

The Dianetic Auditor's BULLETIN

VOLUME 2, NO. 1

JULY, 1951

Editorial	1
Education and the Auditor	3
L. RON HUBBARD	
A Notebook of Dianetic Instruction	13
O. STANLEY WALDROP, H. D. A.	
Aberrations and Genius	31
Only One Child?	31
Case History 1018B	32

Official Publication of

DIANETICS



**HUBBARD
DIANETICS**

THE HUBBARD DIANETIC FOUNDATION, INC.

The Foundation has been chartered in the State of Kansas with these grants: "To study and conduct research in the field of the human mind and of human thought in action; and the application of the principles discovered therein for the relief and cure of all human ills which may be found to originate in the mind of man; and in connection therewith to further study, explore, develop and do research in the science of Dianetics, as discovered and founded by L. Ron Hubbard; and in furtherance and not in limitation thereof, to teach, educate, demonstrate, explain, show, publish and declare, by any means, the facts, findings, results, principles, and axioms ascertained in Dianetic research of the human mind for the cure, relief, and release from all human ills, and ailments which are derivative from engrams and psychosomatic control and command of the human mind, and body. To have and exercise all powers conferred upon a corporation by the laws of the State of Kansas."

The officers of the Foundation are: L. Ron Hubbard, Chairman of the Board, Don G. Purcell, President, and John Wm. Maloney, Secretary-Treasurer. Director, National Press and Publications: Waldo T. Boyd. Director of Admissions: R. Ross Lamoreaux. Director of Training: David C. MacLean.

Published monthly as a source of information on new developments in Dianetics for Professional and Associate Members. An Associate Membership in the Foundation is open to all individuals interested in Dianetics. The membership fee is fifteen dollars annually. Professional Membership is granted only after a Professional Course at the Foundation. Entered as Second Class matter at the Post Office, Wichita, Kansas.

NOTE: Procedures set forth herein should not be applied until the auditor is familiar with "DIANETICS: The Modern Science of Mental Health" and "SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL: Simplified, Faster Dianetic Techniques."

EDITOR WALDO T. BOYD

Printed in U. S. A.

Editorial

The first mechanical weapon used by man in his war against his fellow man was a round stone. The evolution of his mechanical weapons passed through the stone axe, the spear or lance, the bow and arrow, the cross-bow, the catapult and the ram. When gun powder was invented, a new era in the evolution of mechanical weapons began and each new weapon was even more destructive of human life than its predecessor, moving through primitive rifles and cannon which were improved and refined from war to war until we have the precise destructive machines of today's modern armies. Even higher order mechanical destruction was given into man's hands with the introduction of the atom bomb. How many thousands of years have been required for this evolution to take place no one knows for sure, but it has been a great many.

Moving out of the field of mechanical weapons and into the field of psychological weapons, we find an entirely different picture. Man's first attempt at aggression against his fellow man was conducted with the assistance of psychological warfare. Evidence of this is borne out by the present day application of psychological weapons by the warring tribes of interior Africa. Evolution of war has given little improvement to the method of psychological warfare; only refinement to its application. Lies, rumors, false reports, and the undermining of confidence were used by the hordes that came down from the Russian Steppes in 1500 B. C. to lay a smooth path for their armies of conquest. Ghengis Kahn used the white flag of surrender to lure troops into annihilating ambush.

To endure for so many centuries, a weapon such as this must be very powerful. It has been so powerful, in fact, that man has not been able to devise an effective defense against it. That is, until L. Ron Hubbard developed the basic theories of Dianetics.

It would seem then, that the greatest validation of the efficiency of Dianetics as opposed to the other sciences in the field of the mind such as psychology and psychiatry, would be its ability to so rehabilitate the mind of man that it could no longer be affected by lies, rumors, false reports and the undermining of confidence. However, Dianetics does not stop with such a profound accomplishment — it goes even further. Dianetics so rehabilitates the mind of man that it no longer originates lies, rumors and bad reports when the individual has been brought up the tone scale to a good, solid 3.0. Dianetics not only offers a valid defense against this most powerful of weapons, it removes the source of the weapon.

However, in our enthusiasm to learn more about Dianetics and to do a better job of teaching Dianetics, some of us are prone to overlook the fact that we must also use the dianetic process for our own advancement up the tone scale. This is the one chink in our defense against that most insidious of all weapons, psychological warfare. Our experience of the past year clearly shows

how even a group as well educated as we are in the field of the mind can be torn apart and almost destroyed by rumors, bad data and bad reports. We must still be wary of the impact of these things against our future progress toward our common goal until such time as we have risen above the level of vulnerability to this weapon.

In order to shorten and strengthen the lines of communication within our group and to allow it to grow on an ever widening periphery, a new, central organization, the Foundation, was established in the heart of the country. A national association of HDAs was organized with its national headquarters in the same building occupied by the Foundation. This composite organization effects a direct line of communication from the individual interested in Dianetics, to a dianetic group, to the HDAs in the area, to the Association headquarters in Wichita, to the Foundation, and back through the same channels to the individual.

With this type of organization and its attendant lines of communication, it should be a relatively simple matter for us to protect ourselves against rumors, bad data and bad reports relative to the world of Dianetics merely by getting in communication with each other about rumors or reports that are directed toward either you in the field or us at the Foundation.

Now that we have re-grouped our forces and reasserted our self determinism to pursue our chosen course, let us be ever more wary of those who attempt to confuse us and undermine our confidence in each other by the dissemination of rumors, bad data and bad reports. — D. G. P.

To endure for so many centuries, a weapon such as this must be very powerful. It has been so powerful, in fact, that man has not been able to devise an effective defense against it. That is until I. L. Leontovitch developed the basic theories of Dianetics.

It would seem then, that the greatest validation of the efficacy of Dianetics as opposed to the other sciences in the field of the mind such as psychology and psychiatry, would be its ability to so rehabilitate the mind of man that it could no longer be affected by the rumors, false reports and the undermining of confidence. However, Dianetics does not stop with a profound accomplishment—it goes even further. Dianetics so rehabilitates the mind of man that it no longer originates lies, rumors and bad reports when the individual has been brought up the tone scale to a good solid 3.0. Dianetics not only offers a valid defense against this most powerful of weapons, it removes the source of the weapon.

However, in our enthusiasm to learn more about Dianetics and to do a better job of teaching Dianetics, some of us are prone to overlook the fact that we must also use the dianetic process for our own advancement up the tone scale. This is the one thing in our defense against that most heinous of all weapons, psychological warfare. Our expansion of the past year clearly shows

Education and the Auditor

by L. RON HUBBARD

The first thing that an auditor has to find out for himself and then recognize is that he is dealing with precision tools. It isn't up to someone else to force this piece of information on him. The whole subject of auditing, as far as the auditor is concerned, is good or bad in direct ratio to his knowledge of his tools. It is up to an auditor to find out how precise these tools are. He should, before he starts to discuss, criticize or attempt to improve on a technique, find out for himself whether or not the mechanics of this technique are in existence, and whether or not this technique adequately handles the mechanics.

He should make up his mind about each one of the three principle kinds of entheia; the lock, the secondary, and the engram. Do locks exist? Do secondaries exist? Do engrams exist? There are two ways to answer this to his own satisfaction: find them in a pre-clear or find them in himself. These are fundamentals, and every auditor should undertake to discover them himself, thus raising Dianetics above an authoritarian category. It is not sufficient that an instructor stand before you and declare the existence of an engram. Each and every one of you must determine for yourselves whether or not the instructor's statements are true.

In the field of medicine some instructors declare that multiple sclerosis is the decay of nerve fibers, and that it is incurable, and that people who contract the "disease" die in a relatively short period of time. It must be answered in just this way on the examination paper, or the student will find himself with less than a passing grade. This is not instruction — this is obstruction.

In the first place, no one in medical school knows anything about multiple sclerosis, and in the second place it is curable, and in the third place it is not fatal. A good instructor would expect his students to question such a statement, and to find for themselves what can be done about multiple sclerosis.

There are two ways men ordinarily accept things, neither of them very good. One is to accept a statement because Authority says it is true and must be accepted, and the other is by preponderance of agreement amongst other people.

Preponderance of agreement is all too often the general public test for sanity or insanity. Suppose someone were to walk into a crowded room and suddenly point to the ceiling, saying, "Oh, Look! There's a huge, twelve-foot spider on the ceiling!" Everyone would look up, but no one else would see the spider. Finally someone would tell him so. "Oh, yes there is," he would declare and become very angry when he found that no one would agree with him. If he continued to declare his belief in the existence of the spider he would very soon find himself institutionalized. The basic definition of sanity in this somewhat nebulously learned society is

whether or not a person agrees with everyone else. It is a very sloppy manner of accepting evidence, but all too often it is the primary measuring stick.

