instantly went off of the second one he had assessed and went back to run the first one he had assessed. And much to his amazement, the first one really started to pick up and fly!

And then he finally wrote me in desperation, about six or seven hours of auditing later. He says, "When is this thing ever going to flatten?"

So I said, "All right now, Barry, you just run it to a stuck tone arm."

And he did; it took quite a while, but he ran it to a stuck tone arm, and then reassessed. Stuck the tone arm for twenty minutes and learned how long you could run it and what it looks like.

In other words, this tone arm action, sometimes early in auditing, takes a long time to get going; and at no time can you consider that flat, because it's never run yet. It assessed, so if

your assessment was good, it will run. And it may take three to five hours for it to start to run, and we've seen that quite consistently.

Now, that's just one level of the Prehav Scale. Now, let's apply this same thing to the CCHs. This is why I'm taking it up.

Now, your CCHs are run without Model Session and without an E-Meter. We care nothing about the E-Meter in running the CCHs because the PC is the E-Meter. Just as you've learned to watch the tone arm move, so must you learn in the CCHs to watch the PC move—the body reaction. It isn't what the PC says; it is what the PC is doing and it's what is happening to the PC. Now, the PC may communicate to you that certain things are happening, and that's fine—that's a change. But the PC is the E-Meter.

You have to consider all four of the CCHs as one level of the Prehav Scale, in this wise, for this purpose: Sometimes the CCHs do not begin to bite. So, what do you get? You get twenty minutes of CCH 1, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 2, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 3, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 4, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 1, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 2, and followed by 18 1/2 hours of CCH 3. You got that?

Just as it takes, on a normal level, a while for a tone arm to pick up and run, so does it also take a while on some cases for the CCHs to begin to run. But if you sit there and grind on just one CCH, this won't happen. And if you don't run the CCHs . . .

The reason why the CCHs were trotted back out of mothballs, -dusted off, the smell of camphor whisked off the top of them, and put back into the lineup, was because you had what happened in the CCHs: the person would run up against the withhold block. In other words, the person would accumulate more responsibility and become aware of more withholds, and there was no way to get rid of them because the PC wasn't being talked to and no rudiments were being run. So the CCH game was limited by the fact he never had a chance to get his withholds off. Right?

So, in running the CCHs today, you are going to run a processing check—a standard HCO WW form. I repeat, no Security Check is permitted to be edited or altered, changed or added to, period. If it doesn't say HCO WW Form something-or-other at the top of it, it isn't a Security Check. Okay?

And, of course, you don't use a Staff Member Security Check—that is to say, a new . . . one of these new HCO WW Form 6s or something like that—as the repetitive Security Check for processing, or something like that. It means right what it says.

You run a Joburg. You take your most violent versions of Security Check, and you run them one for one. If the PC is an hour on the CCHs, the PC gets an hour of Security Check. You got it?

Now, if you're really booting somebody over the horizon and just really giving them the rocket in a mad way, swap their broomstick for a rocket: give them the CCHs from one auditor and a Joburg from another one. Perfectly feasible. Now, you can actually go ahead and assess for SOP Goals with a third auditor, all at the same time.

In the morning PC gets his CCHs, and in the afternoon he gets assessed for goals, and in the evening gets a Security Check run on him. How fast can you get a gain? Well, wait till you've tried that one—wait until you've tried that one and seen that one go, because, man, you get a gain. It's really inevitable.

But the CCHs are quite powerful, and they throw overts into view quite easily. And the person who is pegged down gets a little bit of auditing and all of a sudden these overts start to loom a little large, and they have to get rid of them.

Now, I don't want you to run into trouble and I don't want you to be abused in auditing, but I hope it happens to you at least once that you get a lot of wonderful auditing that gives you a beautiful case advance without a Security Check, and then suffer for two or three days, and it'll sure make a citizen out of you. Boy, that gives you a subjective reality, right there.

