The Dianetic Auditor's BULLETIN

Official Publication of

DIANETICS

HUBBARD DIANETIC FOUNDATION

HUBBARD DIANETICS

The Hubbard Dianetic Foundation, Inc.

Note: Procedures set forth herein should not be applied until the auditor is familiar with SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL: Simplified, Faster Dianetic Techniques, and ADVANCED PROCEDURES AND AXIOMS.

WALDO T. BOYD
Editor

Something for Nothing

There is an insidious sickness boring through our society at an ever-increasing rate. Its nature is illusive. To accuse any individual of having been stricken by the malady is tantamount to blasphemy, and yet it is attacking young and old, industrious and ne'er-do-well. It is the disease of something-for-nothing.

This is the way it works: There was a time when Mr. Smith was known throughout the little village as the man to see when an automobile began to stutter and balk. When he opened his little shop at the insistence of friends he took a lively delight in being the "spark" that could take the "grind" out of machinery and make it "purr." His homely back-yard shop had a long waiting list of customers who would far rather wait a few days or even weeks than trust their autos to the more highly advertised and impersonal assembly-line repair garages.

But that was some years ago; today his work is run-of-the-mill, slip-shod, and his prices outrageous. His old customers take their limping limousines to the Laughing Frenchman's highly-advertised "free" fix-it emporium. Something happened to John Smith, mechanic. Something insidious and pitiful. But even he doesn't know what it is.

And then there was a young doctor who had been happy and industrious for a long while, bringing babies into the world and alleviating the aches and pains of the working people in his neighborhood. But suddenly his little town began to grow. What had been the edge of town became almost overnight the center of a city.

161

One day the doctor decided his practice was not remunerative enough, that too many patients in his appointment book were from the "wrong" side of the city. He moved into a large luxurious office and raised his fees beyond the reach of those who had once proudly called him their family doctor.

He did not suffer from a dearth of income—but something was not quite right with Doctor Bell. He didn't take an interest in his patients any more. He dragged himself out of bed in the morning and dropped exhausted into it at night, even though the numbers of his patients were reduced by more than half. Somehow, the "spice" had gone from his life.

A book-auditor named Jones in a large western city took the professional course at the Foundation, and while attending classes decided to make auditing his life's work. After he received his certification he opened a modest clinic on the West side of the city. He soon had his weeks booked solid. He relieved some skeptical pre-clears of their painful chronic somatics, and they in turn talked their friends into trying Dianetics. He was interested in everyone whom he audited; he wanted to see them get well. He *liked* to audit. He had found a new and wonderful work, a work in which he could serve humanity and at the same time make an honest living.

But he took unto himself a business partner—one of the "silent" type. The first day of partnership the partner broke the traditional silence:

"Get wise to yourself, Jonsey. These suckers'll pay through the nose for what you can do for them."

So Jones raised the rates. And then a few weeks later he raised the rates again.

"It's a gravy train," his partner cooed.

But the caboose must have been one car too many for that train, because within a few days following the second price raise business dropped off to a standstill. The auditor spent many idle hours auditing the partner, but somehow the case neither rose nor fell; nothing happened, except that the partnership dissolved, and the caboose drifted on looking for another gravy train to hitch onto.

Along the gradient scale between infinite wrongness and infinite rightness, it all adds up to this: that so long as a man is more interested in giving true, enthusiastic service than in receiving pay, his work has that "extra" quality that raises it far above the average. The world will beat a path to the door of the man with a new idea, and it will wear a hard, deep path to the door of the man who works for the sheer enjoyment of working. The man is indeed fortunate who has found that wonderful combination of the work he truly enjoys doing which affords him an adequate income.

If your life's work has become that of dianetic auditing, be aware of the dangers of setting your sights on the income rather than service. Audit to make the pre-clear a happier, healthier, saner person, and your income will take care of itself.

—WTB

Postulate Processing

L. RON RUBBARD

The success of any organism in any environment is determinable by the measure of the degree the organism can change to control a new environment. When a higher organism accepts the obvious fact that its mind is practically the sole means for environmental control it must, to deem itself successful, possess an ability to change its mind, for as environment changes, thoughts must change. Unless that organism is constantly moving, erasing old conclusions and postulating fitting new ones, it becomes static and moves towards succumb.

An individual can thus become a product of his own statics, regardless of their point of origin; he makes a conclusion and is subject to it as long as he holds onto it as a belief. Non-optimum randomity is established when his data, beliefs, and decisions are not in constant review and re-evaluation. The main point of tension in any engram or theta facsimile is the moment the individual made a postulate, drew a conclusion from his existing data, or made an agreement between himself and another entity at the height of pain. His self-determinism is tied up at that point.

Areas of Static Thinking

The auditor's objective when applying Postulate Processing is to raise his pre-clear from the state of compartmented static into a state of motion. It cannot be achieved simply by giving new postulates to replace the old. A first essential is to process the old conclusions and beliefs. Merely to

make a new conclusion which violates an undetected static in one's past sets up non-optimum randomity; confusion exists between the new and the old. Actually, earlier postulates are to the individual the valid postulates, and will cancel succeeding ones to a great extent. Until the basic postulate is processed out, a later one is unalterable, and a new one laid on the same subject as the basic cannot but be invalid.