And then the Rule of Authority: "Does Dr. J. Doe agree with your proposition? No? Then, of course, it cannot be true. Dr. Doe is an eminent authority in the field." A man by the name of Galen at one time dominated the field of medicine. Another man by the name of Harvey upset Galen's cozy position with a new theory of blood circulation. Galen had been agreeing with the people of his day concerning the "tides" of the blood. They knew nothing about heart action. They accepted everything they had been taught and did little observing of their own.

Harvey worked at the Royal Medical Academy, and found by animal vivisection the actual function of the heart. He had good sense enough to keep his findings absolutely quiet for a while. Leonardo da Vinci had somehow discovered or postulated the same thing, but he was a "crazy artist" and no one would believe an artist. Harvey was a member of the audience of a play by Shakespeare in which the playwright made the same observation, but again the feeling that artists never contribute anything to society blocked anyone but Harvey from considering the statement as anything more than fiction.

Finally Harvey made his announcement. Immediately dead cats, rotten fruit and pieces of wine jugs were hurled in his direction. He raised quite a commotion in medical and social circles, until finally, in desperation, one doctor made the historical statement that, "I would rather err with Galen than be right with Harvey!" That is one method of accepting a fact — quietly determine the preponderance of opinion in favor of it, and then accept or reject it on that basis.

Man would have made an advance of exactly zero if this had been the only method of testing evidence. But every so often during man's progress there have been rebels who were not satisfied with preponderance of opinion, and who tested a fact for themselves, observing and accepting the data of their observation, and then testing again.

Possibly the first man who made a flint axe looked over a piece of flint and decided that the irregular stone could be chipped a certain way. When he found that flint would chip easily he must have rushed to his tribe and enthusiastically tried to teach his fellow tribesmen how to make axes in the shape they desired instead of spending months searching for accidental pieces of stone of just the right shape. The chances are he was stoned out of camp. Indulging in a further flight of fancy, it is not difficult to imagine that he finally managed to convince another fellow that his technique worked, and that the two of them tied down a third with a piece of vine and forced him to watch them chip a flint axe from a rough stone. Finally, after convincing fifteen or twenty tribesmen by forceful demonstration, the followers of the new technique

declared war on the rest of the tribe and, winning, forced the tribe to agree by decree.

Man has never known very much about that with which his mind is chiefly filled: data. What is data? What is the evaluation of data? For instance, if you have been in Dianetics very long the chances are that someone has glibly told you that he knew from Psychoanalysis that if one could remember childhood experiences one could be relieved of certain psychosomatic pains. His conclusion from this tiny scrap of information was that Dianetics is not new.

In 1884 when Bruer first presented this tiny fact to Freud, he was unable to convince the eminent Doctor, but he managed to convince Freud in the next ten years. Then Freud convinced his literary agents. Medicine then fought Freud to a standstill, but eventually psychoanalysis emerged from the embroglio.

All these years in which psychoanalysis has taught its tenets to each generation of doctors the authoritarian method was used, as can be verified by reading a few of the books on the subject. Within them is found, interminably "Freud said . . ." The truly important thing is not that "Freud said" a thing, but "Is the data valuable? If it is valuable, how valuable is it? You might say that a datum is as valuable as it has been evaluated. A datum can be proved in ratio to whether it can be evaluated by other data, and its magnitude is established by how many other data it clarifies. Thus, the biggest datum possible would be one which would clarify and identify all knowledge known to man in the material universe.

Unfortunately, however, there is no such thing as a prime datum. There must be not one datum, but two data, since a datum is of no use unless it can be evaluated. Furthermore, there must be a datum of similar magnitude with which to evaluate any given datum. You cannot evaluate a mountain by comparing it to a grain of sand.

Man has always evaluated data to a certain point, and then said, "from here on is God." Strangely enough, with the passing of time and the acquisition of new data with which to evaluate, the line of demarcation between material knowledge and God was pushed further and further back, and today is being pushed even further back. Actually, in order to conceive God, man had to have datum of comparable magnitude — and thus the "Devil."

Data is your data only so long as you have evaluated it. It is your data by authority or it is your data. If it is your data by authority somebody has forced it upon you, and at best it is little more than a light aberration. Of course, if you asked a question of a man whom you thought knew his business and he gave you his answer, that datum was not forced upon you. But if you went away from him believing from then on that such a datum existed without taking the trouble to investigate the answer for yourself — without comparing it to the known universe — you were falling short of completing the cycle of learning.

Mechanically, the major thing wrong with the mind is, of course, the turbulence of the physical pain engram, but the overburden of information in this society is enforced education that the individual has never been permitted to test. Literally, when you are told not to take anyone's word as an absolute datum you are being asked to break a habit pattern forced upon you when you were a child. Your instructor in Dianetics could have told you what he found to be true and invite you to test it for yourself, but unless you *have tested it* you very likely do not have the fundamentals of Dianetics in mind well enough to be comfortable in the use of any or all of the techniques available to you. This is why theory is so heavily stressed in Dianetics. The instructor can tell you what he has found to be true and what others have found to be true, but at no time should he ask you to accept it — please allow a plea otherwise. Test it for yourself and convince yourself whether or not it exists as truth. And if you find that it does exist, you will be comfortable thereafter; otherwise, unrecognized even by yourself you are likely to find, down at the bottom of your information and education an unresolved question which will itself undermine your ability to assimilate or practice anything in the line of a technique. Your mind will not be as facile on the subject as it should be. It is not through courtesy that you are being asked to check your data — you are being asked to become much better auditors by resolving your basic and fundamental concepts.

Any quarrel you may have with theory is something that only you can resolve. Is the theory correct, or isn't it correct? Only you can answer that; it cannot be answered for you. You can be told what other auditors have achieved in the way of results, and what other auditors have observed, but you cannot become truly educated until you have achieved the results for yourself. The moment a man opens his mouth and asks, "Where is validation?" you can be sure you are looking at a stupid ass! That man is saying, bluntly and abruptly, "I cannot think for myself. I have to have Authority." Where could he possibly look for validation except into himself, the physical universe, and into his own subjective and objective reality?

Unfortunately, Dianetics is surrounded by a world that calls itself a world of science, but it is a world that is in actuality a world of Authority. True, that which is science today is far, far in advance of the Hindu concept of the world wherein a hemisphere rested on the backs of seven elephants which stood on seven pillars, that stood on the back of a mud turtle, below which was mud into infinity.

The reason engineering and physics has reached out so far in advance of any other science is the fact that they pose problems which punish man so violently if he doesn't look carefully into the physical universe. An engineer is faced with the problem of drilling a tunnel through a mountain for a railroad. Tracks are laid up to the mountain on either side. If he judges space wrongly the two tunnel entrances would fail to meet on the same level in the center.

It would be so evident to one and all concerned that the engineer made a mistake that he takes great care not to make such a mistake. He observes the physical universe, not only to the extent that the tunnel must meet to a fraction of an inch, but to the extent that if he were to misjudge wrongly the character of the rock through which he drills the tunnel would cave in—an incident which would be considered a very unlucky and unfortunate occurrence to railroading.

Biology comes much closer to being a science than others because, in the field of biology, if someone makes too big a mistake about a “bug” the immediate result can be dramatic and terrifying. Suppose a biologist is charged with the responsibility of injecting plankton into a water reservoir. Plankton are microscopic “germs” that are very useful to man. But, if through some mistake the biologist injects typhoid germs into the water supply—there would be an immediate and dramatic result.

Suppose a biologist is presented with the task of producing a culture of yeast which would, when placed in white bread dough, stain the bread brown. This man is up against the necessity of creating a yeast which not only behaves as yeast, but makes a dye as well. He has to deal with the practical aspect of the problem, because after he announces his success there is the “yeast test”: is the bread edible? And the brown-bread test: is the bread brown? Anyone could easily make the test, and everyone would know very quickly whether or not the biologist had succeeded or failed.

Politics is called a science. The punishment for a mistake in the “science” of politics is so tremendous that this whole culture is on the verge of being wiped out! There are natural laws about politics. They could be worked out if someone were to actually apply a scientific basis to political research.

For instance, it is a foregone conclusion that if all communications lines are cut between the United States and Russia that Russia and the United States are going to understand each other less and less. Then by demonstrating to everyone how the American way of life and the Russian way of life are different, and by demonstrating it day after day, year after year, there is no alternative but a break of affinity. By stating flatly that Russia and the United States are not in agreement on any slightest political theory or conduct of man or nations the job is practically complete. Both nations will go into anger tone and suddenly there is war.