An auditing gain without a Security Check—an auditing gain with velocity, you understand, such as we're handing out now, without a Security Check to clean it unhand you've really handed somebody a bad time. They just practically start bleating, you know? "Why am I doing all these horrible things? My life is such a horrible mess. I have. . ." You know? They didn't think it was; they were in a wonderful state of fixed irresponsibility just a day before and then something got run on them, like Routine 1 or Routine I mean, the CCHs or assessments on the general scale. And this was run and all of a sudden, there they are, off to the races.

And you let them improve and improve and improve and improve, and don't inquire into their private lives, because that wouldn't be nice. You'd practically kill them.

I don't wish you any hard luck, but there's nothing makes a citizen out of you like having that happen to you. You get miserable.

So the CCHs are highly functional as long as they can produce a change in the PC. And the change in the PC is ordinarily stopped by the fact that the PC can't get off his overts. And he's become more responsible by running the CCHs, and then can't get off his overts and so, bang!—that parks his progress on the CCHs.

Now, how many ways could you park progress on the CCHs? One, you could fail to run Tone 40 auditing. You could go at it in some old crummy way, you know? You got so used, in the Academy, to putting it into the ashtray that you keep putting the intention in the ashtray throughout the auditing session, you see? Be pretty wild.

You run it sort of permissively. You say, "We shouldn't be mean to the preclear," and we just sit back and we don't really press it home. And the PC says, "Well, I'm tired today. And I really don't feel . . . I really think this CCH 1 is pretty flat now, and I'm very tired today, and so forth, and I'd rather it wouldn't . . . weren't run. I'd rather you'd go on to CCH 4. I think that was the one I was interested in."

Go on to CCH 4, you've had it. Here we go, because you violated C. The first C is control, the next C is communication and the H is havingness. Control, communication, and havingness, or communication, control and havingness. Either way, because you apply control, you get communication; and if you apply control and get communication, havingness will result. If you communicate with somebody you can apply control, which will give you havingness. Whichever way this adds up, the end result is havingness.

Now, irresponsibility can deny havingness. Irresponsibility, then, is pulled off of a case by the Security Check, which results in havingness. All O/W results in havingness. So Routine 1, whether looked at from above, below, plan view, or projected, gives you havingness. And the final net run of it is havingness. Routine 2, all the prehavingness buttons, are the things that prevent people from having. Prehavingness might as well mean "prevent havingness" buttons. But we don't call it that because somebody would say the scale was designed to prevent havingness. And by that overt, of course, they prevent themselves from having any gain.

Anyhow, prehavingness, and the end result of patching up somebody's various buttons on the Prehav Scale is to give him havingness. And when the individual has enormous numbers of unrealized goals all over the track, the net result of all of these all up and down the track was to deny him havingness because he never attained the goal. So that when you do a Goals Assessment, just the assessment, the end product of it is havingness. And you've got three havingness routines.

Now, all three routines—you have in these routines the inherent fact that you run O/W on a preclear and he gets havingness.

Now, why does he get havingness? Because the individual individuates from things because he can't have them. And therefore he develops overts only on those things he can't have. And when you get the overts off, he can then have.

Here's one of the tests: If you can't get the havingness of the Havingness and Confront Process to work, did you know that all you had to do was run some O/W and you will achieve the same thing?

Supposing we did this weird one: This is just taking it straight from theory, you see? I don't say it's workable or anything else, but it's just theoretical. You look around and you say, "Well, notice that cupboard." And you say, "Well, have you ever done anything to a cupboard? Have you ever withheld anything from a cupboard?" And he recalls one. You say, "Good. Look at that floor; notice that floor. Now, have you ever done anything to a floor? Have you ever withheld anything from a floor? Oh, you have. All right. That's good. Now, notice that fireplace. Have you ever done anything to the fireplace? Have you ever withheld anything from a fireplace? Oh, you have. That's dandy. Very good."

You didn't force him, you see, to have actually done something to fireplaces, and so on, because some of these will draw blanks. He says "No," that's right; you say, "We'll go on to the next one."

And all of a sudden that room will become the most fantastically real room he ever was in. Theoretically, that would be the normal outcome of it. You got it? You give him the environment.