A baby lies in his crib and is unhappy about something the mother has done. "I'll get even with her," he postulates. "I'll not drink my milk. I'll be sick." Twenty years and many postulates later his wife asks, "Now dear, don't you think it's time you had a glass of milk?"

"No!" he answers. "Milk makes me sick! I have an allergy to milk."

And so he has; it began with that basic postulate back in the crib.

General Areas of Postulation

Every individual has made literally thousands of postulates in all areas of life. Of basic importance are those concerning decisions to survive, to know, to understand, to experience, to communicate, to agree to love, to want all emotions, to want all perceptics and desires. There are as well the opposing decisions not to survive, not to know, not to understand, not to communicate, not to agree, and not to want emotions. Decisions concerning any of these areas may be statics for which the individual has become effect.

A central aspect of any case is the desire to experience; life has to experience in order to maintain itself in motion. Security and position are statics. When an individual's desire to experience fades away he begins to seek a static, a never-changing vista of what he believes to be security. He feels that once he has attained "security" he will then be better able to "experience," and yet he cannot attain his security goal without experiencing. He faces a paradox. He puts forth valient efforts to climb to a "secure" position in life, unaware that he is climbing towards a static. To arrive is equivalent to death even though it means five million dollars

in the bank, eight yachts and a fleet of Packard motor cars. From his "secure" perch he will not be able to experience life as he had imagined it, but instead will be spending his time defending and maintaining his hard-won position.

Some who strive for years toward such a goal reach it only to discover that the best way to experience life is with empty pockets. Experience is motion; reality. Security and position are illusions, achieved only by going through static cycles. Some men will shadow-box throughout the best years of their lives for the "security" of a dull, monotonous job. Not infrequently someone (who is truly experiencing, in all probability) invents a machine that does the job better, and suddenly the "security" vanishes. Self-confidence is self-determinism. It is one's belief in one's ability to determine his own causes. There is but one security and that is the security of self-confidence.

The auditor's objective in the use of Postulate Processing is to give the pre-clear back to himself. The times in the past when any individual has desired others to create his security for him are abdications of his own post-of-command. The pre-clear has postulated away his self-determinism by deciding not to have himself. He will rise on the tone scale in direct ratio to the degree to which he assumes responsibility for his own problems.

Postulate Tone Scale

Above	4.0	An I-they-I series
	4.0	I am.
	3.5	I am and they need me.
	3.0	I'm working with them.
	2.5	I'm even with them and I don't like it.
	2.0	I'll be to spite them.
	1.5	I'll be if I destroy them.
	1.1	I'd be if I could get around them.
	0.5	I'm not because they won't let me.
	0	I'm not.

Processing moves a pre-clear up the tone scale from all the "I'm not's" to the "I am's," restoring basic self-determinism.

At the bottom of the tone scale the organism is existing under another control center than the "I," accepting a postulate that it is MEST.

At 0.5 the organism is accepting the role under which it is MEST for another control center, and is not rebellious at the situation.

At 1.1 the organism is making some resurgence and effort to regain control.

At 1.5 the individual begins to make an obvious fight against the control center or environment.

When a person is at a point when "I" has control about one-half the time, he may be considered to be at about 2.0 on the postulate tone scale. At this point he argues with himself and with his environment.

At 2.5 the individual begins to feel he can stay in the game and pitch even though he is but a tiny cog in the great machine. His attitude, if expressed in his own words, might be, "I don't like it but here I am."

Not until one has reached 3.5 can he be assured of his own control.

At 4.0 the individual has full direction of his own command center. The person in this bracket is almost entirely extroverted, and the body acts almost as an automatic-response mechanism towards the environment.

Above 4.0 the auto-control center is far ahead of the environment, and not at all introverted. It is in this range that one would expect to find creative work rather than a more expert handling of the environment.

Any time anyone conceives that he has failed in any way he advances a conclusion as to the explanation of his failure, picking up a theta facsimile and presenting it as an excuse for failure; "Why, I thought the gun wasn't loaded," to quote an all too common excuse for failure. Another often heard is, "I had the right of way!"

The auditor assists the pre-clear to release these theta-facsimile excuses to which he has been holding, not by handing

the pre-clear's "sins" out to him, but helping him to recognize that he himself made the decision which resulted in an engram.

Procedure

Simple questioning is sometimes the best method of going about the business of giving the individual back to himself. It helps him see the situation and come to understand that he is aberrated by his own choice. A computation such as this must not be forced. Rather, the pre-clear slowly comes to see the truth as he contacts his own decisions to be aberrated, giving a man a new respect for himself. The auditor, for example, asks, "When did you first make up your mind that you were going to be sick?"

"I *never* made up my mind to be sick. Nonsense!" the pre-clear usually answers, astounded that anyone might think he had wished his illnesses upon himself.

"Well, when might you have done so? Is there someone around whom you are sick more often than with other people?"

"Yes, my wife. When I go home I seem to get sick. That's funny; I never realized that before. I wonder why that is?"

"Did you ever decide actually, analytically, to be sick around her?"

"No! But yes, yes—we did have a quarrel one day and— I remember now—I told her I had a headache and that I didn't want to fight with her anymore."

"Is there any other time in your life that you decided to be ill?"

"No, I don't think so. No."