Russia is very, very low on the tone scale. She is a totalitarian slave state and about as safe to have in the family of nations as a mad dog at a cocktail party. We as a nation could be very, very clever—we could try to put Russia back together again. We are a nation possessed of the greatest communications networks on the fact of the earth, with an undreamed of manufacturing potential. We have within our borders the best advertising men in the world. But instead of selling Europe an idea we give machine guns, planes and tanks for use in case Russia breaks out. The more threats

imposed against a country in Russia's tone level the more dangerous that country will become. When people are asked what they would do about this grave question, they shrug and say something to the effect that "the politicians know best." They hedge and rationalize by saying that after all, there is the American way of life, and it must be protected.

What is the American way of life? This is a question that will stop almost any American. What is the American way of life that is different from the human way of life? We have tried to gather together economic freedom from the individual, freedom of the press, and individual freedom, and define them as a strictly American way of life — why hasn't it been called the Human Way of Life?

We are faced with an Asia which is awakening. Japan, having been induced to become a modern industrial nation, branched out into Asia with her ideas of freedom for the individual. She sold other backward nations on the idea that Japan would free them from the yoke of the white man, even though she realized that she was committing suicide by so doing. To quote from some political propaganda distributed in these countries by Japan, "You will cry for us when we are gone. But we have freed you. Don't ever forget it, and don't forget us." Japan's missionaries knew that Japan would go under when it came to a contest between her country and the Western world, but the seed she sowed is far from dead.

We, in the persons of Perry and others who sailed their ships into Asia, gave Asia the spark of freedom. Japan accepted the teaching and committed national suicide by attempting imperial expansion, involving us in a very long and terrible war. We cannot but wonder and sometimes become confused, nor can we blame the Asiatics for a tiny bit of confusion now and then concerning the intentions of the Western world, when we try to fathom the actual nature of our political foreign policy. Do we, or do we not, desire Democratic principles and the "American" way of life for the Asiatic peoples?

Consider the U. S. support of China's totalitarian regime headed by Chiang Kai-shek. While we weakly spoke of freeing the Chinese from the yoke of imperialism we poured huge sums of money and war material into the hands of a government which practiced the very principles we spoke against! When this government finally fell there was no one ready to teach the Chinese the human way of life. If we had only sent out a few missionaries with a desire for these people's freedom in their hearts saying, "Now if you would like to have radios, and automobiles, and safety razors, this is how you go about it . . ." things might have been different today. We had no one there, and even if we had our support of the fallen government would have been ample proof to the people that we did not have their interests at heart. But somebody was there. Somebody was there with a propaganda aimed directly into the desires of the people who want just a tiny taste of freedom. Russian

agents were there. "You are all comrades," they shouted over loudspeakers and in public markets. "The way to freedom and equality is to shoot all the landlords and divide the land so that each of you has an equal share." So Russian is first with the most, and we complain because she takes over!

In the field of humanities Science has been thoroughly adrift. Unquestioned authoritarian principles have been followed. Any person who accepts knowledge without questioning it and evaluating it for himself is demonstrating himself to be in apathy toward that sphere of knowledge. It demonstrates that the people in the United States today must be in a low state of apathy with regard to politics in order to accept without question everything that happens.

When a man tries to erect the plans of a lifetime or a profession on data which he himself has never evaluated he cannot possibly succeed. Fundamentals are very, very important, but first of all one must learn how to think in order to be absolutely sure of a fundamental. Thinking is not particularly hard to learn; it consists merely of comparing a particular datum with the physical universe as it is known and observed.

How, for instance, would you find out for your own satisfaction that there exists such a thing as a "lock?" Find a pre-clear who is also interested in verifying such existence and run down a lock chain, or have someone take you down a lock chain. Your instructor in Dianetics has done this a sufficient number of times, and has seen it done to others a sufficient number of times, to satisfy himself that a lock exists. But just because it exists for him, and he informs you of his knowledge does not mean that it exists for you. Unless you have made up your mind through comparison of the information with the known universe you will not be able to handle locks properly. When there is an authoritarian basis for your education you are not truly educated.

Authoritarianism is little more than a form of hypnotism. Learning is forced under threat of some form of punishment. A student is stuffed with data which has not been individually evaluated just as a taxidermist would stuff a snake. Such a student will be well-informed and well-educated according to present-day standards, but unfortunately he will not be very successful in his chosen profession.

Indecision underlies an authoritarian statement. Do not allow your dianetic education to lie on the quicksand of indecision.

Your instructor and the author of this article declare that an engram exists. Unless you have looked into the matter for yourself — unless you have actually run a pre-clear into an engram — the realization that (1) there is a time track, and (2) that physical pain can be stored and can be recovered, (3) that all the perceptics are registered during these moments of unconsciousness, will not be

yours. Your knowledge concerning the engram depends exclusively upon what you have observed about that engram.

There have been volumes of articles written about techniques of running engrams. There are several possible techniques in existence which succeed in running them. There is one which seems to have worked out better than all the others. Make up your mind whether or not it works out for you.

First of all, find out to your own satisfaction whether or not there is an engram in existence. Then determine whether or not the technique in question will discover the engram for you, and whether or not the technique really runs the engram. Having made certain that there is an engram, ask yourself what kind of technique you would evolve if you decided to do something about this object, the engram? How would you go about it. *Unless you have asked yourself this question and tried to come to a definite conclusion about it you will never come into agreement on the technique of running engrams!* You will be performing an authoritarian rote. You can learn how to run an engram by rote, but unless you decide from your own observation that there is an engram to be run you will be simply performing some ritual in which a mistake is very easy to make.

What is a secondary? That a secondary seems to depend for its force upon engrams underlying it is something that is still open to question. Everytime a secondary is run there seems to be an engram sitting under it, but this does not mean that a secondary could not exist independently. It does mean that you can find engrams underlying secondaries. What is a secondary? How does it have to be run out? Why can't it be run out, if such is the case? These are questions you should ask yourself.

What are locks? How are they received, and how does the auditor run them out? What is the technique of straight line memory and how does it apply to locks? Why does straight line memory seem to be a validating technique? Why, when the pre-clear has a high sense of reality on something which he remembers, does his overall reality seem to increase with such running? What is lock scanning? Why perform lock scanning as a technique? What does lock scanning do? You can and should find the answers to these questions to your own satisfaction, and you could not be classified as a good auditor unless you have done so.

An auditor who does not understand straight-line memory has no business lock scanning a pre-clear, since he could hardly know what the anatomy of a lock chain is. It cannot be done well by rote. About the worst thing that could happen to a pre-clear is to drop into something and then feel that the auditor is thinking, "Now let's see — it was page 62 . . . or was it 63? . . . and the question was . . ." while the pre-clear lies there, suffering, and thinking, "Do something! Say something!" An auditor who is auditing by rote will make mistakes like that because he does not have the basic fundamentals as a part of his background of training.

A truly good auditor doesn't have to think twice. He knows "instinctively" that the auditing session itself should be run through either by straight-wire or lock scanning. When the basic fundamentals are securely the auditor's own there is no need for him to be told this must be done.

You are asked to examine the subject of Dianetics on a critical basis — a very critical basis. It is not to be examined with the attitude that when you were in school you learned that such and such was true, and since you learned that first, the first learning takes precedence. A prime example of this is the literary critic who says, after reviewing a book, that the book is not a novel because it is not a cross-section of life. He learned in some seminar or other that a novel *had* to be a cross-section of life. His professor in literature gave him a passing grade because he answered the question "correctly" on his examination paper, and therefore a book is not a novel unless it is a cross-section of life. There is yet to appear a good definition for aesthetics and art, and yet they parrot a definition for a specific form of art!

Do not make the mistake of criticizing something on the basis of whether or not it concurs with the opinions of someone else. The point which is pertinent is whether or not it concurs with *your* opinion. Does it agree with what *you* think?

Nearly everyone has done some manner of observing of the material universe, and there is surely no one in Dianetics who has not done some small amount of observation of organisms. No one has seen all there is to see about an organism, but there is certainly no dearth of organisms available for further study. There is no valid reason for accepting the opinion of Professor Blotz of the Blitz University who said in 1933 that schizophrenics were schizophrenics, and that made them schizophrenics for all time.

If you are interested in the manifestation of insanity there is any and every form of insanity that you could hope to see in a lifetime in almost any part of the world. Study the peculiarities of the people around you and wonder what they would be like if their little peculiarities were magnified a hundredfold. You may find that by listing all the observable peculiarities you would have a complete list of all the insanities in the world. This list might well be far more accurate than that which was advanced by Kraepelin and used in the United States today. If sanity is rationality, and insanity is irrationality, and you postulated how irrational people would be if certain of their obsessions were magnified a hundredfold, you might well have in your possession a far more accurate and complete list of insanities and their manifestations than is currently in existence.