But of course you have shorthanded ways of doing this with all of those thirty-six Havingness Processes that you run on a PC objectively in the room. They all more or less do just this. You see?

So your routines are all devoted to increasing the PC's havingness. And they are devoted to—Routine 1, applying control so as to get him into communication so that he can have; Routine 2, getting out of the road the fixed reactive buttons which prevent him from having things; Routine 3, getting out of the road all of these unrealized goals, each one of which has been a defeat for him at sometime or another, all of which—any goal—all of which goals had as their end product havingness. You can't help but raise his havingness.

Now, running right along with this you run O/W and get off all of his withholds, which are preventing him from having. See, he gets the impulse—he can now have, but he'd better not have because he's done bad things, and if he had these things he would ruin them. And therefore, if you don't get this out of the road, you've left him stuck with the idea that he now could have these things but he'd better not, and he's never noticed before now. And it becomes quite painful to him. He says shame, blame, regret, guilt—oh, he says all kinds of things, but that's what it results in. You got it?

So everything you are doing in auditing at the present moment has the end product of havingness. And, of course, if you could have the whole ruddy universe, I assure you it wouldn't be the least trouble to you, not the least bit of trouble. It's only those things you can't have you have trouble with.

Next time you have a PT problem, look it over—look it over. And just ponder this: "How many things are involved with this problem? All right. What blocks off my having of these things or people?" You'll see a problem blow up.

You see, individuation: individuation from the thing, from the object, from the universe, from the dynamic is what brings about the trouble, because you get into an obsessive games

condition. And an obsessive games condition simply adds up to the fact that you can't have it; and it, of course, by your determination, can't have anything to do with you.

Had a fellow around one time who had a games condition going with fire. And my Lord, that fellow burned up couches and suits and fire just pursued him every place. He could stand in the middle of a street without a bit of fuel anywhere in view and have a roaring bonfire almost consume him. And he was in this terrific games condition with regard to fire.

Now, if you'd improved his havingness in general, sooner or later along the road you would have hit the reactive button "fire," see? What has he done with and to fire? In some way he's made it discreditable, in some way he has made it guilty, in some way he's become irresponsible for fire.

All of a sudden, fire no longer has this obsessive chasing effect. Fire just doesn't pursue him up and down all the boulevards and through his whole life, you see? Because fire isn't pursuing him anyhow: He simply cannot have fire, he cannot control fire, and he can't communicate with fire. Soon as he gets into that condition, wow, he's had it. Because no matter where fire will occur, he has to retreat from fire and pull it in on him. See, he's part of the same universe this fire's in, only he hadn't noticed that.

All right. Now, the CCHs, then, are no different than the other two routines. Where an individual is having any difficulty whatsoever with their physiological beingness, where the individual has been obsessively abused, particularly in this physiological beingness that they find themselves in at the moment, the CCHs knock out individuation from the physical beingness. That physical-beingness individuation has been caused by duress on the part of the preclear toward his body and by, apparently, his body toward him.

He's having difficulty: he can't get in his head, he can't come near the body, he can't do this, he can't do that, and therefore, the body is giving him somatics and he's having trouble with the body. You've got the natural concatenation: he's just individuated, that's all. He's one thing and the body's another thing and he can't have it.

And of course the CCHs attack this one particularly, right on the button. It isn't necessarily the criteria for running CCHs, but it's its most immediate and direct result.

So you take somebody that's been given electric shocks. Of course, this has individuated him from the body, because of his own giving the body electric shocks of one kind or another. Well, what happens to this fellow? You start running the CCHs and his havingness on a body starts rising, inevitably. So he has to become aware of all these electric shocks. So as soon as he becomes aware of them, they start running out.

All right. But as soon as they start running out, if he himself takes no further mental step to find out what he's done to bodies and get rid of his overts against bodies, he's left with the somatics running out—but they stop running out—and his overts against the body in full bloom. Pow! This hurts.