"What about your school days?"

"School? Well, that's different. As a matter of fact, yes. I remember—I can hardly place it, but there was a time in college I said I was sick so I couldn't take the final exam. In fact, I went around for two or three weeks showing everyone how sick I was. Sort of an out-of-valence feeling."

"How about grammar school?"

"There was the time when I told the coach I couldn't go out for gym because I had sick spells. I get a good memory on that one. It always worked!"

As the pre-clear proceeds he thinks to himself, "Am I doing this to myself after all? Why should I treat myself this way? Ridiculous! Incredible!" Suddenly he may recall some other data:

"My first day at kindergarten I was very sick. They had to take me home. I had decided I wasn't going to stay there because I didn't like the teacher. I really *did* get sick in kindergarten!"

He will, if expertly questioned, turn up many more times when he concluded it was better to be ill than otherwise.

In working with the very common aberration of glasses, the auditor may ask the pre-clear to remember a time when he did not want to see, to remember a time when he decided he could not see. He may offer some version of the following:

"My eyes have been bad ever since I was fifteen, but I never decided not to see. As a matter of fact, I was just never able to see.

"I do remember in prep school, though, I complained that the lights were hurting my eyes because I didn't want to sit in the study hall. The headmaster asked what was wrong and I told him, 'My eyes are bad.' They had me fitted with glasses . . . I had forgotten all this until just now."

There will be many postulates on the communication of seeing. Processing one or two postulates on one subject are not ordinarily enough to cause the aberration to relinquish its hold on the individual. There are dozens of them, and getting the earliest is essential.

There is a lie factor in the mind on the recovery of data which sometimes causes a delay of a day or two for asked-for data to appear, particularly in the case of the deep-agreement postulates. Times when the pre-clear as a child was

beaten down into apathy until he had to agree created blind spots on the time track. Such postulates made on an obedience basis locks in data rather securely for a while. The auditor, by simply unburdening the pre-clear's decisions to obey, his decisions that other people knew best, can often open up great sections of the pre-clear's life.

Processing an individual's postulates is done mostly by straight-wire. Whether or not the pre-clear has his full quota of perceptics is of little importance. Behind most postulates, however, is an enormous amount of effort and emotion which may have to be run before the postulate can be contacted; or on occasion the effort may be run simultaneously with the postulates. Often, merely contacting the postulate collapses the emotion and effort tied into it.

If a postulate does not de-sensitize on first recall, repetitive straight-wire is used. Help the pre-clear to recall a decision again and again, or try to get an earlier one on the same subject. If he does not experience relief, there is an even earlier key-in on the track. Later postulates are lying as a sort of burden on the earlier ones.

Sometimes postulates can be located by flash answers if not by straight-wire, although only in a case reluctant to offer data would this be necessary. Ask: "What postulate do we need to resolve the case?" "What's the age?" "In the house?" "Hospital?" "Where are you?" The pre-clear may soon recall the incident, as did a pre-clear when he offered this memory data:

"My parents used to take me to my grandparents home, and I hated to go—I was miserable in the house. I couldn't move or go anywhere." The auditor in this case went after the postulate concerning the first decision involving the desire to remain away from the grandparents.

As long as a pre-clear rationalizes as to why he failed, as long as he presents all sorts of reasons why he has to have a particular postulate, or as long as he blames somebody else for it, the central computation has not yet been reached. Work on emotional locks with effort and straight-wire. By feeding a person's postulates back to him he will come to see that he is in command of himself.

When a pre-clear comments about a situation look for the postulates causing him to make such comments. If he says he never did like other people, the auditor might reply, "When did you decide not to like other people"

"I didn't decide at all," replied one particular pre-clear to this question. "I feel like this just because people are the way they are."

"When did you first decide they were the way they are?"

"Maybe I did decide at one time. I don't know when it was, unless it was in the army. And that was because I hated the cook."

"Do you recall when you made up your mind that you hated the cook?"

"I didn't like the cook because my mother . . . but that's silly."

"When did you first decide not to like your mother?" the auditor asked.

"I never decided that!"

"When did you decide that you had to honor your father and mother?"

"That was when I went to church. It's one of the Ten Commandments."

Thus it was found that the pre-clear was agreeing to obey and disliking it since he was three years old.

Scanning A-R-C

Standing behind each enforcement or inhibition of A-R-C is a postulate concerning future action. Help the pre-clear to scan every time he decided to feel affinity for a person—the *instant* of decision—because the static lies at that point. Contact the times the pre-clear agreed with anybody against his will. Exhaust the times he decided to go into communication with anybody by word of mouth, by writing, etc. Scan all the decisions on reality. And then, having finished scanning each leg of the triangle once, re-scan it. Applying pos-

tulate processing to A-R-C alone will knock out many somatics accepted from another person by the pre-clear. In order to make a systematic session, scan the A-R-C, inhibited and enforced, on each dynamic, using postulate processing.