If you will take the time and effort, then, of making a complete examination of your subject, introspectively and by observation, you will find that you have suddenly become an excellent auditor. The hard way is to sit down and memorize a third of a

million words contained in SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL — the method all too many educational systems employ in this age.

Examine some of the current theories in vogue, one of which is the belief that sex is the prime motivation of life. After you have thought about it for a while and compared it to the known universe you may find that someone has left out a factor or two from their calculations. Consider the theory that pain is the prime motivation of the human being. Ask yourself whether an organism keeps pain or whether he associates things with pain. You may suddenly find that you have extrapolated an engram. You might arrive at the engram independently, and in doing so come up with some brand new workable concepts.

And then, having found the engram you begin to wonder how you can go about getting rid of it. You hit upon a theory that by stretching time from the 1/5th of a second it took to burn a pre-clear's finger to a full minute, the event can be assimilated analytically, and suddenly you have discovered something for yourself. And in so doing you might well discover a lot more. What you have been doing in Dianetics — the techniques, the theories and postulates — are highly workable, but they are not highly workable because the author says so!

Let a plea be entered that you review basic Dianetics all over again. Review with the purpose in mind of arriving at your own conclusions as to whether the tenets you have assimilated are correct and workable. Compare what you have learned with the known universe. Seek for the reasons behind a manifestation, and postulate the manner and in which direction the manifestation will likely proceed. Do not allow the Authority of any one person or school of thought to create a foregone conclusion within your sphere of knowledge. Only with these principles of education in mind can you become a truly educated individual.

A Notebook of Dianetic Instruction

by O. STANLEY WALDROP, H. D. A.

These notes were compiled during observation of and discussion with student auditors at the Foundation over a period of several months. Some points of misunderstanding occurred repeatedly during the period. Some occurred only once or twice, but were considered of sufficient importance to be included in the notebook.

The purpose of these notes is to aid the individual to find and clarify areas of confusion in auditing technique. Each datum is here because someone misused or misunderstood that datum. It is hoped that the points delineated will be of aid in preventing similar mistakes in the future.

WHAT THE AUDITOR SHOULD KNOW

Books which the auditor should study and have at hand for reference are:

DIANETICS, *The Modern Science of Mental Health*, L. Ron Hubbard.

SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL: *Simplified, Faster, Dianetic Techniques*, L. Ron Hubbard.

LANGUAGE IN THOUGHT AND ACTION, S. L. Hayakawa, Harcourt, 1949.

In addition the auditor should make every effort to determine how Dianetics relates to medicine, physiology, endocrinology, anthropology, psychosomatic medicine, general semantics, psychology, experimental social psychology, psychiatry, sociology, education, and other schools of thought and action.

NOTES WHILE AUDITING

The purpose of taking notes while auditing is to help the auditor to help the pre-clear. It is not necessary to write down every word the pre-clear utters. By taking the age flash, somatic, and possible circuit phrases, as well as a general resume' with recommendations for what to do in subsequent sessions, a suitable record can be maintained without distracting the auditor from his task of auditing. All of interest for noting are the number of repetitions, the time required and if in the opinion of the auditor the engram is erased, reduced, or should be asked for at a future session.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOUGHT, MEMORY, STRAIGHT WIRE AND REVERIE

Thought is an extrapolation of many data.

Straight wire is memory of specific events which are reached with the assistance of the auditor's questioning and direction of attention, but maintaining most awareness in present time.

Reverie (and more specifically, the returning afforded by it) deals with the fact or the event, with a large portion of the pre-clear's attention contacting the perception of the event as recorded.

Locks cannot be blown, though sometimes they may be contacted, on the abstract level of thought. Grief cannot discharge completely, though sometimes it may be contacted, on the abstract level of thought.

Dianetics deals with facts; with events. The sooner the auditor gets down to the levels of specific facts and events, and away from the abstract level of thought (from many events), the sooner the case will advance.

There are several different understandings as to what reverie is. One definition is that it is the condition of returning to incidents not in conscious memory. Another definition is that it is the condition of returning any place on the time-track away from present time. The broadest, and possibly the simplest, definition of reverie is that which happens between the time the pre-clear closes his eyes at the beginning of a processing session and the time he opens his eyes at the end of the processing session.

ATTITUDE WHILE AUDITING

To audit effectively, the auditor must demonstrate to his pre-clear that he is competent. This comes about through:

1. Knowledge of tools and techniques.
2. High necessity level. (An auditor *should* control himself while auditing.)
3. Confident attitude, real or simulated.

Naturally, the best way for an auditor to audit without relating the pre-clear's troubles to his own, and thereby misinterpreting the pre-clear's case, is to have accomplished a state of release which makes this unlikely.

To a large extent, the auditor's ability to gain the pre-clear's confidence is contingent on the state of his own case. With a high state of release, fright and uncertainty on the auditor's part become less and less. Until release is accomplished, the auditor should control himself while auditing, and for this period assume the synthetic valence of a well-released auditor.

Pay attention to the pre-clear. Question and follow up unusual physical quirks observed during processing. Don't forget that you are talking to what amounts to about 80% reactive mind which has about as much cognitive intelligence as a one-celled organism.

Don't act sneaky around the pre-clear. Unless you show an air of confidence, the reactive mind may take over and give you a bad time. This occurs also when a lack of knowledge of tools and techniques is exhibited, and when the auditor begins to relate the pre-clear's troubles to his own.

Explain to the pre-clear things happening in present time which distract his attention from the engram. If the explanation

is short and pertinent, give it during the session (present time noises, people coming into the room, etc.). If the matter is long and involved, tell the pre-clear that you'll talk about it after the session.

AUDITOR-PRE-CLEAR RELATIONSHIPS

The best attitude for the auditor to assume with his pre-clear lies somewhere between the very personal and the very impersonal. This varies somewhat and must be determined by the auditor as the case progresses.

Some pre-clears desire such impersonality that the auditor, if ever discussed (as in a pleasure moment), must be so discussed in the third person. Others desire the personal level of communication which addresses the auditor by his first name, etc. Such cases are more common and generally less stilted.

Don't tell the pre-clear how he feels (for example, during the second recounting of a pleasure moment). Ask him how he feels. He may feel different, physically and emotionally, from the first recounting. Maintain communication by asking, not telling. The only positive commands made to a pre-clear are those which direct the somatic strip.

If a pre-clear has gotten down to the fact level about what's happening to him during a moment of pleasure or grief, and is moving through the incident on the fact level, recounting the events, don't ask about his thoughts. This moves him away from the charged events and requires that he think about it, rationalize the event, etc. The thought levels are useful approaches to the events, especially grief engrams, but the sooner the events are contacted, the sooner the charge will be relieved.

The pre-clear is a human being and should be treated as such. If he is 80% reactive, and in an engram, the other 20% is in present time.

If a pre-clear volunteers that he thinks this engram has been contacted before, or that he thinks this is responsible for his epizootics, don't shout at him to stop computing. Computation taboos have gone too far. What the pre-clear volunteers may be of help in running the case, and in any case a "Don't compute!" command from the auditor destroys affinity. This does not imply that an auditor should sit idly by, hour after hour, and listen to his pre-clear psychoanalyze himself. If this situation seems to be developing, the pre-clear can be diverted by saying something like, "Put your attention back on the incident . . . We'll talk about this after the session." In this manner, attention can be kept on the task at hand without breaking affinity with the pre-clear.

Don't invalidate the pre-clear's ability to think. Don't have him repeat every phrase he uses in present time when he's trying to communicate with you. If his phrases sound like circuit phrases, remember them, but listen and question some more before hunting for a circuit. You won't find the circuit otherwise, and you'll lose affinity and communication.

The auditor should guard against mannerisms, noises, etc., which disturb the pre-clear. Making noises with cigarettes, pencils, feet, etc., or making constant and unvaried noises of acquiescence, such as "unh-huh, yes, O. K.," etc., can be very annoying as it indicates boredom on the part of the auditor. If annoyance is experienced, the pre-clear should be indoctrinated to tell the auditor during the session when it occurs, if possible; otherwise, after the session, by straight wire.

The auditor should explain extraneous noises to the pre-clear. Otherwise the pre-clear has attention units drawn away from what he is running in order to communicate with present-time activities. The pre-clear's attention is less distracted by being told that so-and-so just came into or left the room, that the auditor is closing a window, etc., than by having to figure out present time noises by himself.