So you've got to improve a PC's responsibility if you're going to improve his havingness, because he won't permit himself to have unless he can be responsible for having. And that's the other philosophic button on which this rests, which we've known for a very long time. Now, you got this?

So the way you run the CCHs is directly, immediately and so on, precisely, and you pay very little attention to the PC's mental reactions. All you do is give him a demonstration that that body he's sitting in can be controlled. As soon as he sits in on this one and says, "You know, somebody's controlling this body. Heh-heh. Somebody's controlling this body. Maybe I can." And so he'll try.

Now, if you let him get up to a point where the body flies out of control and you say to him, “Well, that’s all right. That’s giving you some trouble. You want to rush out in the street and not come to session and so forth? Well, go ahead”—mmmm. you’ve shown him the body can’t be controlled, haven’t you? And he retrogresses like mad. So you mustn’t do that to him, because it’s a direct reversal to what you’re trying to do.

You’re trying to show him that his body can be controlled; a failure to execute the CCHs show immediately and directly the body can’t be controlled. Of course the body wins.

Now, all you’d have to do if you’re going to ruin somebody—I can tell you how to ruin somebody—is start the CCHs and if the guy says, “Oh, I’m tired of this silly process, ‘Give me that hand.’ What are we doing? Getting in practice to join the Elks?”

And you say, “Well, if you’re tired of it, then we just will go off onto something else.”

All right. We go off onto CCH 2 and we march him up and down the room, and eventually he suddenly throws us off a little bit and says, “You know, this is getting awfully annoying to me.”

And you say, “Well, all right. We’ll go on to something else. Now, let’s sit down here in the chair, and now, you put your hands up there . . .”

“Well, I don’t know that I want to!”

“Well, all right. Then here’s this book. All right. Here’s this book and . . .”

Fellow says, “I never read books. I don’t like books. Don’t want anything to do with books.”

You say well, there’s nothing you can do about it, and you go and see the instructor, the senior auditor, or call somebody long distance, or send them cables from Johannesburg, you know? And you say, “Well, we have this PC who we can’t make any progress with, with these CCHs.”

Now, do you know that you can take Routine 2 and Routine 3 and do— I’m being very hard on Johannesburg. Actually, Johannesburg is snapping out of it, and I’m very happy to notice it. I have noticed it. It was sure in the basement for a while.

Well, anyhow, if you were to do the same thing with any auditing activity, and let the PC get out of control at each and every turn of the road, you of course are giving them the side effect of proving it to him that his aberrations are so strong that they cannot be controlled. And don’t be too puzzled if the PC eventually becomes practically unauditably.

Don’t be too surprised, if you fail to exert heavy auditing control during a session, if the PC starts getting mad at you, chopping you up, doing this, doing that, doing the other thing; because by not controlling him, by taking his advice all the time, by asking him “How do you run this process, anyway?” by doing this and doing that, you have shown him that you are not controlling him in the session. And showing him that you are not controlling him in the session, of course, results in the model of “no control” taking over and he himself is defeated because he sees that he cannot control his mind, he cannot control his body, he cannot control. That’s true of any auditing process.

That might give you a new shading on this idea of control. Whereas you would look on it very bad—I’ve mentioned this to you just the other day.

I was auditing a PC, actually on a think process, and the PC said, “Oh, I’ve had enough of that,” and leaped madly out of the chair from a very, very calm, you know, demeanor, and actually said “I’ve had enough of that” while springing through the air like an impala. And was springing straight to the door, and in mid-flight I simply grabbed her by the wrist, turned her

around in mid-flight and brought her back sitting down in the chair—its legs almost spraddled out into a total splash, you see?—and gave the next auditing command. And that PC began to run like a doll. Nothing to it, man. And we had that process flat just in no time.

And you say, “God, that’s awfully harsh!” No, I wasn’t being harsh to the PC; I was being rather decent about it. If I’d been mad at the PC, all I would have had to have done was not reach out and grab her wrist, let her reach the door, and then not audit her. Oh, pow. She’s had it. She’s had it! She’d go around now in the total belief, “Well, if Ron can’t control this much aberration and so forth, it’s uncontrollable,” don’t you see? And “Zzooh! What can poor little me do about it?” You know, some kind of a stupid rationalization like this, you know, to herself. She’d go off hiding from herself in corners.