Basic Goals

A basic purpose postulate lies at the beginning of every life. Each pre-clear should locate and re-experience this basic postulate. Straight-wire of the individual's goals and fears will often uncover this particular postulate and will materially assist the pre-clear to re-define his goals. Briefly, an outline for procedure could be summarized thus:

Future goals	*Future fears*
Present factors	*Present fears*
Past goals (specific in time)	*Past fears (specific in time)*
Past conclusions	*Past conclusions*

Straight-wire the pre-clear over these six areas, beginning with future goals. What are his main goals which concern his activities in the future? Sometimes he may say he cannot resolve a goal, and such being the case, ask what things he might be afraid of in the future (such as losing his job). Whether a future goal or future fear is found, trace out the present factors which make such possible or probable, and then ask what he is now doing in order to bring such goals into fruition, or to remove the fears from his horizon. It might be well to consider what factors if any are present in present-time that are making such a goal possible.

Next, seek the past goals, specific in time. The question might be asked: "What are some past goals that compare with the future goals?" The points where the pre-clear concluded (in the past) that he could not have such goals are rather stickily fixed conclusions. Straight-wire these fears. Find what he has to be afraid of "right now." Is there anything of which he is afraid in present time? Is the boss unkind? When did he conclude the boss was unkind?

Nearly any pre-clear will find goals in the past which were in conflict. Locate these goals and the times of decision concerning them. Straight-wire on conclusions inhibiting his attaining of any goals, seeking always for the *instant* the decisions were made.

If there is but little response the first time, go over the six areas again, working the pre-clear's goals on all of the eight dynamics, but cleaning up the First Dynamic before going to the next. In this manner the pre-clear is assisted to regain his self-determinism, placing him in a positive approach to the future by removing fears and redefining his early goals.

Deep and Light Processing

There are now two kinds of processing in which we are involved: Light processing and deep processing. Light processing deals with postulates and effects and can be done either on an individual or co-auditing basis. Deep processing calls into use Effort and Advanced Procedure; and with it an auditor is mandatory. Postulate processing combined with Effort and Advanced Procedure helps the pre-clear to pick up very early postulates, incident by incident.

Whatever the method, deep or light, by which postulates are reviewed, the individual eventually comes to the realization that he is the effect of his own postulates. He postulates a conclusion; he moves forward in time and becomes affected by that conclusion. An individual who can remember all the postulates and decisions he ever made is a well person.

Toward
A Saner World

JACK HORNER

For centuries Man has been attempting to achieve universality of agreement in his ideas and approaches to life. As evidenced by the wars and other conflicts which have continually plagued him since the dawn of history, his attempts, to date, have not been entirely successful. That Christianity, Buddhism and the other religions have failed to achieve universal acceptance is obvious in the fact that they all have a present-time simultaneous existence. If universality existed there would be need for only one religion, which to maintain its universality must be ever able to modify its ideas with the process of change and randomness which is necessary for the continued survival of man. Usually those ideas which might have eventually achieved universality failed to take change and randomness into consideration and therefore became obsolete, static, or unsatisfactory to those who were involved in the changes, and drew mainly those who tended to be static in their beliefs. This tendency can be found in virtually all existing religions today from Christianity and Communism to Zoroastrianism.

The non-religious philosophers such as Plato and Hegel have attempted to abstract principles by which man could interact through universal understanding; and some of these philosophers had their mental fingers very close to the principles for which they sought. Yet they failed because their ideas had opposition which failed, from lack of similarity in the perceptions, to grasp their projected reality. Reality

will be considered here mutual agreement upon whatever is being considered.

Man has been continually seeking universal ideas and principles by which peace and progress could be attained. Even today many world leaders say that we need universality of agreement upon ideas, and this is exemplified by the creation of the United Nations. Yet the disagreement within the U.N. and, further, the war in Korea illustrate the failure of the U.N. and the attempt to achieve agreement. Moreover, this will continue forever unless Man either blows the Earth apart or until he can find universality of ideas and principles.

How can this be done? Dianetics, in the opinion of the writer, can help toward this goal more than any other approach known at this time. If reality is the result of agreement among men, then the way to get reality is to find a means by which Man can gain agreeement in his ideas. From whence come ideas? They are the abstractions of both experience and data, the syntheses of these into a correlated whole through induction and deduction. However, if ideas are the result of experiences, then unless men can agree upon what they perceive, they certainly cannot agree upon ideas which are the abstractions of perceived experiences.

Dianetics offers a way in which we can all regain or learn the potential perceptions with which we were endowed. Dianetics makes it possible for a person to be more aware of his present perceptions and also makes it possible for his past perceptions to be regained in full through recall, thus making it possible to get an idea based upon all of the data and ability inherently within the individual, both inherent MEST and theta[1] capacities.

If men perceive differently, then they cannot reach the same conclusions; but if Dianetics makes it possible for people to achieve a more equalized perception of their environment, modified only by theta endowment, then Man's ability to achieve universal principles and ideas of interaction will be enhanced to the point where the tone level of society will be high enough not only to maintain peace but high enough

1. Theta—Thought, Life Energy

to permit Man to reach higher goals such as the societal evolution of Homo Superior.

To those of us in Dianetics it appears obvious that men today do not have a common basis of perception and recall. One can ask a person to estimate the passage of thirty seconds and only about one person in thirty can do so accurately, just as about one person in thirty can accurately estimate the height of a wastepaper basket placed in front of the group. If people are unable to estimate accurately the MEST[1] universe, how can they even begin to agree upon ideas which are abstracted from them? It's a wonder that Man has been able to agree as much as he already has. On the other hand, it is certainly no great wonder that he has had the wars that run through the course of history.