THE AUDITOR'S RESPONSIBILITY

1. Always reduce each engram contacted, or the basic on that chain.
2. Never invalidate the pre-clear's data *during or after* a session.
3. Never evaluate the pre-clear's data for him *during or after* a session.

HDA's after straightening out book auditor cases, begin to have a healthy respect for what non-observance of the above points can do to a case.

At the end of every session, as a part of straight wire, the pre-clear should be asked if anything happened during the session in the way of auditing which bothered the pre-clear. If there was, it should be run out. Agreement between auditor and pre-clear should be such that if at any time a situation occurs wherein the pre-clear is disturbed by the auditor's technique, he should say so, and be encouraged to say so. Complaints can be of two types: reactive or analytical.

If reactive, such complaining can lead the auditor to a circuit. If analytical, the auditor can profit by the criticism.

THE SOMATIC STRIP

The somatic strip, like the file clerk, is an artificial entity or tool to aid in the returning process. If the pre-clear returns simply by the auditor's saying, "Go back," the use of the somatic strip may be superfluous and time consuming. If a pre-clear moves easily on the track there is no need to say, when beginning another pass through an engram, "The somatic strip will go back to the beginning of this incident. When I count to five and snap my fingers, it will be there. One — two — three — four — five. (Snap!) The somatic strip will move forward through this incident, contacting it closely. Somatic strip will start moving. Etc., etc., etc. . . ." By the time this rigamarole has been parroted out the pre-clear

may have come up to present time and gone to a number of pleasure moments.

Experiment with the minimum of direction needed. If all it takes is, "Go back to the beginning and roll it again," that's all that should be said.

It is not necessary to be polite to the somatic strip. Asking if it will please go to wherever it is directed gives it the idea that it doesn't *have* to, and the pre-clear loses confidence in the auditor.

With circuitry or a stuck case, the auditor should never admit that the somatic strip didn't go to where he told it, but locate and rectify the trouble by asking age flashes and hunting for circuit phrases.

No auditor should ever be at a loss as to how to communicate and where to direct the pre-clear's attention units. He should not be mechanical.

After a pleasure moment, recently restimulated chains of locks may be contacted by asking questions similar to, "Has anything been bothering you lately?" This is an alternate method to picking up a sour note which occasionally presents itself in pleasure moments. If nothing develops while probing for locks, the auditor might ask, "Has anything happened recently to make you sad?" and provide entry by this means into areas of painful emotion.

Except for some cases of grief, the auditor should never cease questioning the pre-clear. Find incidents of grief, secondary engrams, etc., by asking a question to follow up each answer given by the pre-clear. When communication seems to wane, "What are you thinking about?" or "What is your attention on?" is in order.

DIRECTING THE SOMATIC STRIP

If, during the running of an engram, temporary contact is lost because of an action phrase or other reason, or if it is desired to send the somatic strip to the beginning of a highly charged area, the somatic strip may be sent where desired by saying, "The somatic strip will go to the point in this engram (or the engram we have been running, etc.) where the phrase about 'milk' occurs," or ". . . to the point where mother is talking about 'milk'."

By this means repetition of phrases is avoided and recovering the phrase is possible only by returning the attention to the point in the engram where the phrase is said. To feed back the complete phrase might cause the pre-clear to come up to present time and remember the phrase from the standard memory banks.

ACTION PHRASES

Action phrases can be recognized in two ways: from the physical mannerisms of the pre-clear, and from the verbal content of the previous phrases (in other words, by what is likely to follow). When the file clerk is questioned specifically about the type phrase to follow, the auditor's guess should be good enough so that 75% of the time the answer of the file clerk is "Yes."

If the following phrase, which the pre-clear can't contact, is a bouncer, holder, denyer, misdirector, valence shifter, callback, grouper, scrambler, or what-have-you, the auditor should be on the lookout for physical indications as to which type of command is in effect. Sometimes the pre-clear's comments will help. For example, "I seem to be stuck," indicates a holder. "I seem to be in present time," indicates a bouncer. "I'm getting all kinds of somatics all of a sudden," indicates a grouper. "I'm all mixed up," indicates a scrambler. If no comment is given, the pre-clear "acts out" what the command is, and it can be determined by observing changes in position, respiration, voice tone, etc.

An alternate way to determine a bouncer is to ask for an age flash. If it does not agree with that already given, return the pre-clear to the original incident, locate and de-intensify the bouncer there.

As mentioned, when an action phrase is asked for the auditor should hit the nail on the head at least 75% of the time. Computing from the *physical attitude* of the pre-clear, as well as from the engram content, the auditor should be able to differentiate between a bouncer, holder, misdirector, scrambler, denyer, valence shifter, grouper, and to work with the file clerk in locating the culprit.

An age flash is a variation on checking for a bouncer, as is "Yes or no — same incident?"

When the file clerk is occluded by a demon, use the demon as little as possible. Some demons are very compliant in handing out as many and as varied action phrases as the auditor can demand.

If a pre-clear inadvertently slips down into an engram, but has too poor perceptics to run it, or if he gives an age flash less than his present-time age, the pre-clear may sometimes be brought up to present time by having him (through the file clerk) give the holders, callbacks, and groupers from the incident in which he is held, called-back, grouped (or on occasion even scrambled). This may be done occasionally even if the process has no reality for the pre-clear.

However, if the pre-clear has enough perceptics to run the entire incident in which he is held, grouped or called-back every effort should be made to run the entire engram.

When, owing to insufficient time, the *whole engram* cannot be contacted at a sitting, the auditor should ask if there are any groupers, holders, or call-backs in the remaining portion of it, and de-intensify them before bringing his pre-clear to present time. It is a cardinal crime not to get the *whole engram*, but the realities of life sometimes force us to commit this crime. We should at least make sure the pre-clear will not be held or sucked back into it. (A note concerning sectioning of engrams appears later).

A grouper in a basic area engram can activate holders all over the bank. If a pre-clear shows difficulty in returning to present

time because of holder after holder, return him to the basic area engram and ask for the grouper. De-intensify this (and any other action phrase) and bring him up to present time.

TIME SHIFT

Time shift is a tool used in Dianetics for cleaning up an engram by establishing the exact beginning and end of the engram. Example (when at the beginning): "The somatic strip will now go to thirty seconds before this point, move forward through this thirty seconds, and continue into the engram . . ."

Like any tool, it can be over-used.

If the pre-clear characteristically starts at the beginning and reaches the end of an engram without difficulty, the use of the time shift is superfluous. As with any tool, over-use will cause the pre-clear to become dependent on it even when it is no longer necessary.

FILE CLERK

The file clerk is a tool of Dianetics designed to get flash answers to non-computational questions (data) without their being filtered through a circuited analyzer. Since its function is arbitrarily assigned, it is to that extent a circuit.

If non-computational answers are forthcoming without addressing the file clerk *per se*, then it should not be addressed. If non-computational answers are not forthcoming without addressing the file clerk *per se*, then it should be addressed.

Check the file clerk for possible circuitry by asking questions which can be validated by memory, such as, "Is grass green?"

In addressing a question specifically to the file clerk, ask about the pre-clear, not about the file clerk. Example, "File clerk, how old is John?" — *not* "File clerk, how old are you?" Simpler, if possible, "Age flash?" (Not directed specifically to the file clerk.)

Never ask the file clerk how he feels. Ask the pre-clear.

Don't ask the file clerk if a phrase is exact just because it differs from the previous pass. Even people with strong sonic occasionally change phrases from time to time. Just because an auditor wrote down a phrase a certain way the first time through doesn't mean that's the way it was said.

To encourage close contact and exact phraseology, say: "Repeat, please; re-phrase as necessary." "Roll it as it occurs." "Say it like it's being said." "Feel what is happening to you and listen." "Yes or no — does this phrase belong at this point in this engram?" (This doesn't invalidate the phrase, but merely checks on possible action phrases which might have bounced, misdirected, etc.) "Is this the correct phrase?" or "Is the word heck or hell?" If the engram is run to reduction, the file clerk will straighten out the text. Just direct the somatic strip and listen. Don't censor. Try not to put the file clerk in a position where further progress on the case will make the file clerk out a liar.

Don't get in a jam by asking the file clerk if there are more phrases, to which he says "No," and then more phrases crop up! Better: "Are there more phrases in this engram now available?" This question can be repeated on subsequent passes without invalidation.

Never ask the file clerk if an engram is erased or reduced. That's computational, and should be ascertained by the auditor on an observation level — otherwise it invites demons, known and unknown, to take over.