All right. So she did have a black-and-blue addendum. That was an awful lot better than having a black-and-blue psyche.

And if you for a moment think you’re being anything but ornery when you fail to control a PC in session, get rid of the idea. Don’t get this kindness all mixed up. I saw I didn’t get through to you too good the other day on the subject of kindness, but that’s right on the button now. By misguided kindness, you let the PC take control of the session; by misguided kindness, you let the PC off from finishing off the somatic; by misguided kindness you consult endlessly with the PC to make sure that he isn’t displeased with what we are doing; and out of that misguided kindness, you practically drive somebody to the bottom of a well.

Be the most vicious thing you could do to a PC is to fail to control him.

The factor is so strong that even if the PC is right in his advice’s, you had better not take it, because he will suffer more from having been run rightly but out of control, than wrongly in control. Now, do I make myself clear?

Just the fact that the PC has said, “But this has been flat for days!” And you were just that moment going to open your mouth and say, “You know, I think this level has been flat for days!” You were just about to say this. But the fact that he says it, that’s enough, man. You have no choice but to run it. Why? Because his announcement of the act throws him out of control. And it is more serious to let a PC out of control in session than it is to run the wrong process or to overrun a process. That can’t louse him up, but letting him go out of control can practically kill him.

So if you ever want to err, don’t err on the side of sweetness and light, man, err on the side of the heavy-handed parent; err on the side of the lion tamer; err on the side of the machine-gunner. Keep the Auditor’s Code, but keep control. And if you do that, your PCs will never do anything but recover, because the hidden factor of the CCHs are present in whatever you’re running, even though you’re doing formal auditing.

“Well, is it all right with you if I end this process?”

And he says, “No, it certainly is not!”

And you say, “What objection do you have?”

And he says, “Sa-rowr, rowr-rowr, rowr-rowr.” And you say, “All right. Okay. Thank you very much. Now, I’ll give you two more auditing commands and end this process.”

“Oh, God! What are you doing to me?”

And you say, “Have you ever shot the moon? Thank you. Have you ever shot the moon? Thank you. Is there anything you’d care to say before I end this process?”

And you know, about that time, if you've done the job right, he'll say, "No, as a matter of fact I don't have."

You say, "Good. End of process."

What happened to the ARC break you knew was going to occur? It wasn't that he was knuckled under and overwhelmed—that was not what happened. You say, "What do you know? This outburst is easily controlled. Look, PC controlled it."

PC's controlled it. "Not only did the auditor control it, I controlled it too. Heh-heh. What do you know? Tooh! Nothing to it." Got the idea?

All right Wrong—wrong way: "Well, is it all right with you if I ask you two more times and end this process?"

"No, my God, I will say it isn't! I've got a somatic eight feet thick, and why don't you ever pay any attention to your auditing, and what is the matter with you anyway?"

"Well, how wide is this somatic? Okay. All right. Well, we'll carry on the process a little while longer then, and see if you get rid of it."

"Well, you'd better."

Fifteen minutes more auditing and you've got a real roaring ARC break. What's the ARC break over? You did what the guy said. You tried to flatten this terrible somatic; you were being nice about the whole thing; you were being reasonable about the whole thing. Well, the test is, did the somatic get better? No, as a matter of fact, it will always get worse. Always. It's better to end the process wrongly on the auditor's determination than to end it on the PC's rightly. Remember that. Of course, it's a happy chance that you end it rightly on the auditor's determination.

Give you a new viewpoint of this sort of thing?

Audience: Yeah.

Yeah.

Now, the auditor is running the session, and if the PC starts running the session, expect trouble expect trouble, man. It's not a kind thing to do; it's a rotten, mean, dirty, nasty thing to do to a PC. It's almost covert hostility to do that to a PC.

