

P.A.B. No. 156
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology
From L. RON HUBBARD
Via The Hubbard Communications Office
37, Fitzroy Street, London, W.1

15th March, 1959

PROCESSES USED IN 21ST ACC

(Continued from P.A.B. No. 155)

All of these straightwire processes run best with an E-Meter, using the question "When". About the only reason we came off *time* was because auditors were using time to harass. It is not that it isn't best to run it with time—it is best to run it with time. The muzzled fashion of running here is "Recall a time . . . when . . ."

The guy says he did.

"When?"

All right, the next response on the preclear's part is, "I don't know." Then the auditor goes into action.

Now, when you hound them and mix them up and twist them up and mess them up with time questions, all that's happening is that the auditor is dramatizing his own confusion about time, and he probably wouldn't accept the preclear's answer if it was three o'clock, September 2nd, 1959.

Muzzled Auditing is very severely this: the auditor utters the auditing command, the preclear answers it, and the auditor says, "All right." The preclear originates, the auditor nods. Let's make this a very severe definition of what we call muzzled auditing. Now, when you let the auditor go a little bit and give him an E-Meter and "When", my experience and observation here in the 21st ACC is, he just goes for broke. It's rather as if you cut two strands of a three-strand rope and he quickly busts the other strand. In other words, it's muzzled or nothing. And where you have somebody who is doing any chop-up or is stacking up ARC breaks in any way, you have as your best answer "muzzled", and muzzled is *muzzled*. And they can't say "When", either, because evidently if you give them "When" they can go for broke and they can use "When" and the answers thereof to chop the preclear up.

We did try to install a muzzled "When". For my money, it hasn't been successful. We've had at least one of our people exceed this at once. Just letting him open his mouth starts the machine. "It's all right for you to say *When*," you can say to this auditor—"It's all right for you to say *When*." Right away, he says, "Well, I've got to do something else." And so forth. We have even found that muzzled auditing wouldn't go on this one: "I'll repeat the auditing command." You can't even let them do that. You can't let them say this, because it has been used to invalidate the preclear. We have an auditor (he's not an auditor, he's a case) who, every time the preclear answers the question, says, "I'll repeat the auditing command." The preclear tries to answer the question again, and the auditor just uses this as a non-acceptance. So this can't go as part of muzzled auditing. That so far has been my observation.

This may be a very harsh look, but I feel from what I have observed that I am justified.

As I have already mentioned, we've got another condition here—reasonability. People have been writing script on the preclear's engrams to some degree. That is a great evil. And those people we have turned loose and those people who are running engrams and are saying this sort of thing are doing pretty well, and some of them are

writing a bit of script. And the main thing they are *not* doing is picking up the overts. There are a couple of them stalled around here on overts.

There is a rule about this—when they cannot easily find or run the overts, take them right straight on down to Dynamic Straightwire. These people are not owning up to their own responsibilities and that means that—perhaps because the case has changed over to an area of irresponsibility—you have a situation here in which the individual has dropped out responsibility factors to such a degree that he cannot be trusted. When a person won't own up to his overts, you have an irresponsibility of great magnitude. This goes hand in glove with failing to answer the exact auditing command, failing to execute an auditing command, and so forth. And that can happen while running engrams.

(To be continued)

Compiled from the research material and tape lectures of

L. RON HUBBARD

Copyright © 1959 by L. Ron Hubbard. All Rights Reserved.

DISPATCH from Millie Galusha to LRH after the 21st American ACC.

Something I've found as a preclear:

Was being run on a snake engram. I felt something was between me and the engram. I told the auditor it was "a bug". Told him, I felt that if it were run I could run the engram more easily.

It checked out on the meter, so he ran it. As we ran it, I could "feel" the engram getting looser and looser. It felt as though, if we continued running overts (*particularly* if they were terminals such as those in an engram), an engram would loosen up more and more, until one could do nothing but go ahead and confront the engram. As we ran A Bug, the snake people engram got looser and looser—it got so damned real. "Pretty soon," I thought, "I'll just have to go ahead and confront that part I've been not looking at. There's nothing else left to do now but look at the damned thing!" And my willingness to confront the engram increased rapidly.

(My conclusion is that if any auditor is running an engram and it's sticky, etc, he can run overt-withhold on a terminal right out of the engram and, boy, will that free it up!)

Like you said, (1) an auditor should check with the preclear on past auditors who ran on him an engram which isn't flat, and clean that up if the preclear is hung up in it; and (2) an auditor could ask the preclear for the most real terminal in the engram and run overt-withhold on that. In my case, we did not run "snake people", although I *might* have said that was the most real terminal in the engram if an auditor had asked, but if an auditor had asked for a flash answer (or otherwise) on the most real terminal TO REPRESENT that engram, or "What would represent Snake People (or whatever)?", I might have said "A bug". I wouldn't have understood it at that early stage of the game, but A Bug would have been it, nevertheless. (Since, I have now found out that A Bug does indeed represent many things, snakes included.)

You are so right—getting overts off will reduce motivators to "Couldn't care less, because I can be and have been Cause (pant, pant—sigh, relief) PLENTY of times!" Then, engrams can be run so much easier. Real great, this overt-withhold stuff. Everybody around here is finding that out! You're due for a great big Thank You. Maybe some day you'll get one big enuf as you deserve.