Never ascertain from the file clerk that the engram contacted is basic on the chain, because if an earlier one crops up, the file clerk is invalidated. Better: "File clerk, is this the earliest engram now available on the chain?" Then, if it won't reduce, you will be better able to go earlier without invalidating the file clerk's answers. Basic engrams come more and more into view as the file clerk dusts off the files via running engrams higher up on the chain, even if they won't reduce properly.

Avoid invalidating the file clerk. Don't ask the file clerk for the next phrase, and then ask the file clerk if it is the next phrase when he hands it out.

Don't ask the file clerk questions he can't answer. Example: "File clerk, how do you feel?" This is a question which should be addressed to the pre-clear. Also, don't ask computational questions of the file clerk. Ask only questions regarding data on the pre-clear's time track about which the pre-clear is not consciously aware.

If the pre-clear is consciously aware of the datum, ask the pre-clear. If the pre-clear is not certain of a datum, check with the file clerk.

If the file clerk is occluded by a "No" circuit, it can be checked by asking for a flash on some datum which can be validated by the pre-clear's memory. For example, if after a string of "No's" (or "Yes's") the question is asked; "Yes or no — is grass green? (or red?)" the existence of the circuit can be validated.

In such a case, either the circuit should be uncovered on whatever level of accessibility is feasible; or, if possible the pre-clear should be run by by-passing the circuited file clerk.

When going from a late lock to an earlier one on the chain, it is better not to define specifically what the earlier lock will be like. This can be accomplished by saying, "Go to an earlier time when you felt the same way," or "Go to an earlier lock on this chain," or "File clerk will hand out an earlier lock on this chain — what flashes?"

By asking for an earlier lock when a similar situation occurred, the auditor leaves selection completely up to the file clerk, who hands out what will help the case most. If the auditor were to say, "Go to an earlier time when you fell down and hit your knee," he

would be, to some extent, evaluating and not letting the file clerk do the job.

Always get answers when addressing the file clerk. Train the file clerk to give a yes or no answer. "I don't know," or "I really can't say," are not file clerk answers. Ask again, addressing the question specifically to the file clerk.

Actually there are four answers possible from the file clerk: Yes, No, Yes-No, and no response. Therefore, if no answer is forthcoming to your question, it still has been answered.

Be observant of questions which should be addressed to the pre-clear's file clerk, and those which should be addressed to the pre-clear. Anything which the pre-clear can himself sense, measure or experience, should not be questioned of the file clerk. The pre-clear feels his somatics; ask the pre-clear how the somatics are. The entity called the file clerk is reserved to hand out data concerning events in the pre-clear's life about which he has no conscious awareness.

Refrain from asking the file clerk the same questions twice the same way, questions which invalidate previous answers, and questions which are biased toward a yes or no answer.

UNCONSCIOUSNESS: THE DURATION OF AN ENGRAM

The period of unconsciousness in an engram equals the period of the engram. The verbal period of an engram may be equal to or less than the period of unconsciousness. Therefore, do not ask in the middle of an engram, "Is there unconsciousness here?" There is certainly unconsciousness, even enough to assume the proportions of a dope-off, but this fact may be ascertained by observation rather than by questioning. To ask such a question is to invalidate the preceding material which has been run.

The pre-clear manifests unconsciousness by yawning. Heavy unconsciousness is manifested by dope-off, usually followed by yawns when he comes out of it.

FINGER SNAPPING

There are three situations in which finger-snapping helps:

1. To precipitate a flash answer.
2. To move the somatic strip.
3. To keep the pre-clear more in present time if he dives too fully into the incident.

Some auditors accomplish very good results without snapping fingers at all. Like other tools or techniques of auditing, it tends to be over-used. If the pre-clear is restimulated by a finger snap, don't snap until the circuit causing it has been contacted and run out.

PLEASURE MOMENTS

The purpose of a pleasure moment is four fold:

1. To establish mobility on the time track — that is, to train

the pre-clear to go from the beginning to the end of an incident, contacting the events therein as they occur. If a pre-clear can run a pleasure moment like this, he can also run an engram. By running a short section of the pleasure moment over and over like an engram, mobility will improve.

2. To build perceptics. After mobility has been established, question the pre-clear about his perceptics. Don't give the pre-clear the third degree about what he perceives before mobility is established. This does more harm than good, trains him to move from one "still" scene to the next.
3. To build up tone. Third degree questioning also destroys this purpose. By moving the pre-clear through the time the event occurred, over and over, the details will come.
4. To lead into locks and circuit phrases. If a pleasure moment is run long enough, usually a sour note will enter into it. Run down this chain of locks to the underlying engram. Take note of possible circuit phrases and straight-wire the pre-clear on when similar phrases were said earlier.

Don't have the pre-clear select a pleasure moment which is pleasant to you. Have him select one (or have the file clerk select one) which is pleasant to the pre-clear.

More often than not, if the file clerk selects a pleasure moment it will turn out to be a lock on an underlying physical pain or painful emotion engram. This is good at the beginning of the session, but not at the end, as it cannot be run out and leaves the pre-clear restimulated.

Find a short section of a pleasure moment and run it like an engram over and over (but NOT with the attitude of a cross-examiner) to build up perceptics and establish mobility on the time track. Such a section may be found by memory, using past tense. When the section is found to which the pre-clear is returned, and it is desired to begin to build up perceptics and mobility by running it like an engram, this may be accomplished merely by switching from past tense to *present tense* and adroitly questioning so that nothing from the time sequence is missed.

Show and *feel* interest in the pre-clear's pleasure moment. It helps A-R-C!

The purpose in running pleasure moments to build up perceptics and establish time track mobility is to find out everything possible about the pre-clear's case, not about the pre-clear. An auditor who, in a pleasure moment, asks, "Is it expensive?" is so wrapped up in his own troubles that he should never be auditing in the first place. Just find out what the pre-clear is experiencing and forget how it relates to you.

Some things to look for in pleasure moments:

- Perceptic shut-offs.
- Areas of occlusion.
- Possible circuit phrases.

Any occurrence which points to an aberration.

Don't just listen and laugh. Compute!

Caution: Don't jump to conclusions as to what is aberrative behavior in a pleasure moment and what isn't. It may merely seem irrational because of your own aberrations.

Don't tell the pre-clear to do and say things in a pleasure moment he isn't doing or saying. Don't say, "Take a bite of the pork chop." Ask, "Are you eating anything at this point in the incident?" Don't say, "Look at the table." Ask, "What are you looking at?"

In general, don't make requests or demands, but rather ask questions which put more attention units on the moment of pleasure without deranging the time sequence.

Don't parrot the incident back to the pre-clear on subsequent passes. He will come up to present time and listen to you. Don't say, "Go back to where you're walking up the hill and you feel tired, but the sun is shining and you're wearing green pants and you feel your girl's hand," etc., etc., etc. This is merely your interpretation of what he has told you is happening. Do say, "Go back to the time you start up the hill. Tell me what happens . . ."

If the pre-clear says somebody speaks, ask, "How does he say it?" If the pre-clear says, "I can see something," ask "How does it look?" If the pre-clear says, "I don't seem to be able to see the face," ask, "What do you see?" If the pre-clear says, "I'm in a magnolia tree," ask, "Can you smell it?" Etc., etc.

The auditor is the pre-clear's analyzer. By adroit questioning an auditor can sharpen the pre-clear's perceptics *without* disturbing time track mobility (i. e., he can move through the incident as it occurs) to the degree which spells the difference between reality and unreality.

LOCATING LOCKS AND CIRCUITRY BY STRAIGHT WIRE

The purpose of straight wire is to:

1. Look for possible circuitry phrases by questioning the pre-clear about who might have said what.
2. Determine the *dramatis personae* in the pre-clear's life, and how they relate to the pre-clear. This is part of inventory.
3. Get the contents of a session completely in the analyzer by having the pre-clear give a resume of what happened during the session. (This comes at the end of the session.) At the beginning of the session, by straight-wiring what happened at the last session, it can be determined if anything in the last session created a lock, and if anything contacted in the last session (or sessions previous to the last) has any remaining charge.

The "haywire" technique is a tool to aid straight wire, whereby a pre-clear "scans" in memory the events on any given subject,

from the earliest he can remember to present time. Each chain of events should be scanned until no new incidents are remembered.

The "hurdy-gurdy" technique aids straight wire by helping the auditor organize and question how each of the *dramatis personae* inhibited and enforced ARC on all dynamics. It avoids tacit consent. Remember not to pry into any given point of pain too long with straight wire. The mind protects its pain. When you think you have found such an area, veer away to an unrelated subject, and then come in again from another angle later, so that the pre-clear will not be too aware of your purpose.