PC says, "Oh, God, you're not gonna . . . you're . . . you're actually . . . no, my God! You're not going to run any more 'failed can't'!"

And the auditor says . . . My normal response to such a thing is "What's the matter?"

And he says, "Yow, yow, yow, yow, yow! And yow, yow, yow, yow, yow."

You say, "No kidding! All right. The auditing command is 'What have you failed to can't?' 'Who has failed to can't you?'" And he'll all of a sudden—he's suddenly good as gold.

He says, "Well, it (kmpf, kmpf) wasn't nat-tarted to run flat."

The PC can steer a session wrong on me by being too informative of actually what is the exact situation, because he opens a gate there that you can't let him go through. And he says, "Well, this 'failed can't' has been flat for the last session. I know it." And you were just about to open your mouth and say, "This 'failed can't' has been flat for the last session, I'm sure."

And he says, “This ‘failed can’t’ has been . . .” Whooh. Well, here goes a half an hour of ‘failed can’t.’

In the first place, I wouldn’t believe it was flat if he was protesting against it. And the other thing, even if it was flat, it would do him more harm to let him start running the session than it would be to overrun a process or underrun one. You got that? It would do him more harm.

Now, many people have trouble ending sessions, and that’s because they keep consulting the PC as to “what’s the state of the PC,” so as to determine when the session should end. And I’ll tell you a good test sometime, is the next time a PC says to you that the session shouldn’t end, or he has something undone, or he feels very bad about it, or he hasn’t made his goals, why, that’s just dandy; just nicely, firmly and pleasantly end the session, and find no ARC break. And you’ll say, “What happened to the ARC break that we knew was coming?” It didn’t materialize.

Now, what happened to it was, this is an effort of a breakout, an effort at a continuance, and you come along behind the thing and you say, “You see? It wasn’t necessary to continue it.”

And he says, “It wasn’t necessary to continue it.”

So the next time you have trouble ending a session... This, by the way—a new auditor on an HGC always, almost always, has this difficulty. They say to the old-timers, “How can you possibly get your sessions ended by 3:30? How can you end a session by 3:30?” And the new auditor is staggering out of the auditing room, you see, at 6:45.

Well, that’s a sure indicator that the new auditor does not have his PC in control, because he’s said to the thing, “Now, how do you feel now? How do you feel about the process we’ve been running, and so forth? How do you . . . how are you . . . how’s your general health?”

And the PC says, “Well, it’s pretty bad, actually. My aunt Methuselah matildaed the other day, and it’s pretty bad.”

And the new auditor would say, “Well, the poor fellow. Why, we . . . the best . . . the best thing for him to do is to carry on here and get this matildaing out of the way.” And so he does that, and then he’ll find something else, and he’ll find something else and it goes on and on and on. And the PC anises less and less, and makes less and less progress, and is slowed down more and more, and the auditor’s getting into more and more trouble, and he wonders, “What on earth is happening to me?”

Whew. The only thing that’s happening is, is back there at 3:30 with the tone arm moving—it could have been, you see, as bad as this. The tone arm was moving on a rock slam—the tone arm was rock-slamming, you see, not the needle. And 3:30 was about to come around, and he just had time to get in his end rudiments before he reached 3:30, and he said, “All right. Is it all right with you if I give you two more commands and end this process?”

“All right with me? My God, I’m just getting going!”

You say, “All right. Thank you very much.” Give him two more commands. “Is there anything you’d care to say before I end this process?”

“Well, there certainly is. My God, I never saw such horrible bad auditing, and you’re doing me in,” and so forth.

And you say, “Good. End of process.” And then you run your end rudiments. “Now, is there any ARC breaks?” And you expect immediately that you’re going to get your head taken off, before you get used to this kind of thing, you know? And you’re sitting there all ready for the meter to blow up. Ah, there’s a little twitch.

And you say, “What was that?”

“Well,” he says, “you ended it. You ended the process, and I don’t know if I can ever get back into it or not.”