Through Dianetics the perceptions of Man can be brought to a minimum level where sufficient agreement on perceived data can permit agreement upon ideas abstracted from these data and as a result allow the tone level of society to rise as the result of increased affinity, reality and communciation. This does not mean that if everyone were able to perceive things equally that men would agree on *everything,* thereby creating a static condition in which motion could not exist and therefore Man could not exist. It might mean, however, that Man could agree enough so that there would never be the worry of another atomic war between men. Moreover, there are enough plus and minus randometries in society today that the total agreement between Man is something which will not have to be worried about for centuries. And by that time he may have learned that agreement and communication must change with the changing realities he creates, and those imposed upon him. Melville's White Whale Moby Dick, representing the Unknown challenging the Best Efforts of Man, was not conquered; but even if he were he would undoubtedly be replaced by other White Whales, or more Unknowns. The number of things to be discovered increases in direct proportion to the number of things which have been discovered, in both the theta and MEST universes. However, if Man's tone level is brought up to the point where he no longer worries about MEST Unknowns within himself and is continually at-

1. Matter, Energy, Space, Time—MEST

tempting to conquer the Unknowns external to—instead of within Himself then Homo Superior will have arrived.

For the first time in the history of Man a method by which Man can reach agreement through common perception has been discovered. Dianetics, as long as it can continually grow and change with optimum randometry, provides the bridge on which Man can cross from Homo Sapiens to Homo Superior. This constitutes one of the major present-time goals of all dianeticists and is, in the opinion of the author, one well worthy of achievement. Hubbard has provided, through the thinking of preceding philosophers and his synthesis of their thoughts plus his own ideas, the Architecture, the Design, and some of the Structural Steel for this goal. It remains for the rest of us to help finish the bridge. And, perhaps, more important, through our own processing to make the other side of the Bridge worthy of the attention of the people on this side of it. We have within our grasp the tools of Dianetics which can raise Man one more step on the ladder of both theta and MEST evolution. With self-determined effort we can make that step toward the saner world now within our sight.

Priority One:
Professional Auditors

HEINZ MAUERER AND ELLIE CREED

This paper is presented with the idea that low-tone auditors will never produce clear pre-clears or MEST clears or Fifteens. It is based on the premise that it may be possible, to some slight extent, to run a pre-clear a little above your own tone level. To accomplish this, however, requires that as many motives (of the auditor) be kept in awareness as is possible by the furthest stretching of the auditor's present abilities imaginable. The questions listed are some of many that an auditor may do well to ask himself. There are no correct answers; however, a definite "yes" or "no" answer may well indicate some interesting possibilities to the auditor about himself. No one need know what your answers are as long as you are willing to assume the attendant responsibility for your own case and others who are trusting your integrity and intentions. The case of the dianetic auditor is in some respects unique. The following questions are posed to indicate some of the possible areas of enturbulation.

Is this pre-clear's tone higher than mine?

Is this pre-clear a threat to me in any way?

Does this pre-clear remind me of anyone else?

Would this pre-clear be a threat to me if he were clear?

Is there any reason why I don't want this pre-clear to be his own control center?

Has this pre-clear ever done anything or said anything to me that I should run out before processing him?

Am I too restimulated at this moment to audit?

Am I, by running this pre-clear, trying to prove anything (theory, technique, computation of pre-clear's case, etc.)?

Is there any reason why I would want to be superior to this pre-clear?

Am I jealous or envious of this pre-clear?

Do I like this pre-clear?

Would it be nice to have this pre-clear dependent upon me?

Would this pre-clear like me less if he were clearer?

Is there anything I want from this pre-clear?

Do I have computations on this pre-clear's case that I want him to get?

Am I limiting this pre-clear to those things and only those things which I am able to run myself?

Am I avoiding incidents in running this pre-clear which I don't like to run?

Am I trying to convince this pre-clear of anything?

Do I sympathize with this pre-clear?

Am I afraid of this pre-clear?

Is it easy for me to talk to this pre-clear outside of session?

Prior to dianetic sessions, did I seem to understand this pre-clear at all?

Am I willing to have this pre-clear make computations and conclusions after he is audited, with which I may not agree?

Does this pre-clear bore me?

Do I believe whole-heartedly that I can help this pre-clear?

Would this pre-clear be less useful, as far as I am concerned, if he were clearer?

Have I ever been influenced by other auditors' computations on this case?

Have I ever been influenced by the opinions of others close to this pre-clear?

Would my approach be the same if I were auditing this pre-clear without charge?

Would my approach be the same if I were not a professional auditor?

Am I willing to modify my technique if necessary, for the good of this pre-clear's case?

Do I consistently approach the same subject areas in every pre-clear?

Is there any aspect of this pre-clear's case which arouses personal curiosity?

Am I seeking information from this pre-clear for my own use?

Would I feel better if this pre-clear felt the same way I do about anything?

Am I being run frequently and regularly by an auditor whose tone is as high or higher than mine?

Is this my "favorite" pre-clear?

Do I feel that this pre-clear must have an understanding of MY theory before I can run him?

Do I want this pre-clear to share my philosophy of life?

Have I scanned out the pre-clear's invalidation of my reality, if there exists such?