GOING DOWN A CHAIN OF LOCKS

When the auditor has contacted a lock during or after a pleasure moment and wishes to follow it down through a few earlier locks to the basic engram, better results may be obtained by merely saying, "Go to an earlier time when you felt the same way," without stipulating (perhaps wrongly) *what way*. If the pre-clear asks, "What way is that?" say, "The same way you felt in the incident we were just running." His file clerk knows. A possible exception to this procedure would be if the pre-clear makes a reactive effort to dodge a series of locks lying on top of a circuit engram by "jumping the chain."

LOCKS AND SECONDARY ENGRAMS

The charge of locks, secondary engrams and, for that matter, any incident contacted lies in the event and not in the abstraction of thought surrounding it. Sometimes locks and secondary engrams must be contacted on thought levels, but they should be run on the event levels (what happens, not what the pre-clear thinks or interprets as what happens).

In the case of painful emotion, the charge can be approached through the thought level, and some charge taken off on this level before the actual grief event can be contacted and reduced; but charge which comes off on the thought level should be followed by getting at the actual incident as soon as possible.

Others psychoanalyze thoughts, but we can return the pre-clear to events and remove charge via dianetic technique.

VALENCE

If a pre-clear is out of valence:

1. Command him into his own valence. If this doesn't work:
2. Question the pre-clear so thoroughly about what is happening to him that he is forced to get into his own valence.

If this doesn't work:

3. Ask if there is a valence-shifter phrase. If this doesn't work:
4. Run the engram you have contacted to reduction as nearly as possible, then straight-wire the pre-clear to find out whose valence he is in, and whether it is because of ally

computation or circuit command. If ally, get grief. If circuit command, shoot circuit.

The only engrams a chronically out-of-valence pre-clear should be allowed to run are circuit engrams.

Occasionally an open case will run engrams out of valence the first time through, but with subsequent passes gets into his own valence. A probable cause for this is that the initial valence shift protects the pre-clear from pain until he finds out what is happening to him in the engram.

VALENCE — SCREAMERS

The pre-clear yells or hurls insults at the auditor when:

1. The auditor makes a mistake.
2. The auditor is insecure.
3. The reactive mind takes over. This is the usual case. The malice which seems to be directed at the auditor is in reality a dramatization. A pre-clear may dramatize during a session and direct it toward the auditor, yet when brought up to present time may be very quiet and cooperative. The job of the auditor is to get the pre-clear in his own valence and run out the engram he is dramatizing.

In addition to dramatizing, the pre-clear may become very noisy and perhaps insulting when in his own valence and while running grief and terror. By concentrating the pre-clear's attention on the incident contacted, it will lose its charge.

Don't be afraid. The pre-clear needs and wants help. It is the auditor's job to give him that help.

WHAT TO DO NEXT (THE AUDITOR'S DILEMMA)

If the auditor finds himself at a loss as to what to do next, certain responses should be so built into his training pattern that they are automatic.

"What are you thinking?" or "What is your attention on?" is a good way to establish communication which is temporarily lost during the running of an engram.

WHEN IN DOUBT ABOUT WHAT TO DO NEXT:

Don't lose contact with the pre-clear. Don't give his reactive mind the computation that it has the auditor stymied.

By saying, "Continue," "Contact your somatics," "What's happening now?" "What happens next?" "Next phrase," etc. — whichever is most pertinent — communication with the pre-clear will not be broken; but remember, an auditor *can* talk too much.

When running pleasure moments or locks or secondary engrams and the pre-clear stops talking and exhibits the attitude that nothing is happening to him, by asking, "What is your attention on?" or "What flashed across your mind just then?" or "What flashed across your mind when I sent you to an earlier incident on

the chain?" etc., the chain of events latched on to an engram will not be lost.

Sometimes a charge chain may be contracted merely by noticing a shadow cross the pre-clear's face during a pleasure moment, and by asking what he is thinking about.

There are many times when even the most experienced auditor will find himself at a crossroad. Some of the more frequent crossroads are:

"Should I hunt for this circuit, or should I let the file clerk hand out the next engram?"

"Should I run another pleasure moment, or are his tone and perceptics good enough to dive down for an engram?"

"Is the engram so available that I am wasting my time with locks?"

"Should I run this, or should I go earlier?"

Experience and knowledge are the best bets that the auditor will select the best road. In many cases, each road at the cross is equally good. In some cases, when he realizes that he has been mistaken, the auditor should retrace his steps.

This question should be the auditor's guide: "In what way may I accomplish the most over-all good for my pre-clear in the shortest amount of time?"

When a case or session begins to bog down, when the pre-clear begins to deny his own data, an insertion of "Roll it just as it comes to you," or "Just tell me what happens," will sometimes help.

If the pre-clear begins to invalidate his own data to the point where no further progress on the case is possible, treat this condition as you would any other circuit, trace it down through locks if necessary, and contact and reduce the basic circuit engram.

The possibility should not be overlooked that in some cases a pre-clear's invalidation of his own data might be basic personality fighting against a lie factory circuit, or something in the line of circuitry approaching a lie factory.

The earlier the engram, the more charge will be removed from the whole bank by running it. Don't waste time with minor late-life locks if the pre-clear will go early with good perceptics.

Use as the criterion: "Work what is accessible, and cooperate with the file clerk."

Dianetically speaking, birth is a rather late life engram. Early engrams occur in the basic area, from before conception to the first missed period. Every tool and technique of Dianetics is used to restore enough attention units to make this area accessible.

THE PERCEPTICS

Normally, pre-clears are weaker in one perceptic than in others, depending on how much circuitry and how many ARC breaks have occurred.

When running pleasure moments and engrams, harp on the weakest perceptic. If no extraneous noises are forthcoming, keep reminding the pre-clear to contact them. If no kinesthesia is felt, keep reminding the pre-clear to sense it.

If weak perceptics are not turned on by asking for them, something has happened to turn them off. Find the circuit by the most accessible channel. (This is also true for somatics and unconsciousness.)

FOREIGN LANGUAGE CASES

When running a foreign language case, the auditor should insist that the engram be run "as it is said" and then ask for a translation.

Automatic translation does not erase the engram, only reduces it; but it is sometimes necessary with a new case which has forgotten or never knew the language spoken in prenatal. In time the original language will be contacted.

It has occurred that due to locks and shame on a prenatal language the pre-clear has failed to mention that there was a foreign language background, and has attempted to translate by himself without the auditor's finding it out. This can be avoided by good ARC.

Key-ins on foreign-language prenatsals are less likely than with similar-language prenatsals, but possible through similar sounds, perceptics, and somatics, the key-ins of language still spoken at home, or if the pre-clear returns to live in the country in which the language is spoken.

THE CONTENT OF AN ENGRAM

It is quite important that each datum, and each perceptic of an engram be run out thoroughly and completely.

If all commands, even in one engram, were keyed-in, the pre-clear would probably be in a condition to be institutionalized. With average cases only a few phrases and other perceptics are keyed in. However, unless they are fully contacted and re-filed in the analyzer by going over the entire engram time and time again, there will always be the possibility that they will key in and begin to aberrate the pre-clear.

When an engram is contacted, the entire engram goes into restimulation, to a greater or lesser extent. By running the incident over and over, until the charge is off, the engram is put out of restimulation forever. That is why, when parts of engrams (one phrase, one perceptic, etc.) are contacted and reduced separately, the pre-clear may be in worse shape than he was in when the session began. Therefore, make every effort to reduce the entire incident.

In a long engram, such as birth or a childhood illness, the engram should be run to the nearest natural break, and what is contacted should be thoroughly reduced. This break can be deter-

mined by asking the file clerk how long it is until the next point where the somatics are light, etc., or better still, by observing the next point where the pre-clear doesn't seem to be uncomfortable. (Caution: make certain that the phrase following the break is not a holder or callback. The pre-clear may have scanned ahead and restimulated it.)

Sometimes in the case of illness, if there are many hours with no noises but only unconsciousness and perhaps somatics, they can be reduced by running the pre-clear through the hours one by one, and getting into the analyzer such perceptics as have been recorded. This can be done in a relatively short time, and usually accomplishes a much better reduction than to concentrate entirely on the periods in which words were spoken.

REPEATER TECHNIQUE AND REPEATING PHRASES

Repeater technique should not be used until after careful computation based on straight wire and lock content as to what phrase causes the circuit which affects the pre-clear.

When the earliest available engram containing the repeated phrase has been contacted, it should be run to reduction if possible. If it won't reduce, the somatic strip should be sent to an earlier engram containing the phrase or a similar phrase.

The ultimate object is to contact and *erase* the earliest engram containing this phrase.