“All right,” you say. “Well, is it all right with you if we take that up tomorrow?” And you say, “Okay. Now, do you have any ARC breaks?” And there is none. And you say, “All right. And here we go,” you see, and run off the end rudiments and that’s it. The PC goes out whistling and everything’s fine, dandy.

But the new auditor, the new auditor at 6:35, you see, streaked with sweat and coal dust, comes staggering out of the auditing room, you know, and he says to the others, he says (who have now assembled for an evening briefing session or something of the sort), “How do you people do it? You must be terribly cruel. You must just chop the PC off in the middle of nothing, you know, and you just must be thinking about yourselves and nobody else, and . . .”

They say, “Well, I don’t know, we end it, and it never seems to do any harm.” And that’s the correct way to go about it, that’s all. You run the session.

Now, that’s very, very observable in the CCHs, but, of course, it carries over into the remainder of auditing. In the CCHs it is so observable that if you let the PC start running the auditing session, he will practically spin, and in the others he just has an ARC break.

You want to know what an ARC break is? Sometime or another the PC went out of session and you lost control of the PC. And it sometimes takes as much as an hour to an hour and a half for that ARC break to materialize in the physical universe. That is so true that when I get a PC who is ARC breaking (which doesn’t happen very often, because I do this other one), I say to them, “What happened a half an hour ago?”

“Half an hour ago? Oh, a half an hour ago. I’m not interested in a half an hour ago. It’s what’s happening right now. I mean, I’m . . . after all, I feel these bayonets in my chest and so forth, here.”

“No, what happened a half an hour ago?”

“Oh, I remembered a half an hour ago, I—yeah, that’s right. There was something there. I . . . I remembered about a half an hour ago I’d forgotten to phone my wife at noon and she’s probably furious with me.” There was your ARC break; didn’t have anything to do with what you were doing in auditing.

Now you, not understanding what ARC breaks are, or how to take ARC breaks apart, find your auditing apparently under criticism all the time from the PC, and then you try to put your finger on what it is that you are doing wrong in your auditing so as to set it right. And the truth of the matter is, the only thing you’re doing wrong in your auditing is not being pig-bullheaded. And a half an hour after you have broken down and relinquished control of the session, you get an ARC break and get all this criticism from the PC of your auditing. And that happens an hour and a half to a half an hour after you have committed the “fox pass” [faux pas]. And you let them “foxes” through and you’ve had it.

And that’s what occurs. You got it now?

Audience: Yes. Hm-hm.

Try sometime to be overbearingly, stupidly domineering about a session. Just try it sometime, just for the hell of it! Have the PC make a perfectly reasonable suggestion, such as “Could I have a break so that I can go to the bathroom?” and look at him as though he has suddenly stolen the crown jewels. Yes? And say, “Well, we’ll get a break in an hour or so,” and note the peculiar lack of an ARC break.

And then sometime have a PC say this to you, “Well, actually, I don’t quite feel up to running the process at the moment,” and you say, “Well, we’ll do something else,” and watch the ARC break materialize in an hour and a half to a half an hour.

You see? And because it’s an hour and a half to a half an hour afterwards in most cases, you don’t associate cause and effect, because it’s such prior cause that you haven’t noticed where you lost control of the session. But the best way to patch up an ARC break is to find out where you lost control of the session and reassert control of the session, not Q-and-A with the ARC break! Now, there’s a real way to patch them up.

So you’re very graduate in the way of auditors, and you ought to learn that one, and you ought someday, just for the hell of it, just to find out that it’s true, just start—as you’re auditing, just be pigheaded about something sometime or other. Just utter pigheaded. Pick out one of the cartoons they used to draw of the German army back in World War I, you know, and put it on.

And the PC has made a perfectly reasonable request. The PC has said, “Can we end the session by 4:30, because I have a date with a millineuse?”

And look at him pityingly, you know, and just disregard it utterly. Just make as if—pointedly—he’d never said a word. You’re going to be charitable; you’re going to disregard this terrible thing he has obviously done.