Does this pre-clear push my buttons greatly?

Does this pre-clear's life have "story-book appeal" to me?

Is this pre-clear sexually attractive to me?

Do I have any preference as to the sex of the pre-clears I run?

Am I trying to "save" a marriage?

Am I trying to "break up" a marriage?

Do I dislike this pre-clear?

Would I want this pre-clear for my friend?

Do I feel inferior to this pre-clear?

Is this pre-clear much older than I am?

Am I in awe of this pre-clear?

Will I gain any personal reward if this pre-clear runs well?

Have I referred to this pre-clear as a "control case"?

Do I share one or more psychosomatics with this pre-clear?

Do this pre-clear and I "think alike"?

Would I "just die" if this pre-clear quit processing?

Is it imperative that I help this pre-clear?

Is there anything in this pre-clear's personal history that "shocks me"?

Is there anything in this pre-clear's history that frightens me?

Are this pre-clear's aberrations "obvious" to me?

Am I impatient to ask the pre-clear another question?

Do I want to hurry in running this pre-clear?

Do I glance at my watch frequently when running this pre-clear?

After running this pre-clear for awhile, do I invariably find myself in the same bodily position?

Do any of my somatics turn on when I run this pre-clear?

Do I "really" feel competent as an auditor?

Am I familiar with any "hopeless" cases?

Is this pre-clear worth saving?

What would my friends think of this pre-clear?

Are this pre-clear's aberrations the ones I dislike the most?

Does this pre-clear have annoying habits?

Would I take this pre-clear to dinner at my mother's?

Is there an aberration I wish this pre-clear would realize he has?

Do I see an aberration in this pre-clear I want to run immediately?

Does this pre-clear have a great deal of influence over me?

Am I willing to have this pre-clear clear before myself?

Am I determined to end sessions with this pre-clear at a certain time?

Am I beyond the point of needing an auditor myself?

Does this pre-clear run painful emotion incidents similar to my own?

Am I trying to force Dianetics into a less inclusive frame of reference?

Have I ever been an advocate of any other school of "mental healing"?

Do I use techniques from other ideologies that are inconsistent with the tenets of Dianetics?

Is Dianetics a good way to make a dollar?

Has Dianetics raised or lowered my prestige?

Has Dianetics worked on me?

Has there been any improvement or cure in my psychosomatics through Dianetics?

Do I revert to force when the going gets tough?

Do children still annoy me?

WHAT DO I THINK OF THESE QUESTIONS?

A Dianetic Birth

MARY BETH HORNER

Many people have expressed interest in the birth and present development of my second child, a dianetic baby. At the request of many I am writing this for those of you who may be interested.

It still remains to be seen, in the light of future development on a comparative basis, exactly how important the birth engram is in the optimum survival of an individual. Here for your own evaluation is the experience and observations of an H.D.A. mother of two children.

My five and a half month old boy, Lance, was born on a hot summer afternoon in the home of an H.D.A. doctor. As many precautions as possible were taken while he was being carried to avoid creation of engrams; but numerous sneezes, coughs, and bumps were seemingly unavoidable, not to mention the romping and jouncing of a comparatively active and unrepressed girl, Denise, who was sixteen and a half months old when Lance was born. It became a natural thing, habit pattern if you will, to say *nothing* when something of this sort occurred, and that response even carried over for a few weeks after the necessity no longer existed.

The doctor's home was chosen for a very important reason, and one that is easy to overlook—no nursery. The first three days after birth, as you should know by this time, are still part of the birth engram, and the rule of silence should still hold over this entire period. Such a situation is utterly impossible in a hospital where the babies are "thrown into the tank" and where there is a lot of chit-chat between nurses

and much crying, squalling, and so forth. So this factor was taken care of by using a back bedroom in the doctor's home, incidentally frowned upon by the A.M.A., (seemingly for reasons of monopoly and "control"). So technically, it is illegal in California to have a baby anywhere but in a hospital. (How ridiculous can one get?)

Anesthesia was no problem for me. My first child was born without anesthesia, by the Read method of natural childbirth, and under protest from the nurses and internes involved, one of whom kept wailing, "Doctor, *please* give her something, make her take some gas. I can't *stand* to see her suffer so!" Guess whose buttons were being pushed! I wasn't suffering, I was merely working hard, and the weird sounds I was making were a direct result of the effort I was exerting; but no amount of reassurance from me would ease *her* suffering or stop her wailing. (This was B.D.—Before Dianetics.) The first child was eight hours in coming; the second was two, and would have gotten here sooner if I had done my part. Here's how it was.

Second stage labor (when the mother helps out by "bearing down") had set in before I realized that there had been any first stage at all. The water broke at home when I got up from a nap. Then the second-stage contractions really set in. We went to the doctor's home, even though he was out somewhere on house calls. While the medical exchange was frantically trying to locate him, I was frantically trying to keep the baby from being born. Another doctor was present in case my own shouldn't arrive on time; but he didn't believe in Dianetics, and went around turning on all the lights, saying something about the "dim religious light in here," assuring me I was doing a fine job, I was a real "brick," I didn't need a doctor but could step behind a bush and have a baby, and yak yak yak yak! I would gladly have silenced him forcibly had I not been so busy with what I was doing. When I heard a car door slam and someone outside called "Here's Fritz"—an hour and forty-five minutes later—I relaxed, greatly relieved, and went to work on my part of the job. Ten minutes later, with the "dim religious light" restored, and in complete silence, our son was born. And my husband was there watching, and helping by holding one of my legs (no

braces as on a delivery table). He said he didn't notice until ten minutes after the birth that it was a boy. When I heard the cry, (as soon as the head emerged, before the rest of the body was out, even) I lifted up my head to watch, and I saw immediately that it was a boy.