If the auditor ineptly makes the wrong computation as to which phrase is causing a troublesome circuit, and then makes a bad job of his repeater technique, failing to erase or at least reduce what he has contacted, he is going to find that not only has his pre-clear failed to get rid of the circuit in question, but also now has another circuit in full-fledged restimulation.

An engram consists of data impinged on the reactive mind of the organism during moments of pain or unconsciousness. It occupies an area on the time track starting at the beginning of the unconsciousness and ending at the end of the unconsciousness.

Phrases are not engrams — they are parts of engrams. We don't reduce phrases; we reduce engrams.

The power of engrams may be erased by sending the pre-clear's attention units through the time the engram occurred and filing the information contained therein into the analyzer.

Phrases should be repeated only until close contact is made with the time track and the aberrative command is deintensified. (This is especially true in the case of action phrases.) Action phrases should be repeated a few more times than others. Others should be repeated two or three times, depending on the file clerk. Then the engram should be run as a whole, over and over, until no further reduction is observed or indicated by the pre-clear's actions or comments.

The danger of too much repetition is that repetition might act like repeater technique and restimulate a number of engrams other than the one being run.

The danger of too little repetition is in the fact that unstimulated action phrases might, with only one repetition, become restimulated but not reduced, and take effect on subsequent passes.

If the pre-clear appears lost the second time through, but seems to contact the incident well on the first pass, a number of things could have occurred:

1. De-intensified action phrases could be taking effect.
2. The pre-clear's attention may be tied up in a lock "upstairs." (Sometimes if the lock is charged highly enough it becomes necessary to run it and then return to the engram.)
3. Dub-circuit or lie-factory may be in evidence.
4. Other circuitry or valence problems may be occluding.

PICKING UP THE NEXT PHRASE

If the next phrase is not forthcoming, there are several things the auditor may do:

He may have the preceding phrase repeated a few more times, especially if it is a holder or other action phrase which holds or scatters attention units. Then when he asks for the next phrase again, chances are he will get it.

Check on age flash: pre-clear may have bounced.

Check for an action phrase, depending on physical attitude and engram content. Even though the previous phrase was an action phrase, it doesn't mean that the next one isn't.

Check for a silent period. Use tricks, depending on the pre-clear, such as sending the somatic strip ten seconds later, or to the end of the phrase in question.

Always try to get the engram completely before rolling again. Catch and de-intensify all action phrases.

CLEANING UP

In the progress of the engram's reduction or erasure, it is to be expected that new material will be contacted from the incident as the session progresses. However, as the aberrative force of the engram reduces, analogous to the series of mountains—engrams—the somatic strip may be from the now small "mountain" to an adjacent or in some way similar mountain (engram) which has come into view.

This can happen despite any verbal bouncer, on a purely mechanical basis, as the scanner finds and hands on to the file clerk the next incident needed to resolve the case.

Since it behooves the auditor to flatten out completely the engram contacted before moving along to other bumps on the time track, careful check ("Age flash?" "Same incident?") should

be made to ascertain if this mechanical bounce has occurred while clean-up was in progress.

As soon as an engram is run through on two subsequent passes without any apparent change, the time has come for the auditor to decide what to do next. If the engram has been run to reduction, the basic on the chain could be asked for or, if time is short, the pre-clear could be brought up through a pleasure moment.

If the engram has been run several times with no apparent reduction, and without definite somatics, and the pre-clear characteristically runs nicely in his own valence, by going earlier an underlying engram can usually be contacted and erased. The engram needed is the basic on the chain, and if it is not forthcoming the file clerk is not invalidated later.

Cleaning up may be accomplished by insisting, on the final passes, that any remaining data not yet contacted be contacted. Sometimes it helps to count the somatic strip through, until no more phrases, perceptics, or somatics and unconsciousness are forthcoming. Other pre-clears do nicely by having the somatic strip move without counting.

The axiom for leaving an engram is to reduce each engram contacted or the basic on the chain. Sometimes a circuit engram may be reduced in three passes, even though the pre-clear is out of valence and making very poor contact. Run such an engram until no further reduction is noticed from one pass to the next. Generally, subsequent passes will do nothing but waste time, as the engram is available only for de-intensification.

After this is done, try either for the basic engram on the chain, if sufficient attention units are available to run it, or bring the pre-clear up to present time, stabilizing him with a pleasure moment and straight-wire to turn off any residual somatics.

Do not waste time running anything (locks, secondary engrams, or engrams) which on subsequent passes show no further reduction. There are other areas on the time track or levels of accessibility on which time can be better spent.

Aberrations and Genius

Eccentric genius is a problem in communication. The urge to create and the urge to communicate are simply the dynamics at work.

Violinist A plays brilliantly. He is a great violinist because a heavy thrust of dynamic lies behind his ability to play. He communicates powerfully to other men. Aberrated, A's ability to play and his ability to express generally is great and this includes ability to express his aberrations.

Genius then appears to be more eccentric because it better expresses eccentricity residual. The eccentricity is not a drive in itself. — L. R. H.

Only One Child?

It is not uncommon for a woman to have one child and then be unable to have another. Two cases have been observed which may shed some light on this.

Many of the remarks made to a pregnant woman can have the effect of leaving her permanently stuck in her own pregnancy if she is at all anaten at the time. Being already pregnant (reactively) may be an excellent reason for not becoming so again. "Everybody knows" that the one time intercourse is perfectly safe is when the woman is already pregnant. "You can't get more pregnant than you already are."

Consider the facetious remarks made during the nine-month period: "She's just slightly pregnant." "You're certainly stuck now!" "Can't you get rid of it?" "I got knocked-up last month." "I'm caught now." "You can't leave me now." Any of these, or almost any of the humor during this period, can have the effect of holding a woman in her own pregnancy — and she may well be perfectly "safe" from then on.

One pre-clear was observed who was stuck in her mother's pregnancy. Not only was she stuck, but in the bank was a multitude of phrases having to do with mother gaining weight. A gratifying loss of weight accompanied the pre-clear's getting un-stuck and into her own valence.

While many other things could have the effect discussed here, being stuck in pregnancy is worth checking for because of its very simplicity and the fact that it can be reached easily on straight wire.

— R. Ross Lamoreaux

Case History 1018B

November 16, 1950

Pre-clear is female, age 47, married. Four months before processing pre-clear underwent radiographic examination of her back, having gone to her physician for treatment of severe pains she was experiencing in that region.

After thorough examination the physician reported that there were advanced hypertrophic osteo-arthritic changes of the lower cervical vertebral bodies. The condition was diagnosed as cervical osteo-arthritis.

This condition was still present when the pre-clear arrived at the Foundation and began processing at the end of September, 1950. During the first week of processing, the pain was lessened when the pre-clear realized she had formed a sympathy computation when her father broke his back. The key-in was strengthened further by the pre-clear's mother constantly telling her: "You're just like your father! You have no backbone! You have no spunk!"

During the first fifty hours of processing an engram at two weeks post-conception was contacted which contained the phrase: "I break my back carrying these pails of water back and forth." This engram appeared to be the origin of the cervical osteo-arthritis and upon reduction no further pain was experienced.

A subsequent report from the examining physician read to the effect that an x-ray examination of the cervical spine through the use of A-P and lateral views failed to reveal any trouble of a pathological nature.

Foundation Services

The Foundation acts as a coordinating center for all Dianetic activity. It seeks to acquaint all members and all interested persons with the theory and technique of Dianetics. For those who do not wish to undergo a full Professional Course it arranges shorter periods of lectures and demonstrations. Full cooperation with all agencies or persons desiring to test or use the tenets of Dianetics is the basic desire of the Foundation.

Processing

A limited number of persons can be accepted for Dianetic processing at the Foundation. Of particular interest to those who are able to stay near the Foundation for only a short time is thirty-six hours of Intensive Processing in one week. For conditions of admission and other particulars please communicate with the Foundation.

Professional Course

Professional Certification is granted only on successful completion of the Professional Course at the Foundation. A professional dianeticist is a Hubbard Dianetic Auditor and must comply with the regulations and ethics of his regional and state dianetic associations. In addition to other privileges and services, he receives THE DIANETIC AUDITOR'S BULLETIN so long as his professional standing is maintained. Arrangements for beginning the Professional Course may be made by contacting Foundation Headquarters, Wichita, Kansas. The fee for the Professional Course is \$500.00.

Associate Membership

An Associate Member receives THE DIANETIC AUDITOR'S BULLETIN and is entitled to a question and answer service from the Foundation and a discount on all Foundation publications. No Professional Course is required of Associate Members. Associate Membership is open to anyone interested in the science of Dianetics. Membership may be applied for at any time. The annual fee for Associate Membership is \$15.00.