Now, to your way of thinking, that would cause an ARC break. No, the way the ARC break is caused, you must also do this one—do this other one, see?

Sometimes a PC says, “Oh, I don’t know if . . . I . . . you . . . God . . . God almighty! I . . . I don’t . . . I don’t have to run this. You say you found a present time problem on that meter. Well, look, I’m so tired of having all of my auditing time wasted on present time problems! Can’t we just skip the present time problem for once?”

Go ahead. Skip it. Just knuckle-headedly skip it, pleasantly, and just say, “Well, all right. Well, if you don’t want to run it, we won’t run it. Okay. Now, let’s take up the next one here.” And watch it start to arrive. You can actually measure it on your clock. The maximum time you will have to wait is one and one-half hours of auditing, but somewhere, certainly—certainly within an hour and a half, and in certainly not less than a half an hour, you’re going to have an ARC break on your hands.

“Your fingernails are dirty. Your fingernails are dirty. You know, you really ought to get some training at the local Academy, because if you ran your confronting a bit better, I’m sure I could make some progress or something. Do you realize that you have crossed your legs?” Any kind of an ARC break you can think of that has nothing to do with the price of fish. No, it was right back there.

And you say, “Well, naturally. We had a present time problem. That’s making him edgy.” No, that is not what happened. Is you let the PC run his own bank for a moment and showed him that you were an incompetent, weak schnook. And showed him that his bank was not controllable, and you’ve proved this to him conclusively that his bank was not controllable, so what materialized? The simplest thing in the world materialized: the bank, having been demonstrated to be uncontrollable, of course becomes uncontrollable. And you get what is commonly called an ARC break.

And auditors who have constant, continual ARC breaks with PCs can be rated just exactly this: no control of PC. PC says, “I am schnooking today,” and the auditor says, “You poor fellow, so therefore we’re not going to schnook.” You know, he says, “It’s schnooking. Naturally, we’ll avoid schnooking then. We won’t get into that nasty field.”

Or the PC says, “I keep hearing these violins in my ears,” and that sort of thing. And the auditor is sitting down there just to do one thing, which is to run an assessed level of the Prehav Scale—get the rudiments in order to run a level of the Prehav Scale. And the PC knows very well what’s going to happen. And he says, “Violins in my ears,” you know, “all the time!” and so forth.

And the auditor says, “Well, is this a present time problem with you?”

And he says, “It certainly is.”

And the auditor just goes right on down the line and gets the rest of what he ought to do and runs the assessment, and we don’t hear anything more about it. And the violins turn off ‘cause they were part of the level.

But, this one: The auditor says, “Oooh, violins. Well, we’ll have to do something about violins. Now, what trouble have you had with violins in your life?” and just throws the session away. And you’ve got an ARC-breaky PC from that point right straight on. You got it?

Learn that one well. Because it’s the difference—no matter what tricks you learn, that one that I’ve just been talking about, which is very much in keeping with the CCHs, that one is the difference between auditing and no auditing. You’ve got a black and white: auditing or no auditing. Auditing, the auditor is in control of the session with a capital C and a capital T. Got it? All right. Auditing takes place. Auditor not in control of session, reactivity takes place, because there’s nobody now in control of the session, so there couldn’t be any auditing.

And the easiest way in the world to get rid of auditing is to delete control from an auditing session. Then the auditor isn’t controlling the session, the PC can’t control the auditing session, the reactive mind damn well won’t control the auditing session, so where is the auditing?

Actually, a lot of your feeling about auditing, or some of your flinches that you occasionally get about auditing, simply stems from times when you have not controlled an auditing session; and only then did you come under heavy criticism from the reactivity of the PC. Only then.

The only thing that could ever be criticized about any of you as an auditor is that you do not control a session heavily enough.

So take your cue from the CCHs and control the rest of auditing the same way, and the results which you get will be five to ten times as fast as they are right now. You want to know how to speed up auditing results? Just try it. Okay?

Audience: Thank you. Hm-hm.

Right-O. Said my piece. Thank you very much.