I like to recall the experience for pleasure. It was a hot day, and I hadn't a stitch on except a strapless halter, no sheet or anything; I was perspiring too much and working too hard to want to be bothered with conventionalities and false modesty. And to top it off, the doctor came rushing in wearing spotless white tennis shorts, nothing more. The humor of the situation, although possibly not apparent to others, has been a source of amusement for me.

For three days, from Friday through Monday, complete silence was maintained in that bedroom. And here are the things we have observed that might be evaluated on a comparative basis. Lance has never gone through a two- or three-month period, as seems to be "normal," of sleeping and eating, sleeping and eating, and mostly sleeping. Since his first week home (almost two weeks old) he has stayed awake anywhere from six to ten hours out of twenty-four, sometimes staying awake for up to six hours at a stretch, with maybe a ten-minute "cat-nap." He seems to be perfectly happy to look around, "talk," kick and generally keep himself busy. He is very alert and quick in his responses, and loves to be talked to and played with; but he is also happy without this sort of attention. Once in a while when he gets fussy, he will respond quite readily to attention, but always only as a prelude to being fed. I find that I have to watch the clock if he's to get four or five feedings a day. I believe in a self-demand schedule, but he will "demand" only about three times a day. It was remarked that he is too good-natured for his own good! ("The squeaky wheel gets the grease." !!!!) He still goes to sleep somewhere between 8:00 and 10:00 P.M., but he wakes up between 7:00 and 9:00 A.M.

The idea has been persistent in my mind that not only do different individuals require different amounts of sleep but also maybe an "aberrative" birth experience, or lack of same, makes an even greater difference in the total amount of sleep

necessary. I was validated when, at the December Wichita conference, Hubbard put forth the idea that maybe sleep isn't necessary. I would qualify this to add "to such a large extent, and taking into consideration individual differences," and also to what degree sleep may possibly be a social aberration.

Further observation and comparison may bring out other interesting characteristics to evaluate in the light of what we now know. At this time, however, it would seem that birth is an important factor, aside from the fact that we were all born! We shall see; and maybe this will be the beginning of an interesting collection of data.

Foundation
Amateur Radio Station

Now on the air, WⲫYGL Amateur Radio Station can be contacted on 40 meters (7140 KC.), C.W. Times: Intermittent.

The File Clerk

The FILE CLERK questions ordinarily come from readers of the DIANETIC AUDITOR'S BULLETIN. Questions of a technical nature are preferred and should be addressed to The Editor.

Q: If a pre-clear's environment is satisfactory, if he is not using drugs or being hypnotized, and if the Auditor's Code is not being broken, what might cause the free theta which is released from an engram or lock, during a reduction or erasure, to go back into enturbulation somewhere else on the time track?

A: Free theta is ambitious. As soon as a bit of it gets free, it tries to tie into another bit of entheta, but often gets hung up in the incident it has selected in the process. It is imperative that the sessions be scanned out or straight-wired out, however, since failing to do this also allows free theta to become enturbulated or latched up in the session.

Q: If the commands in a lock, secondary or engram are dramatized during regular life, is that lock, secondary or engram made harder to contact and reduce or erase?

A: When a pre-clear's tone is high, either from plenty of straight-wire or running of pleasure moments, secondaries and engrams are much easier to contact and much easier to erase. In fact, a pre-clear should be run only in conjunction with the tone scale, and his position on it. When he has enough free theta to do the job, he will have little trouble getting through an engram, and its reality will be high.

Q: If the dramatization is held back by the pre-clear himself, does that lock or engram become potently more and more easy to contact and reduce or erase as time goes on?

A: If the dramatization is held back by the pre-clear, other somatics will appear. The dramatization is demanded by the engram. If the demand is not met, the somatic of the original pain contained within the engram will appear, since the dramatization is simply the "survival" computation of the mind.

Q: Does the fact that the pre-clear feels bad when he resists his own dramatizations produce locks which enturbulate more than he would be enturbulated by dramatizing so long as no one aided his dramatization?

A: Answered by question three.

Q: Would it not be profitable to run hurdy-gurdy and lock scanning on the tone scale as well as on ARC and circuits? By this I mean, in hurdy-gurdy asking for times when a person caused the pre-clear because of enforced or inhibited communication to become bored, then antagonistic, then angry, fearful, unhappy, apathetic, and progressing on through A and R; and in lock scanning, looking for chains of boredom, anger, fear, etc. I assume this is implied and understood, but I did not notice it specifically mentioned in either the BULLETIN or SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL. Also how about using these techniques on each dynamic in turn?

A: Emotion processing is of extreme importance in the majority of cases, either by scanning or by running the emotional curve (swinging down the slump in emotions and then the upsurge in a particular situation) or by some other effective method as straight-wire. Your suggestion assists in contacting those particular emotions. Working each dynamic on the emotional curve or by emotional scanning has been found effective.

Second Annual Conference
of
Hubbard Dianetic Auditors

Dianetic enthusiasm again mounted high in Foundation Halls with the arrival of the second annual conference on December 27-30, 1951. Lectures, refresher courses, intensives to facilitate handling new processing approaches, renewing "auld land syne" were various objectives of attending members. Except for occasional group facsimiles brought into present time, group tone was high.

Lectures, demonstrations and seminars evolved around Ron Hubbard's latest book, HANDBOOK FOR PRE-CLEARS ($2.50), introduced at this meeting, and ADVANCED PROCEDURES AND AXIOMS ($2.50). Hubbard's lectures presented mainly effort, emotion and thought processing, cause and effect and life continuum. They were delivered in the Crystal Room of the Shirkmere Hotel. Tapes of the lectures are available by arrangement for Foundation affiliates, and later will be available for general rental.

Using the Fifteen Acts as a basis, Don Purcell, on Thursday and Friday evenings, audited a pre-clear. These sessions were picked up by microphone and amplified into the lecture hall where the group assembled; these were followed by discussion with Don Purcell. The demonstration helped to clarify the processing approach presented in Hubbard's latest books.

Mornings were arranged with the group divided into five seminars, each led by a Foundation member: Morris and Virginia Kammann, Rae Perrier, Lawrence Platt, Ross Lamoreaux.

On Sunday evening dancing and a floor show created present-time pleasure moments at the Hotel Lassen, assisting the group to scan off previous days' seriousness and to develop fellowship in true group-dianetic spirit. Jack Nonmacher acted as master of ceremonies and Sue Whipp as hostess.

Personnel attending the conference follows:

Lohren Applegate
Gil Baker
Elizabeth Burrage
Doris Graffam
Mary Beth Strong
Warren Collins
Byron S. Warner
Ellen Watson
Dr. M. D. Woodgate
George Ware
E. Mayne van Vogt
Bonnie Turner
Lois Switzer
J. A. Struckmeyer
W. F. Strong
William Stocker
Richard Steves
George M. Sterling
Miriam St. George
John Speirs
Eugene E. Smith
Robert Smith
George Seidler
Faith H. Rossiter
H. G. E. Rhodes
Walt Remy
Charles W. Putnam
Charles P. Putnam

Hal Seyle
Mr. and Mrs. George Sheffer
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Taylor
Basil Vaerlen
Jeanne Warfield
Idella Stone
Ima Anita Jones
Mrs. Charles Brown
Helen O'Brien
Gerold Slater
Roland Richards
Joan Baron
John Neugebauer
Dr. H. R. Nelson
Bill Hays
Walter Needham
Dan Osborne
Jim Cooper
Robert W. Fisher
Sadah Field
Bud Eubanks
Wayne Dunbar
Olla M. Curry
Martha and Joe Courtis
Thomas Clifton
John M. Campbell, Jr.
Leo Burnett
Leonore Buchin

Walter Pearson
Mr. and Mrs. L. J. Oulette
Moritz Nappe
William S. McCulley
Roman J. Mazurek
Mrs. Esther Matthews
Nelson Marlowe
Anne Mandell
Mamie E. Lilly
Irene Lesser
Seber Leslie
Irene Leslie
G. Paul Koontz
Jonathan Koontz
M. Ann Koontz
Kenneth Kerrigan
Margaret L. Kahmann
Lewis Jordan
Harvey Jackins
L. C. Hultine
Eph Howard
Hank Hill
Fred W. Hibbard
Mr. and Mrs. Carroll Hennick
Janet C. Hays
Benjamin Harrison
William C. Hamilton
Inez Graf
Mrs. Otis Halliday
Stanley Gottlieb
Mr. and Mrs. Harry Gordon
Paul Mitman
Norman Fritz
Evelyn Freer
William J. Fisk
Edward Matjasich
Harold A. Penny
David Russell

Howard S. Bryce
Marjorie Bridges
Iva Lee Breeding
Billi Bowen
Gilbert R. Bentley
Dr. Gordon Beckstead
Edward Barazani
Robert T. Arnold
George A. Cabaniss
Alan Englehardt
Robert Burns
David Dobbs
James Elliott
Evans W. Farber
Mr. and Mrs. George R. Halpern
Clarence E. Humphrey
Mr. and Mrs. Horner
Leonard Hunter
Laverne Jammaron
Carl Jardine
D. C. King
Alberta Elliott
Elizabeth Remy
Louise Mosely
Joyce Black
Don Bartholomew
L. J. Clifford
Amber Ekberg
Ralph Keyes
Lewis Newgard
Don Schuster
Verne Dewey
James Scheler
David MacLean
Ross Lamoreaux
Waldo T. Boyd
John W. Maloney
Don and Margaret Purcell

Margaret Sassaman
Nan McCurdy
Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Lane
Carl Warner
Mary Blackman

Rae Perrier
Lawrence Platt
Morris and Virginia Kammann
Genevieve Crist

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.

Mr. and Mrs. A. E. van Vogt

announce the opening

of

HUBBARD DIANETIC CENTER

7175 Sunset Boulevard

Hollywood 28, California